

King of Killers: The Criminological Theories of Hannibal Lecter, Part One

By

J.C. Oleson
Old Dominion University

The public exhibits an insatiable appetite for crime, especially for serial murder. Serial killers are prominently featured in television programs, feature films, novels, and true crime books. But one serial killer remains our favorite: Dr. Hannibal “the Cannibal” Lecter. Thomas Harris’ enigmatic literary character – the American Film Institute’s number one villain of all time – has become a wildly successful franchise. The trilogy of Lecter novels has sold tens of millions of copies, and the four Lecter films have earned more than \$838 million. Perhaps the character of Hannibal Lecter is so popular because, drawn from real-life serial killers, he fits several criminological models. Or perhaps Lecter is popular because he presents readers with a puzzle, encompassing contradictions, defying convenient categorization.

Keywords: Hannibal Lecter; serial killer; cannibal

CRIME AND POPULAR CULTURE: FIXATED BY VIOLENCE, FASCINATED BY MURDER

“[T]hey love crime, every one loves crime, they love it always, not at some ‘moments.’”
Dostoevsky, 1881/1949, p. 451

The public exhibits a seemingly insatiable appetite for crime (Hyatt, 1995). At any given moment, there is usually a movie about cops and killers playing at the local metroplex theater. Our airwaves are congested with primetime television programs about homicide detectives, sex offender units, and crime scene investigators. We clamor for taut psychological thrillers and we watch gory slasher films “through a pinkish shield of splayed fingers, ... [allowing these thrillers to fill us] with mixed feelings of amazement and terror” (Hinson, 1993, p. G1). It is true of books as well as movies. Amid the poetry and literature, our bookstores have devoted shelves (and sometimes whole sections) to true crime publications (Egger, 1998, p. 85). Accordingly, notorious offenders like Jesse James, Al Capone, and Charles Manson have been elevated into the pantheon of villains: individuals who enjoy hero-like adoration but who represent the shadowy aspect of the hero archetype (Campbell, 1988; Jung, 1936/1959; May, 1975). At the pinnacle of this infatuation with crime towers the serial killer. “[T]he serial killer constitutes a mythical, almost supernatural, embodiment of American society’s deepest darkest fears. We are compelled by the representation of this figure because he allows us to project our fears onto a clearly delineated villain” (Beckman, 2001, p. 62).

Apter (1992) suggests that serial killers transfix people because dangerous things – like serial killers – tend to create a state of invigorating psychological arousal. To neutralize the feelings of anxiety that accompany dangerous threats – like serial killers – we use protective

© 2005 School of Criminal Justice, University at Albany
Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture, 12 (3), 186-210.

frames such as narrative explanations or criminological theories. In explaining the serial killer's behavior, we allow ourselves to succumb to the exciting magnetism of evil (Kloer, 2002, p. B1) and can thereby "experience the excitement of arousal without being overwhelmed by anxiety" (Ramsland, 2005).

The same principle explains the allure of horror movies. But in a future-shock society of blasé attitudes (Toffler, 1970), we have grown inured to the horror stories of our childhoods. Fattened on a diet of mad scientists, alien invaders, and forces of nature that have run amok, society has become desensitized (Alford, 1997). Indeed, few Hollywood villains retain the power to create genuine fear in the modern mind. But the concept of the serial killer endures – the idea of the murderous everyman next door continues to rivet us in a way that supernatural monsters and bogeymen cannot (Broske, 1992).

Because they have the power to make us feel alive in our benumbed "wound culture" (Seltzer, 1998, pp. 1-2), a strange kind of adoration is heaped upon contemporary serial killers, the monsters of our cynical age (Broske, 1992; Jenkins, 1994). "Our society is obsessed with serial killers," suggests Bruno (Kloer, 2002, p. B1). Similarly, Hawker (2001) quips, "All the world loves a serial killer." These authors appear to be correct. Today, the Internet is littered with shrines devoted to serial killers (e.g. Portraits of Serial Killers, 2005; Serial Killer Central, 2005; Serial Killer Collection, 2005).

A FASCINATION WITH MODERN MONSTERS: THE SERIAL KILLER

"Killings are escalating. I pretty much see this as a growth industry."

Michael Newton, quoted in Broske, 1992, p. B18

We have inverted our villains into strange heroes, commodifying their wickedness for legions of consumers. Merchants and collectors have created a thriving market in crime scene memorabilia (Kahan, 2000; Schmid, 2004). Although they were so controversial that Nassau, New York passed a law prohibiting their possession (Reiter, 1998), true crime trading cards were sold and later collected into a bound volume (Jones & Collier, 1993). These cards resemble traditional baseball cards, except that instead of photos of batters and outfielders, they featured blood-splattered watercolor portraits of cannibal killers and serial murderers, and instead of describing homeruns or bases stolen, they described the killer's number of victims and modus operandi of killing. More recently, Johnson has achieved another sort of "celebrity of infamy" (Oleson, 2003, p. 407) by selling collectible serial killer action figures on the Internet (Schmid, 2004; Spectre Studios, 2005).

Even individuals who think that Charles Manson action figures and Ted Bundy trading cards are reprehensible are not immune from society's pervasive fascination with serial killers. Most people recognize some of the names in Table 1: Jeffrey Dahmer and Ted Bundy, for example, have become iconic.

Table 1

The Names of the Famous and the Infamous

Jeffrey Dahmer	Aaron Ciechanover
Ted Bundy	Avram Hershko
Richard Ramirez	Irwin Rose
Aileen Wuornos	Finn E. Kydland
John Wayne Gacy	Edward C. Prescott
Theodore John Kaczynski	Elfriede Jelinek
David Berkowitz	Richard Axel
Ed Gein	Linda B. Buck
Charles Starkweather	Wangari Maathai
Kenneth Bianchi	David J. Gross

Many people recognize some of the names, but few recognize them all. Indeed, while people tend to recognize some (or all) of the names in the left-hand column, the names in the right-hand column tend to be unfamiliar. This is because the names in the left-hand column are serial killers and because the names in the right-hand column are 2004 Nobel Prize winners (Nobel e-Museum, 2005). In our society, we appear to know more about the serial killers of yesteryear than we do about our current Nobel laureates.

Yet one serial killer dominates all others in notoriety: Dr. Hannibal “The Cannibal” Lecter. As one journalist astutely noted, “[I]t’s hard to avoid the omnipresent Dr. Hannibal Lecter – fictional though he may be” (Kloer, 2002, p. B1). Dr. Hannibal Lecter is a character drawn from three novels by Thomas Harris: *Red Dragon* (1981), *The Silence of the Lambs* (1988), and *Hannibal* (1999). The books have been made into four feature films: *Manhunter* (1986) (based on *Red Dragon*), *The Silence of the Lambs* (1991), *Hannibal* (2001), and *Red Dragon* (2002). A fourth book, *Behind the Mask*, will be released in 2005, and made into a fifth Lecter film, *Young Hannibal* (*Behind the Mask*, 2005). Even a Hannibal video game is being developed (PC Gameworld, 2005).

To assert that the Lecter novels have been influential is an understatement. These books have been translated into dozens of languages and have sold tens of millions of copies. The films earned nearly one billion dollars at the box office (Numbers, 2005). Derided by some critics (e.g., Finke, 1999; Mitchell, 2002; Palmer, 2001; Whitty, 2002) and lauded by others (e.g., Gray,

1999; Hawker, 2001), the films also catapulted the character of Hannibal Lecter to celebrity status. In describing the widespread appeal of the character, Skal (1993, p. 383) wrote, "Hannibal Lecter was, arguably, the most publicized and recognizable personality (real or not) in America during February 1991."

HANNIBAL LECTER: THE NUMBER ONE VILLAIN OF ALL TIME

"Evil has its heroes as well as good."

La Rochefoucauld, 1665/1959, p. 60

The public venerates the character of Hannibal Lecter as a celebrity, as an icon, as a cult hero (Arnold, 1999; Thomson, 2001). Certainly, the public appears to love Hannibal Lecter. But *why* do we love him? Lanchester has suggested that Hannibal Lecter "is attractive because we are repulsive: the more people like Lecter, the worse the news about human nature" (Hawker, 2001). It *does* seem strange that the public would embrace a villain in such a way. One journalist astutely asked, "How can one make a murderous psychopath who not only kills his victims but eats them, sometimes alive, into a cult hero? What kind of civilization celebrates such a creation?" (Suraiya, 1999). This is an important question. Indeed, the veneration of a cannibal killer may imply that something has gone horribly awry within our culture. But perhaps Hannibal Lecter resonates in the public imagination for some other, deeper reason.

Why do we love Lecter? Perhaps because he is the "perfect gothic hero" (Dunant, 1999, p. 24) or because he is the perfect gothic *antihero* (Dery, 1999). Perhaps it is because the heroic and the villainous co-exist within him. Because he is Obi Wan Kenobi and Darth Vader rolled into one (Hawker, 2001), because he is Darth Vader and Superman rolled into one (Cagle, 2002, p. 84), or because he is Sherlock Holmes and Professor Moriarty rolled into one (Sexton, 2001). Why do we love Lecter? Dery attempted to answer the question, writing:

Why do we love him? ... He's cool, in the same way that Anne Rice's Vampire Lestat is: He has all the best lines, great bone structure, an I.Q. measureless to man, Draculinian dominion over wild animals (in *Hannibal*, feral pigs obey his commands), is 'size for size ... as strong as an ant,' drives a supercharged black Jaguar, is richer than God, and gets the babe. Coolest of all, his pulse doesn't top 85, even when he's tearing out your tongue and eating it (1999, p. 40).

Whether Lecter is hero, antihero, or the terrible Hegelian synthesis of the two, there is no question that he has struck a profound chord in the public. We love Lecter. He is the paragon of serial killers. There is something about this character that resonates in the popular imagination, and that lures audiences back to the novels and the films in order to spend their time with Lecter. It is this fascination with the character that has made the books and movies into such a profitable franchise (Cagle, 2002; Johnson, 2001; McGuigan, Gordon, & Sawhill, 1999).

Thomas Harris's novels have been phenomenally successful – *The Silence of the Lambs* was a Book-of-the-Month Club selection and sold more than 12 million copies (Sexton, 2001). As a global literary franchise, the Lecter trilogy has sold tens of millions of books. *Red Dragon* has been translated into 12 other languages and *The Silence of the Lambs* has been translated into 22 other languages (Random House, 2005). Indeed, the success of *Red Dragon* and *The Silence*

of the Lambs made a household name of its author, and permitted Thomas Harris to negotiate a lucrative 2-book deal for \$5.2 million dollars (Hawker, 2001), publishing *Hannibal*, the first of these two books, years after his deadline, in 1999 (McGuigan, et al., 1999). Publisher Random House was so confident in the success of *Hannibal* that it printed 1.2 million copies of the book in its initial print run, more than double the 500,000 originally planned (Arnold, 1999). *Hannibal* debuted at number one, held that spot for six weeks, and sold more than 1.7 million hardcover copies through nine print runs (Maryles, 2000), looming as the second best-selling hardback book in the United States during 1999 (Locus, 2000). Although *Entertainment Weekly* panned it as one of the ten worst books of the year (Locus, 1999), Dell Books launched the mass market paperback printing of *Hannibal* with 2.4 million copies (Maryles, 2000).

The Lecter movies have been even more high-stakes than Harris' novels. The intensely atmospheric *Manhunter* (Mann, 1986) introduced the movie-going world to Hannibal Lecter and grossed more than \$8.6 million dollars in domestic box office revenue (Numbers, 2005). But this limited commercial success of *Manhunter* was modest compared to the runaway sales of *The Silence of the Lambs* (Demme, 1991), which grossed three times its cost at the box office (Finke, 1999), earning more than \$130 million dollars at the domestic box office, and making another \$142 million in foreign receipts (Numbers, 2005). *Hannibal* (Scott, 2001) was another very successful movie. Anthony Hopkins was paid \$24 million for revisiting the role of Lecter in the film (Palmer, 2001), which shattered February opening records, earned more money in its opening weekend than any other R-rated movie (E. Mitchell, 2001), and had grossed more than \$350 million in worldwide earnings before being released to video (Numbers, 2005). But *Hannibal* was not the last installation in the Lecter series. Anthony Hopkins received 7.5% of the box office receipts – with an \$8 million dollar advance – for reprising his role in *Red Dragon* (Cagle, 2002). *Red Dragon* (Ratner, 2002) earned \$36.5 million in its opening weekend, and more than \$206 million in worldwide box office receipts (Numbers, 2005). Together, the four Lecter films have earned more than \$838 million dollars (Numbers, 2005). The release of *Young Hannibal* will almost certainly catapult the Lecter films over the one billion dollar mark.

The films have been enjoyed critical, as well as commercial, success. *Manhunter* was nominated for a 1987 Edgar Allen Poe Award, and won the Cognac Festival du Film Policier Critics Award (Internet Movie Data Base, 2005a). In 1992, the film adaptation of *The Silence of the Lambs* became the third movie in Academy Awards history to sweep the Oscars in all five of the major categories (Harris & Dunkley, 2001): Best Picture, Best Director, Best Actor, Best Actress, and Best Adapted Screenplay. It also garnered more than a dozen other prestigious film awards (Internet Movie Data Base, 2005b). *Hannibal* earned a 2002 ASCAP award and a 2002 Saturn for Best Make-Up (Internet Movie Data Base, 2005c), and *Red Dragon* earned a 2003 London Critics Film Circle Award and the 2003 World Stunt Award for Best Fire Stunt (Internet Movie Data Base, 2005d).

But the success of Lecter's character transcends the successes of the individual films. In ranking the screen's 100 greatest heroes and villains, the American Film Institute (AFI) selected *The Silence of the Lambs'* Hannibal Lecter as the number one villain of all time, beating out baddies such as Darth Vader, the Wicked Witch of the West, and *2001's* HAL 9000 (American Film Institute, 2005a). More recently, Hannibal Lecter's quotation – "A census taker once tried to test me. I ate his liver with some fava beans and a nice Chianti" – was selected by the AFI as

the number 21 film quote of all time, beating out classic lines such as “Bond. James Bond” (number 22) and “Houston, we have a problem” (number 50; American Film Institute, 2005b).

Lecter is our number one villain. We are fascinated with serial killers, in part, because we are fascinated by him. Indeed, the character of Lecter is so skillfully-drawn that numerous journalists have written about him as if he was a real figure, blurring the boundaries between fiction and fact. Jenkins (1994, p. 89) notes:

Case studies of serial killers frequently refer to Harris’s work as if it were the definitive account of a true-life phenomenon. The fictional Hannibal became a villain as well known as any authentic offender, and was even cited in journalistic accounts as if he were a real figure.

Even criminal justice professionals have sometimes written about Lecter as if he was a real offender (Kloer, 2002; Sexton, 2001). Egger (1998), for example, criticized the “FBI agents [who] continue to ride the wave of publicity that surrounds a serial murder investigation. ... Some of these agents even have the audacity to characterize the movie *Silence of the Lambs* as an accurate portrayal of a typical FBI investigation into a serial murder” (p. 89).

HANNIBAL LECTER: THE QUINTESSENTIAL ORGANIZED SERIAL KILLER

“Adaptability and mobility are signs of the organized killer. Moreover, organized killers learn as they go on from crime to crime; they get better at what they do....”

Ressler & Shachtman, 1992, p. 132

Because journalists and law enforcement officers have conflated fact and fiction, selling the fictional character of Hannibal Lecter to the public as a bona fide serial killer, it is no surprise that Lecter looms in the popular imagination as *the* paradigmatic example of the serial killer. Perhaps, though, this is not as erroneous as it initially seems: Hannibal Lecter is fictional, but the character is based upon real offenders (Canter, 1994).

Some have suggested that Lecter is based upon on a Mexican doctor that author Thomas Harris interviewed in prison; others have suggested that Lecter was modeled upon a real-life offender, William Coyner, who escaped from prison in 1934 and went on a murder and cannibalism spree in Cleveland (Sexton, 2001), and others have hinted that Lecter may be based on Welsh killer, Jason Ricketts, who murdered and eviscerated his cellmate in a Cardiff prison (Hannibal Library, 2005). Most commentators, however, believe that the character of Hannibal Lecter is derived from the case studies that Harris reviewed while visiting the FBI’s Behavioral Science Unit [BSU] in Quantico, Virginia (Canter, 1994; Douglas & Olshaker, 1995; Ressler & Shachtman, 1992; Seltzer, 1998). Specifically, Jenkins (1994, p. 89) sees the criminal antecedents for Lecter in Ted Bundy and Edmund Kemper. But because Harris does not grant interviews (C. Mitchell, 2001), it is unlikely that a definitive answer about the inspiration for Lecter is forthcoming. Still, if nothing else, it is clear that Harris’ brief tenure at the BSU introduced the author to the FBI’s influential model of serial homicide.

Simpson (2000) describes the FBI’s reductivist vision of the etiology of serial homicide:

The rather rigid set of conclusions about the “typical” serial killer that resulted are variations on two basic themes: “the dominance of a fantasy life and a history of personal abuse.” According to the FBI, the serial killer’s psyche is that of a violent child’s inhabiting the physically powerful body of a full-grown male. His development has been stalled because of some primal trauma or traumas that he cannot resolve. While the serial killer develops the intellectual powers of an adult, he also retains the volatile emotions of the unjustly wounded child (p. 128, citations omitted).

The model is not without some foundation, however. Other researchers have concurred with the FBI’s conclusions, identifying two important precursors to serial homicide. The first of these is a pathological fantasy life (see e.g., Hickey, 1991, MacCulloch, Snowden, Wood, & Mills, 1983; Prentky, Burgess, & Carter, 1986; Ressler, Burgess, & Douglas, 1988), while the second of these is childhood trauma (see e.g., Abrahamsen, 1973; Lewis et al., 1985; Malmquist, 1971; Seghorn, Prentky, & Boucher, 1987; Smith, 1965). In the *Lecter* novels, the character of Hannibal appears to fit this basic etiological model. He enjoys a rich and detailed fantasy life (Harris, 1981, p. 59; Harris, 1988, p. 164; Harris, 1999, pp. 251-2) and he suffered serious childhood trauma (Harris, 1999, p. 255). But Hannibal Lecter is an interesting character because he also conforms to another important model advanced by the FBI.

Between 1979 and 1983, investigators with the FBI conducted extensive clinical assessments with 36 sexually-motivated murderers in an attempt to divine the origins of serial murder (Ressler, Burgess, Hartman, Douglas, & McCormack, 1986). These interviews facilitated the development of the FBI’s dichotomous model of organized and disorganized homicides (Ressler, Burgess, Douglas, Hartman, & D’Agostino, 1986). Robert Ressler wrote that within the walls of the BSU, the “organized versus disorganized distinction became the great divide, a fundamental way of separating two quite different types of personalities who commit multiple murders” (Ressler & Shachtman, 1992, p. 129). Organized offenders, like John Wayne Gacy, Ted Bundy, or Ed Kemper, plan and coordinate their offenses, while disorganized offenders such as Richard Trenton Chase or Herbert Mullin, do not choose their victims logically. Table 2 identifies the fundamental profile characteristics of organized and disorganized offenders.

The organized/disorganized dichotomy is just one taxonomy of serial murder. There are many ways to classify homicides (i.e., Egger, 1998; Lester, 1995). Dietz (1986), for example, identified five discrete types of serial killers: psychopathic sexual sadists, crime spree killers, organized crime functionaries, custodial poisoners and asphyxiators, and supposed psychotics. Rappaport (1988) defined four categories of multicides: pseudocommandos, family annihilators, set-and-run killers, and serial murderers. In their well-known taxonomy, Holmes and DeBurger (1988) identified four categories: visionary types, mission-oriented types, hedonistic types (including lust-oriented killers, thrill-oriented killers, and comfort-oriented killers), and control-oriented types. Holmes (1990) later added a fifth category: predatory types. Hickey (1991) outlined a trauma-control model, incorporating predispositional factors, traumatic events, trauma reinforcements, low self-esteem fantasies, and facilitators into an interactive model. Douglas, Burgess, Burgess, and Ressler (1992) developed a motive-based classification system for homicides that includes organized and disorganized sexual homicides, but that encompasses a larger number of homicide types (such as criminal enterprise homicides, personal cause homicides, and group cause homicides). There are many ways to categorize killers. But because

author Harris sat in on classes at the FBI's Behavioral Science Unit in the early 1980s, when FBI agents were first pioneering the organized versus disorganized dichotomy, his fiction appears to be heavily influenced by the early FBI taxonomy.

Table 2

Profile Characteristics of Organized and Disorganized Murderers

Organized	Disorganized
Average to above-average intelligence	Below-average intelligence
Socially competent	Socially incompetent
Skilled work preferred	Unskilled work
Sexually competent	Sexually incompetent
High birth order status	Low birth order status
Father's work stable	Father's work unstable
Inconsistent childhood discipline	Harsh discipline as a child
Controlled mood during crime	Anxious mood during crime
Use of alcohol with crime	Minimal use of alcohol
Precipitating situational stress	Minimal situational stress
Living with partner	Living alone
Mobility with car in good condition	Lives/works near crime scene
Follows crime in news media	Minimal interest in news media
May change jobs or leave town	Significant behavior change (drug/alcohol abuse, religiosity, etc.)

Indeed, in *The Silence of the Lambs*, Harris (1988) overtly acknowledges the model. Speaking with FBI-trainee Clarice Starling, the character of Lecter tells her:

[M]ost psychology is puerile...and that practiced in Behavioral Science is on a level with phrenology. Psychology doesn't get very good material to start with. Go to any college psychology department and look at the students and the faculty: ham radio enthusiasts and other personality-deficient buffs. Hardly the best brains on the campus. Organized and disorganized – a real bottom-feeder thought of that (pp. 18-19).

Yet while some (e.g., Campbell, 1976; Oleson, 1996; Wessley, 1994) have joined the character of Lecter in criticizing the FBI dichotomy, there is little question that within Harris'

novels – *Red Dragon*, *The Silence of the Lambs*, and *Hannibal* – the character of Hannibal Lecter fits almost every one of the 14 characteristics of the organized offender (Hannibal Library, 2005). First, Lecter possesses above-average intelligence. Indeed, Harris describes his intellect as so dizzying that it is “not measurable by any means known to man” (Harris, 1988, p. 190).

Second, Lecter is socially competent. Exceptionally so. Before his incarceration, he was a prominent patron of the arts, serving on the board of the Baltimore Philharmonic (Harris, 1999, p. 60). An acquaintance from his social circles describes him as “an extraordinarily charming man, absolutely singular” (Harris, 1999, p. 300). Even from his cramped cell within the Baltimore State Hospital for the Criminally Insane, Lecter complains that “discourtesy is unspeakably ugly” to him (Harris, 1988, p. 24), remains urbane and polite, and demonstrates a social grace that is incongruous with his dungeon-like surroundings (e.g., Harris, 1988, p. 58). His warder, Barney, suggests that “Dr. Lecter had perfect manners, not stiff, but easy and elegant” (Harris, 1999, p. 87).

Third, Lecter prefers skilled work. Before his capture, he worked as a brilliant and highly respected psychiatrist (Harris, 1988, p. 124; Sundelson, 1993) and after his escape from custody in Memphis, Tennessee, he assumed the prestigious post of translator and curator of the Capponi Library in Florence (Harris, 1999, p. 136).

Fourth, Lecter is sexually competent. Although one of Lecter’s enemies denounces him as a homosexual of the type to hire prostitutes for sadomasochistic purposes, author Harris defends Lecter’s honor, rebutting the accusation by noting that Lecter was often seen in Baltimore society circles with attractive women on his arm (Harris, 1999, p. 263). Furthermore, although it disappointed critics, Lecter eventually consummates his relationship with Clarice Starling, suckling her breast (Harris, 1999, p. 477) and later having sex with her on a daily basis (Harris, 1999, p. 483)

Fifth, Lecter has high birth order status. He is the first-born son of an Eastern European family. Although it is not revealed until *Hannibal*, Lecter had one sibling, just one – a younger sister, long deceased (Harris, 1999, pp. 255, 267-68, 283).

Sixth, Lecter’s father had stable work. Actually, Lecter’s father’s position was far more than “stable” – he was an aristocrat, a Lithuanian noble. Author Harris tells us that Lecter’s “father was a count, title dating from the tenth century, his mother high-born Italian, a Visconti” (Harris, 1999, p. 267).

Seventh, although Harris has revealed little about Lecter’s childhood, it is clear that – at least for a brief period – the character of Hannibal Lecter suffered inconsistent childhood discipline. When Lecter was six years old, Nazi panzers killed his parents (Harris, 1999, p. 267). A number of half-starved deserters took the children of the estate captive – including Hannibal Lecter and his sister, Mischa – imprisoning them in a barn. In a scene seemingly derived from *Hansel and Gretel*, the deserters palpated Hannibal’s thigh and upper arm, and finding him too thin, chose his sister to kill and butcher instead. When Lecter clung to Mischa, the deserters slammed his arm in the barn door, cracking the bone (Harris, 1999, p. 255). Accustomed to the life of an aristocrat, to suddenly be treated as a captive and a source of food, to have your arm

broken, and then to helplessly stand by as your sister is butchered with an axe, is perhaps the quintessence of “inconsistent childhood discipline.”

Eighth, Lecter demonstrates an exceedingly controlled mood during his crimes. The character is inhumanly self-possessed. In *Red Dragon*, Lecter’s buffoonish keeper, Dr. Chilton, recounts one of Lecter’s attacks:

On the afternoon of July 8, 1976, he [Lecter] complained of chest pain. His restraints were removed in the examining room to make it easier to give him an electrocardiogram. One of his attendants left the room to smoke, and the other turned away for a second. The nurse was very quick and strong. She managed to save one of her eyes (Harris, 1981, p. 52).

Chilton then displays the EKG tape that was recorded during the attack: Here, he’s resting on the examining table. Pulse seventy-two. Here, he grabs the nurse’s head and pulls her down to him. Here, he is subdued by the attendant. He didn’t resist, by the way, though the attendant dislocated his shoulder. Do you notice the strange thing? His pulse never got over eighty-five. Even when he tore out her tongue (Harris, 1981, p. 52).

Ninth, Lecter sometimes uses alcohol in the commission of his crimes. He does not, however, use alcohol to disinhibit himself. Rather, as a cannibal killer-cum-gourmand, he uses alcohol to complement his macabre culinary preparations. In the novel, *The Silence of the Lambs*, he delivers a variation on the line that was selected by the AFI as one of the great movie quotes of all time. He boasts about one of his grisly food-wine pairings: “A census taker tried to quantify me once. I ate his liver with some fava beans and a big amarone” (Harris, 1988, pp. 22-23). Similarly, in *Hannibal*, a character notes:

In the month that Dr. Lecter served the flautist Benjamin Raspail’s sweetbreads to other members of the Baltimore Philharmonic Orchestra board, he bought two cases of Chateau Petrus bordeaux at thirty-six hundred dollars a case. He bought five cases of Batard-Montrachet at eleven hundred dollars a case, and a variety of lesser wines (Harris, 1999, p. 262).

Tenth, Lecter sometimes kills during episodes of precipitating stress. When someone offends Lecter, or gets on his nerves, or irks him, he sometimes kills them. For example, grown tired of his patient, Benjamin Raspail, Dr. Lecter simply murders him. In *The Silence of the Lambs*, Lecter reminisces about the event, “Frankly, I got sick and tired of his whining. Best thing for him, really. Therapy wasn’t going anywhere” (Harris, 1988, p. 57). In the Baltimore State Hospital for the Criminally Insane, Lecter (indirectly) kills fellow inmate “Multiple Miggs” for offending his visitor, Clarice Starling (Harris, 1999, p. 92). Soon after he escapes from custody, Lecter kills Frederick Chilton (former Director of the Baltimore State Hospital for the Criminally Insane), thereby avenging eight years of petty torments (Harris, 1999, p. 70). When Lecter encounters a crude poacher at a gun and knife show (Harris, 1999, p. 294), he kills the man with a crossbow bolt, butchers him, and positions him in the Scandinavian “bloody eagle” – separating the short ribs from the spine and pulling the lungs out the back to look like wings

(Harris, 1999, p. 305). He applies the same philosophy to his cannibalistic exploits, eating the rude – the “free-range rude” – whenever feasible (Harris, 1999, p. 87; Whitty, 2002).

Eleventh, Lecter has lived with a partner. In the final pages of *Hannibal*, Hannibal Lecter has run away to Buenos Aires with Clarice Starling, settling into an exemplary partnership. Harris paints a portrait of übermensch domesticity:

Dr. Lecter and Clarice Starling often talk at dinner in languages other than Starling’s native English. She had college French and Spanish to build on, and she has found she has a good ear. They speak Italian a lot at mealtimes; she finds a curious freedom in the visual nuances of the language. Sometimes our couple dances at dinnertimes. Sometimes they do not finish dinner (Harris, 1999, pp. 482-83).

Twelfth, it is something of an understatement to say that Lecter enjoys mobility with a car in good condition. In fact, after a history of driving a custom supercharged Bentley – supercharged, not turbocharged – he purchases a supercharged Jaguar XJR (Harris, 1999, p. 226).

Thirteenth, Lecter follows crime in the news media (e.g., Harris, 1999, p. 137). Although he finds newspaper journalism too banal to be of real interest, he does collect news clippings of natural disasters and atrocities (Harris, 1981, p. 241). In doing so, he resembles the character of Ivan Karamazov (Dostoevsky, 1949).

Fourteenth, Lecter sometimes changes jobs and leaves town when his crimes necessitate such drastic measures. In fact, Lecter changes not only his city (Baltimore to Florence) and his occupation (psychiatrist to psychiatric patient to translator and curator), but changes his own features. In the closing pages of *The Silence of the Lambs*, Lecter self-administers silicone gel injections to alter his appearance (Harris, 1988, pp. 349-50) and in *Hannibal*, he even amputates one of his own fingers to conceal his identity (Harris, 1999, p. 184). Thus, it appears that author Thomas Harris, exposed to the FBI’s dichotomy of organized and disorganized offenders, created *the* quintessential textbook example of an organized serial murderer.

**HANNIBAL LECTER:
A CHARACTER THAT DEFIES SOME MODELS OF SERIAL MURDER**

“As fiction, ... the Harris novels are superb, though they are not truly realistic in their portrayals either of the serial killers or of the heroes and heroines inside the FBI.”

Ressler & Shachtman, 1992, p. 273

While the character of Lecter fits the etiological model of fantasy-and-trauma, and very neatly fits the FBI’s model of the organized offender, he does not appear to fit some of the other criminological models developed to explain serial murder. He does not, for example, seem to fit the addiction model advanced by Norris (1988) and Giannangelo (1996). These authors suggest that serial murder is a form of addiction in which the killer is compelled to ritually act upon his murderous fantasies, manifesting them in waking life. Norris has argued for seven incremental stages through which the killer’s fantasy is reified:

Aura Phase. Withdrawal from everyday reality; possible hallucinations; prolonged and rehearsed states of fantasy; loss of reason, inhibition, and volitional control

Trolling Phase. Begin to act on fantasy by actively seeking out potential victims; deliberate cruising for suitable prey; alert and singularly focused on identification of possible victims; later, active stalking of victims

Wooing Phase. Further reify fantasy by moving beyond stalking, by actually interacting with victims, winning their confidence and luring them into a trap; overcome victims' natural suspicion

Capture Phase. May be very sudden (like locking a door or bludgeoning a victim to incapacitate her) or quite gradual (such as a monologue that increasingly hints at the violence that is about to take place); further reifies fantasy by exercising dominance over victim

Murder Phase. Realizing the long-rehearsed fantasy confers an intensely emotional high upon the killer, like "an emotional quasar, blinding in its revelation of truth" (Norris, 1988, p. 33); may or may not involve pre-mortem sadism; some killers report spontaneous orgasms during the act of murder

Totem Phase. Because the intensity of the murder phase quickly fades, some killers will transform the now-dead victim into a symbolic trophy, taking photographs, the victim's possessions, or body parts in order to sustain the triumphant high of the murder

Depression Phase. Even the taking of totemic souvenirs cannot maintain the high of the murder, and the killer begins to go through a state of painful withdrawal; feelings of emptiness and sorrow may dominate the killer's mind, giving rise to increasingly desperate fantasies, triggering a return to the initial aura state

This model may accurately describe the compulsion to kill that drives some serial murderers, but it does not seem to describe the character of Hannibal Lecter. Lecter's crimes do not seem to be precipitated by dissociation or aura-state fantasies, and after he kills, he does not seem to suffer any form of depression or withdrawal.

Interestingly, this model is not the only commonly-applied psychological model that fails to describe Hannibal Lecter. While Lecter is repeatedly called a "sociopath" throughout the novels (Harris, 1981, p. 47; Harris, 1988, p. 10), the character does not actually fit that clinical profile. In *Red Dragon*, one agent describes his "sociopathy":

They say he's a sociopath, because they don't know what else to call him. He has some of the characteristics of what they call a sociopath. He has no remorse or guilt at all. And he had the first and worst sign – sadism to animals as a child. ... But he doesn't have any of the other marks.... He wasn't a drifter, he had no history of trouble with the law. He wasn't shallow and exploitive in small things, like most sociopaths are. He's not insensitive (Harris, 1981, p. 47).

The quoted agent is correct: Lecter does not exhibit many of the essential characteristics of psychopathy described in Cleckley's (1976) pioneering research, and later developed by Hare (1996) and Raine (1993). He does not satisfy the American Psychiatric Association's criteria for antisocial personality disorder (2000, pp. 701-06). Nor does he resemble the profile outlined in Hare's (1980) commonly used psychopathy checklist (see Table 3).

Table 3

Psychopathy Checklist

Glibness/superficial charm	Promiscuous sexual relations
Previous diagnosis as psychopath (or similar)	Early behavior problems
Egocentricity/grandiose sense of self-worth	Lack of realistic, long-term plans
Proneness to boredom/low frustration tolerance	Impulsivity
Pathological lying and deception	Irresponsible behavior as a parent
Conning/lack of sincerity	Frequent marital relationships
Lack of remorse or guilt	Juvenile delinquency
Lack of affect or emotional depth	Poor probation or parole risk
Callous/lack of empathy	Failure to accept responsibility for own actions
Parasitic life-style	Many types of offense
Short-tempered/poor behavioral controls	Drug or alcohol abuse not direct cause of antisocial behavior

Note. From Hare (1980).

The agent in the passage misidentifies sadism to animals as a characteristic of sociopaths. But this is an understandable mistake. Instead of sociopathy, the agent probably meant to allude to the infamous "homicidal triad" of warning-sign behaviors: bed-wetting, animal cruelty, and fire starting (Douglas & Olshaker, 1996). According to some BSU agents, these three behaviors, especially when appearing in combination, may signal an elevated risk of subsequent serial homicide. Curiously, though, Hannibal Lecter does not fit this profile, either.

Thus, the character of Hannibal Lecter presents readers with a paradox. While he conforms to some criminological models of serial homicide – such as the fantasy-and-trauma

model of etiology or the organized offender model developed by BSU agents – he defies other influential models – such as the addiction model of serial murder, the model for antisocial personality disorder (which used to be called psychopathy or sociopathy), or the homicidal triad of serial murder. But there is at least one other characteristic that makes the character of Hannibal Lecter difficult to categorize: he is a cannibal.

HANNIBAL LECTER: URBANE CANNIBAL KILLER

“I believe that when man evolves a civilization higher than the mechanized but still primitive one he has now, the eating of human flesh will be sanctioned. For then man will have thrown off all of his superstitions and irrational taboos.”

Diego Rivera, quoted in Maurer

Arens (1979) suggests that cannibalism is more rhetoric than reality. He claims that when one group of people describes another group as cannibals, it is really just a form of cultural libel, a device to establish moral superiority over them. Whether or not Arens' thesis is generally correct, confirmed acts of cannibalism *have* occurred throughout history. Cannibalism has been documented among castaway sailors (Rex v. Dudley & Stevens, 1884), among the Donner party during 1846 and 1847 (Stewart, 1936/1988), and among Uruguayan rugby players in the Andes mountains during 1972 (Read, 1974). Although disputed, there are claims of widespread cannibalism during Europe's great famine of 1315-17 (Aberth, 2000), during the Ukrainian famine of the 1930s (Lukov, 2003), during the Siege of Leningrad during World War II (Vulliamy, 2001), and it has been suggested that as many as 20,000 people in the southwestern Guangxi Zhuang region were killed and eaten by Communist Party officials during China's Cultural Revolution (O'Hagan, 2001). But the cannibalism that stems from cultural practice or from the necessities of starvation is fundamentally different from the cannibalism practiced by murderers. In consuming human flesh, the cannibal murderer does not honor his culture; he defies it. In consuming human flesh, the cannibal murderer does not violate the taboo against cannibalism because he must; he does so because he *can*.

Cannibalistic serial killers are not unheard of: throughout the 1920's, Albert Fish raped, murdered, and ate a number of children (Bell, 2005); during the 1950's, Ed Gein – the inspiration for the movie, *Psycho* (Hitchcock, 1960; Picart & Greek, 2003, p. 49) – killed three individuals, and exhumed and desecrated at least 15 women's bodies, flaying them and wearing their skins around his house, eating at least some of them (Bell, 2005); in the 1980's, Jeffrey Dahmer murdered and cannibalized 17 young men, consuming parts of their bodies in the belief that they would be brought to life within his body (Bell, 2005; Simon, 2000; Tithecott, 1997).

But while numerous real-life examples of cannibal killers exist, there is little doubt that the consumption of human flesh is viewed with profound revulsion in Western society. Unless justified by conditions of severe famine, cannibalism seems like *prima facie* evidence of madness (Samuels, 1975, pp. 199-200). Richard Dawkins has claimed that the “taboo against cannibalism is the strongest we have” (Riddell, 1999, p. 18) and Rawson (1999) has suggested that anthropophagy may be the ultimate pariah act.

The furor surrounding the 2004 case of Armin Meiwes, the German homosexual internet sex cannibal, confirms the deep antipathy surrounding cannibalism. Although Meiwes' victim (Bernd-Jergen Brandes) volunteered to be killed and eaten, and even consumed part of his own severed penis before dying, Meiwes was convicted of manslaughter and sentenced to eight and a half years in prison for Brandes' death (Saunders, 2004). In April 2005, prosecutors appealed, claiming that Meiwes should have received a life sentence for murder, and a German court has ordered a retrial (Cannibal Killer, 2005). Some have suggested that no actual crime occurred because Brandes consented to being killed and eaten, but other commentators have expressed outrage and disgust.

Curiously, the public does not appear to regard Hannibal Lecter with the same seething contempt it reserves for Meiwes. While both violated deeply-held social norms by engaging in acts of cannibalism, Lecter continues to be celebrated (Suraiya, 1999), while Meiwes is scorned as a pathetic freak. Perhaps this stark difference in public perception exists because Meiwes consumed part of Bernd's severed penis, suggesting a sexualized motive, while Lecter's objectives appear to be asexual. But this explanation is flawed: Meiwes insists that his act of cannibalism, while intimate, was more akin to communion than sex (Eckardt, 2004). There is, however, a second explanation. Perhaps the public forgives Lecter his transgressions because he dresses his cannibalism in the trappings of a gourmand. Because they forgive him because Lecter is a figure of finely developed tastes who prefers fine books and music (Harris, 1988, p. 193), expensive cars (Harris, 1999, p. 226), gourmet cuisine (Harris, 1999, pp. 249, 262, 288), who abhors discourtesy (Harris, 1988, p. 24), and who exhibits impeccable manners (Harris, 1988, p. 58). Because they forgive Lecter because he pairs his grisly preparations with rare wines, expertly selected. Or perhaps they forgive Lecter because, as the Latin maxim goes, "What is allowed to Jupiter is not necessarily allowed to an ox" (*Quod licet Iovis, non licet bovis*). In Meiwes, the public sees an outsider and a misfit who, if not insane, is so maladjusted that he cannot conform to even the most rudimentary rules of society (e.g., do not eat human beings). In Lecter, however, the public sees an elite who has shrugged off the conventions of society not because he *cannot* conform to the rules of society, but because he *will* not. He prefers not to.

Possessed of impeccable manners (Harris, 1999, p. 87), the character of Hannibal Lecter has become so educated, so cultured, and so refined, that he has freed himself of society's taboos, and lives above the law. Readers may disapprove of Lecter's fiendish crimes, and accordingly view him as a villain, but they admire the power of his will, and the audacity with which he exalts himself above the law, and accordingly view him – at least in part – as a hero. Lecter looms as a heroic arch-villain.

HANNIBAL LECTER: TRIUMPH OF THE PARADOX

*Do I contradict myself?
Very well then I contradict myself,
(I am large, I contain multitudes.)*

Walt Whitman, "Song of Myself," 1855/1959, p. 48

Hannibal Lecter is paradoxical character, drawn from contradictions. Messent (2000) quotes Barry Taylor, who describes Lecter as collapsing binary definitions and as blurring the lines between savagery and civilization:

The novels (*Red Dragon* and *The Silence of the Lambs*) define Lecter through an oxymoronic implosion of definitions: brilliant scientist and bestial madman, a psychiatric case-study who, as a psychiatrist himself, ridicules the models which his captors apply to him, the serial killer who is a consultant to the police. More fundamentally, Lecter confounds the monstrous and the civilized, the violence of nature and the refinements of culture, the raw and the cooked: he is a cannibal we first see, in *Red Dragon*, reading Alexandre Dumas's *Grande Dictionnaire de Cuisine*... [H]e is an ethical abomination with whom one is manoeuvred into identification.

Although, like many other serial killers, Lecter enjoys a rich fantasy life (Harris, 1981, p. 59; Harris, 1988, p. 164; Harris, 1999, pp. 251-2) and suffered serious childhood trauma (Harris, 1999, p. 255), he does not fit the addiction model advanced by researchers such as Giannangelo (1996) and Norris (1988). The character scoffs at the forensic psychology of the FBI's Behavioral Science Unit, sneering at the organized-disorganized typology in particular (Harris, 1988, pp. 18-19), but he perfectly fits (in one fashion or another) all 14 characteristics of the organized serial murderer (Ressler et al., 1986). Within the pages of Harris's books, Lecter is repeatedly described as a sociopath (Harris, 1981, p. 47; Harris, 1988, p. 10), but the label does not fit him. He is a textbook serial murderer, yet he did not exhibit the telltale characteristics of the "homicidal triad" (Douglas & Olshaker, 1996). Although Hannibal Lecter is described as possessing impeccable manners, he is a cannibal, indulging in the same taboo acts that evoke contempt and scorn in the Meiwes case. Somehow, Lecter manages to encompass these apparent contradictions, unifying them in a consistent identity.

The fact that the character of Hannibal Lecter is something of a paradox, a riddle, may help to explain his tremendous appeal. Readers of the Lecter novels may experience a kind of kenetic strain. Kenetic strain is the term used to express the cognitive tension that exists when incongruous statements must be reconciled by the mind (Sarbin, 1972). It can be used to explain the neurological processing of humor (Johnson, 1990) and metaphor (Brownell, Simpson, Bihrlé, Potter, & Gardner, 1990). When the reader is presented with apparently incongruous claims (e.g., Lecter is both villain and hero), the reader must exert a mental effort to see (or "ken") a way of reconciling the claims. The mental exertion involved in the process may increase attention, leading to deeper semantic processing, and improving retention and retrieval (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1979). Just as kenetic strain may help explain why people remember metaphors, or recall jokes and riddles, the theory might also help to explain the remarkable popularity of Hannibal Lecter. Because he is an enigma, he sparks our imaginations, and becomes embedded in our minds. Thus perhaps the character of Hannibal Lecter looms as the quintessential serial killer in the popular imagination because he emerges from contradictions, because he is simultaneously villain and hero, and because he is something that we ache to understand.

ENDNOTE

J.C. Oleson, Chief Counsel, Criminal Law Policy Staff, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C. This article was written while the author was an Assistant Professor of Sociology and Criminal Justice at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia, and does not necessarily represent the views of the Administrative Office or the federal courts.

Correspondence concerning this article should be sent electronically to James_Oleson@ao.uscourts.gov.

REFERENCES

- Aberth, J. (2000). *From the brink of the apocalypse: Confronting famine, plague, war and death in the later Middle Ages*. New York: Routledge.
- Abrahamsen, D. (1973). *The murdering mind*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Alford, C. F. (1997). *What evil means to us*. Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.
- American Film Institute. (2005a). Heroes and villains. Retrieved April 6, 2005 from <http://www.afi.com/tvevents/100years/handv.aspx>
- American Film Institute. (2005b). 100 years...100 movie quotes. Retrieved June 24, 2005 from <http://www.afi.com/tvevents/100years/quotes.aspx>
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Apter, M. (1992). *The dangerous edge: The psychology of excitement*. New York: Free Press.
- Arens, W. (1979). *The man eating myth: Anthropology and anthropophagy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Arnold, M. (1999, May 20). Making books: Novels haunted by actors' faces [Electronic version]. *New York Times*, p. E3.
- Beckman, K. (2001). [Review of the book *Psycho paths: Tracking the serial killer through contemporary American film and fiction*] [Electronic version]. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, 8, 61-65.
- Behind the Mask. (2005). Wikipedia. Retrieved August 4, 2005 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Behind_the_Mask_%28novel%29
- Bell, R. (2005). Cannibalism: Sexual cannibalism. Retrieved April 6, 2005 from http://www.crimelibrary.com/criminal_mind/psychology/cannibalism/5.html?sect=19

- Broeske, P. H. (1992, December 13). Film: Serial killers claim movies as their prey [Electronic version]. *New York Times*, p. B18.
- Brownell, H. H., Simpson, T., Bihrlle, A. M., Potter, H. H., & Gardner, H. (1990). Appreciation of metaphoric alternative word meanings by left and right brain-damaged patients. *Neuropsychologia*, 28, 375-383.
- Cagle, J. (2002, October 7). Hannibal inc. Retrieved July 6, 2005, from <http://www.time.com/time/pacific/magazine/20021021/reddragon.html>
- Campbell, C. (1976). Portrait of a mass killer. *Psychology Today*, 9, 110-119.
- Campbell, J. (1988). *The power of myth*. New York: Doubleday.
- Cannibal Killer to Face Retrial. (2005, April 23) [Electronic version]. *The London Independent*, p. 25.
- Canter, D. (1994). *Criminal shadows: Inside the mind of a serial killer*. London: HarperCollins.
- Cleckley, H. (1976). *The mask of sanity*. St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Crime scene and profile characteristics of organized and disorganized murderers. (1985). *F.B.I. Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 54, 18-25.
- Demme, J. (Director) (1991). *The silence of the lambs* [Motion picture]. United States: Orion Pictures Corporation.
- Dery, M. (1999, June 22). Inside our heads [Electronic version]. *Village Voice*, p. 40.
- Dietz, P. E. (1986). Mass, serial and sensational homicides. *Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine*, 62, 477-491.
- Dostoevsky, F. (1949). *The brothers Karamazov* (C. Garnett, Trans.). New York: The Limited Editions Club. (Original work published 1881)
- Douglas, J. E., Burgess, A. W., Burgess, A. G., & Ressler, R. K. (1992). *Crime classification manual*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Douglas, J., & Olshaker, M. (1995). *Mindhunter: Inside the FBI's elite serial crime unit*. New York: Scribner.
- Douglas, J., & Olshaker, M. (1996). *Unabomber: On the trail of America's most-wanted serial killer*. New York: Pocket Books.

- Dunant, S. (1999, July 24). Sympathy for the devil: Post-cold war serial killers have taken over as the symbol of evil in US fiction: Among their ranks, Hannibal Lecter stands out as the most popular – and the most subversive [Electronic version]. *London Guardian*, p. 24.
- Eckardt, A. (2004, Jan. 28). Germany awaits verdict in ‘cannibal’ trial: Gruesome case enthralls and revolts a nation. Retrieved July 8, 2005, from <http://msnbc.msn.com/id/4039034/>
- Egger, S. A. (1998). *The killers among us: An examination of serial murder and its investigation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Eysenck, M. W., & Eysenck, M. C. (1979). Processing depth, elaboration of encoding, memory stores, and expanded processing capacity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory*, 5, 472-489.
- Finke, N. (1999, June 4). Will Hannibal the cannibal eat Hollywood? Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.salon.com/media/feature/1999/06/04/lambs>
- Giannangelo, S. J. (1996). *The psychopathology of serial murder: A theory of violence*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Gray, P. (1999, June 21). Dessert, anyone? Thomas Harris’ Hannibal tracks the evil gourmand through a third course. *Time*, 72.
- The Hannibal Library. (2005). The Hannibal library: The one stop resource for information about Dr. Hannibal Lecter. Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.hannibal-library.com/main/>
- Hare, R. D. (1980). A research scale for the assessment of psychopathy in criminal populations. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 1, 111-119.
- Hare, R. D. (1996). Psychopathy: A clinical construct whose time has come. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 23, 25-54.
- Harris, D., & Dunkley, C. (2001, March 19). Who gets Lecter’s lucre: Plenty of thumbs in cannibal’s pie. *Variety*, 7, 10-11.
- Harris, T. (1981). *Red dragon*. New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons.
- Harris, T. (1988). *The silence of the lambs*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Harris, T. (1999). *Hannibal*. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Hawker, P. (2001, February 13). Lecter the dissector. Retrieved November 30, 2002, from <http://www.theage.com.au/entertainment/2001/02/13/FFXFI2313JC.html>
- Hickey, E. W. (1991). *Serial murderers and their victims*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- Hinson, H. (1993, May 23). In defense of violence: Why movie murder and mayhem may not be so bad [Electronic version]. *The Washington Post*, p. G1.
- Hitchcock, A. (Director) (1960). *Psycho* [Motion picture]. United States: Paramount Pictures.
- Holmes, R. M. (1990). Human hunters. *Knightbeat*, 9, 43-47.
- Holmes, R. M., & DeBurger, J. (1988). *Serial murder*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hyatt, R. (1995, May 1). Criminals: An American obsession. *USA Today Magazine*, 36-38.
- Internet Movie Data Base. (2005a). Awards for Manhunter. Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0091474/awards>
- Internet Movie Data Base. (2005b). Awards for The Silence of the Lambs. Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0102926/awards>
- Internet Movie Data Base. (2005c). Awards for Hannibal. Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0212985/awards>
- Internet Movie Data Base. (2005d). Awards for Red Dragon. Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0289765/awards>
- Jenkins, P. (1994). *Using murder: The social construction of serial homicide*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Johnson, A. M. (1990). A study of humor and the right hemisphere. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 70, 995-1002.
- Johnson, B. D. (2001, February 19). Haute-cannibal cuisine: Hannibal's overcooked: Two other tales dish on childlike romance. *Maclean's*, 114, 48.
- Jones, V., & Collier, P. (1993). *Serial killers and mass murderers*. Forestville, CA: Eclipse Books.
- Jung, C. G. (1959). Concerning the archetypes, with special reference to the anima concept. In G. Adler & R. F. C. Hull (Eds. and Trans.). *The archetypes and the collective unconscious, The collected works of C.G. Jung* (Vol. 9, Part I). Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press. (Original work published 1936)
- Kahan, A. (2000, Summer). The marketing of murderabilia. Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.madd.org/news/0,1056,2011,00.html>

- Kloer, P. (2002, October 12). The new faces of Satan: As the devil is ridiculed in popular culture, serial killers – such as Hannibal Lecter – replace him as the embodiment of evil. *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, p. B1.
- La Rochefoucauld, F. (1959). *Maxims* (L. Tancock, Trans.). New York: Penguin. (Original published 1665)
- Lester, D. (1995). *Serial killers: The insatiable passion*. Philadelphia: The Charles Press, Publishers.
- Lewis, D. O., Moy, B. S., Jackson, L. D., Aaronson, R., Restifo, N., Serra, S., et al. (1985). Biopsychosocial characteristics of children who later murder: A prospective study. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 142, 10.
- Locus. (1999, December 21). Books and publishing: More best and worst books of '99. Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.locusmag.com/1999/News/News12e.html>
- Locus. (2000, April 17). Books and Publishing: Publisher's Weekly 1999 Bestsellers. Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.locusmag.com/2000/News/News04b.html>
- Lukov, Y. (2003). Ukraine marks great famine anniversary. *BBC News*. Retrieved July 6, 2005, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/3229000.stm>
- MacCulloch, M. J., Snowden, P. R., Wood, P. J. W., & Mills, H. E. (1983). Sadistic fantasy, sadistic behaviours, and offending. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 143, 20-29.
- Malmquist, C. P. (1971). Premonitory signs of homicidal aggression in juveniles. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 128, 461-465.
- Mann, M. (Director) (1986). *Manhunter* [Motion picture]. United States: De Laurentis Entertainment Group.
- Maryles, D. (2000, June 12). Behind the bestsellers [Electronic version]. *Publishers Weekly*, 30.
- Maurer, D. (2003). Unmentionable cuisine. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from <http://www.themodernist.com/terminal3/cuisine.html>
- May, R. (1975). *The courage to create*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
- McGuigan, C., Gordon, D., & Sawhill, R. (1999, June 7). Second helping: Reclusive author Thomas Harris has produced the book "Hannibal," which is a sequel to his popular "Silence of the Lambs." *Newsweek*, 72.
- Messent, P. (2000). American gothic: Liminality in Thomas Harris's Hannibal Lecter novels. *Journal of American and Comparative Cultures*, 23, 23-36.

- Mitchell, C. (2001, September). The horror, the horror [Review of the book *The strange world of Thomas Harris*] [Electronic version]. *The Spectator*, 34.
- Mitchell, E. (2001, February 19). Critic's notebook: The cannibal who evolved into a stereotype [Electronic version]. *New York Times*, p. E1.
- Mitchell, E. (2002, October 4). Film review: Taking a bite out of crime [Electronic version]. *New York Times*, p. E1.
- Nobel e-Museum. (2005). List of all laureates (by year). Retrieved August 12, 2005, from http://nobelprize.org/search/all_laureates_y.html
- Norris, J. (1988). *Serial killers*. New York: Doubleday.
- The Numbers. (2005). Box office history for Hannibal Lecter movies. Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.the-numbers.com/movies/series/HannibalLecter.php>
- O'Hagan, A. (2001, February 16). You can't keep an evil man down: Though Hannibal misses some of the subtleties of *The Silence of the Lambs*, Anthony Hopkins's mesmeric performance carries all before it [Electronic version]. *London Daily Telegraph*, p. 26.
- Oleson, J. C. (1996). Psychological profiling: Does it actually work? *Forensic Update*, 46, 11-14.
- Oleson, J. C. (2003). The celebrity of infamy: A review essay of five autobiographies by three criminal geniuses. *Crime, Law, and Social Change*, 40, 409-16.
- Palmer, M. (2001, February 6). Empathy with the very devil [Electronic version]. *London Times*, p. 1DD.
- PC Gameworld. (2005). Hannibal: The Game. Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.pcgameworld.com/game.php/id/1705>
- Picart, C. J., & Greek, C. (2003). The compulsion of real/reel serial killers and vampires: Toward a gothic criminology. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*, 10, 39-68.
- Portraits of Serial Killers. (2005). Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.serial-killers.hk.st/>
- Prentky, R. A., Burgess, A. W., & Carter, D. L. (1986). Victim responses by rapist type: An empirical and clinical analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1, 73-98.
- Raine, A. (1993). *The psychopathology of crime*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ramsland, K. (2005). Evil, part three: Depraved indifference: Why we love Lecter. Retrieved August 12, 2005, from http://www.crimelibrary.com/criminal_mind/psychology/evil3/5.html?sect=19

- Random House (2005). Thomas Harris' publishers around the world. Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.randomhouse.com/features/thomasharris/foreign.html#reddragon>
- Rappaport, R. G. (1988). The serial and mass murderer. *American Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, 9, 39-48.
- Ratner, B. (Director) (2002). *Red dragon* [Motion picture]. United States: Univeral Pictures.
- Rawson, C. (1999). Unspeakable rites: Cultural reticence and the cannibal question. *Social Research*, 66, 167-183.
- Read, P. P. (1974). *Alive: The story of the Andes survivors*. New York: Avon.
- Reiter, J. (1998). Serial killer trading cards and First Amendment values: A defense of content-based regulation of violent expression. *Albany Law Review*, 62, 183-212.
- Ressler, R., Burgess, A., & Douglas, J. (1988). *Sexual homicide: Patterns and motives*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Ressler, R. K., Burgess, A. W., Douglas, J. E., Hartman, C. R., & D'Agostino, R. B. (1986). Sexual killers and their victims: Identifying patterns through crime scene analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1, 288-308.
- Ressler, R. K., Burgess, A. W., Hartman, C. R., Douglas, J. E., & McCormack, A. (1986). Murderers who rape and mutilate. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1, 273-287.
- Ressler, R. K., & Shachtman, T. (1992). *Whoever fights monsters*. New York: St. Martin's.
- Rex v. Dudley & Stevens, 14 QBD 273 (1884).
- Riddell, M. (1999, March 26). "The taboo against cannibalism is the strongest we have – but even that needs to be looked at": Interview with academic and author Richard Dawkins. *New Statesman*, 18-19.
- Samuels, A. (1975). Mental illness and criminal liability. *Medicine, Science, and the Law*, 15, 198-204.
- Sarbin, T. R. (1972). Schizophrenia: From metaphor to myth. *Psychology Today*, 6, 18-27.
- Saunders, D. J. (2004, February 3). The victim asked for it [Electronic version]. *San Francisco Chronicle*, p. A17.
- Schmid, D. (2004). Murderabilia: Consuming Fame. *M/C Journal*, 7(5). Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/0411/10-schmid.php>
- Scott, R. (Director) (2001). *Hannibal* [Motion picture]. United States: Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

- Seghorn, T. K., Prentky, R. A., & Boucher, R. J. (1987). Childhood sexual abuse in the lives of sexually aggressive offenders. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 26, 262-267.
- Seltzer, M. (1998). *Serial killers: Death and life in America's wound culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Serial Killer Central. (2005). Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://members.skcentral.com/html/news.php>
- Serial Killer Collection. (2005). Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://www.serialkillercollection.cjb.net/>
- Sexton, D. (2001). *The strange mind of Thomas Harris*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Simon, R. I. (2000). Serial killers, evil, and us. *National Forum*, 80, 23-28.
- Simpson, P. L. (2000). *Psycho paths: Tracking the serial killer through contemporary American film and fiction*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Skal, D. (1993). *The monster show: A cultural history of horror*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.
- Smith, S. (1965). The adolescent murderer: A psychodynamic interpretation. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 13, 310-319.
- Spectre Studios. (2005). Spectre studios home page. Retrieved April 6, 2005, from <http://store.yahoo.com/spectrestudios/index.html>
- Stewart, G. R. (1988). *Ordeal by hunger: The story of the Donner party*. New York: Houghton Mifflin. (Original published in 1936)
- Sundelson, D. (1993). The demon therapist and other dangers: Jonathan Demme's 'The Silence of the Lambs.' *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 21, 12-17.
- Suraiya, J. (1999, August 29). Portrait of messiah as a 'monster.' Retrieved July 13, 2005, from <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/1713341031.cms>
- Thomson, D. (2001, February 8). The doctor will eat you now... Why we can't get our fill of Hannibal Lecter [Electronic version]. *London Independent*, p. 1.
- Tithecott, R. (1997). *Of men and monsters: Jeffrey Dahmer and the construction of the serial killer*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Toffler, A. (1970). *Future shock*. New York: Random House.

Vulliamy, E. (2001, November 25). Orchestral manoeuvres (part one). Retrieved July 6, 2005, from <http://observer.guardian.co.uk/life/story/0,6903,605454,00.html>

Wessely, S. (1994, January 31). How to profile a Hannibal Lecter [Electronic version]. *London Times*, p. 31.

Whitman, W. (1959). *Leaves of grass: His original edition* (M. Cowley, Ed.). New York: Viking. (Original work published 1855)

Whitty, S. (2002, October 6). The devil and Hannibal Lecter [Electronic version]. *Newark, NJ Star-Ledger*, p. 001.