A casual view of trials occurring in the courtrooms of the criminal justice system every day seldom provides the observer with more than a superficial appreciation of the importance of what transpires there. Mostly, these are not cases of national importance and do not involve participants of high rank or note. They seem little more than the sad unfolding of the pageant of human tragedy most of us wish to ignore. The system itself appears to be the emergency room of society, binding up its serious wounds without trying to inflict too many of its own. But the true importance of the criminal justice system cannot be overstated. Our law of torts or contracts may provide future generations with a window into the nature of our society, but if those generations seek to ask if we were truly just, they will examine the administration of our criminal law.

Nowhere are the stakes higher than here. Nowhere do we permit the government created by our consent to exercise more ominous power over us in the name of the collective good. The criminal law is the frontier where personal freedom and societal control meet. If these laws are not drawn and administered justly, justice in any other part of the landscape is an illusion. It is here we need the best of our reason. It is here that we need to honor the noble champions on all sides who seek to right its wrongs lest we all bear the judgment of history for our failure to make this system right.
There is a serious wrong in our system in the way we instruct juries in a criminal homicide case about the crucial but mysterious concept of malice, the concept that demarcates murder from all other types of homicide. Malice has the mysterious air of any trinity, a single entity with three distinct natures.\(^1\) It exists, the judge will tell the jury, when the killer coldly premeditates his act, executing, so to speak, a plan of execution. But it also arises in two scenarios in which death is not intended. Where the defendant perpetrates a serious but non-lethal felony like robbery or consciously disregards a serious risk he is creating by some reckless act, and death results, there is malice. This trinity is not, however, a “supernatural mystery” humans are not meant to understand.\(^2\)

The jury is meant to understand it and apply it justly. But they are seriously misled in this effort when the judge tells them the following:

> If you believe that the defendant intentionally used a deadly weapon on a vital part of the victim’s body, you may regard that as an item of circumstantial evidence from which you may, if you choose, infer that the defendant acted with malice.\(^3\)

Empirically, there are many things wrong with this instruction.

First, it does not define the state of knowledge the jury has to reach before convicting the defendant either in terms of elements to be proven or the level of certainty of the proof.\(^4\) Neither does it give practical information about basic court procedures.\(^5\) It

\(^1\) **MODEL PENAL CODE** §§ 210.1-210.2; and **PA SSJI** (Crim.) § 15.2501A.


\(^3\) This is the current form in use in Pennsylvania, the state we will use as a common reference point. **See, PA SSJI** (Crim.) § 15.2502C(4). This same Instruction would be given with regard to the issue of specific intent to kill, allowing the jury to distinguish among the grades of murder on that basis. **See id.** at § 15.2502A(5). The use of this instruction in other jurisdictions is noted **infra.** at note 8.

\(^4\) In his dissent in **Brown v. Payton**, Justice Souter called it “elementary law” in all United States jurisdictions that “[t]he judge bears the ultimate responsibility for instructing a lay jury in the law.” 544 U.S. 133, 160 (2005) (Souter, J., dissenting). As early as 1895, the Supreme Court described the court’s instructions as a major hemisphere of the trial decision process:

> We must hold firmly to the doctrine that in the courts of the United States it is the duty of juries in criminal cases to take the law from the court and apply that
merely suggests the absurdity that jurors need judicial permission to infer something, a suggestion so absurd that its true purpose remains hidden.

Second, the logical relation between deadly weapons and malice is tenuous at best. Indeed, where a weapon is not used to kill malice is more likely to be present, not less so. If Jones died of a gun shot, and Smith of manual strangulation, where might malice more readily be inferred? Kowalski’s shooting death could be accidental, but how likely is it he non-maliciously died from a pillow applied to his face? Yet, the defendant tried for Smith’s strangulation or Kowalski’s smothering would not hear this instruction, but Jones’ shooter would, regardless of the circumstances under which he pulled the trigger. Skepticism about this inference seems particularly appropriate.  

Third, where the defendant admits causing the death but claims accident, self-defense, or provocation, the instruction is fatally simplistic by suggesting that one undisputed fact (he shot the victim) permits the jury to whisk away those complex matters in one tidy act of inference. In the “whodunit” murder, it confuses the issue of the identity of the killer by suggesting that the defendant had used the weapon, leaving his intent the only issue. It adds nothing in either case and is pernicious in both.

---

Sparf v. United States, 156 U.S. 51, 102 (1895). The Pennsylvania Court’s certainly agreed. See Ferrer v. Trs. of the Univ. of Pa., 825 A.2d 591, 612-13 (Pa. 2002) (the purpose of the court’s charge is to provide guidance to the jury on the relevant legal issues arising from the claims before the jury); and Commonwealth v. Bricker, 581 A.2d 147, 154 (Pa. 1990) (the duty of instructing the jury as to the law which is to be applied during their deliberations cannot be delegated to or usurped by a litigant involved in the trail of the case as the judge carries the sole responsibility for instructing the jury).

5 See, for example, PA SSJI (Crim.) § 2.01.

6 All skeptical thought must pay homage to David Hume. Hume argued that all cause and effect reasoning was based upon experience and that reason alone could not show a constant connection between the two that was anything near infallible. DAVID HUME, A TREATISE OF HUMAN NATURE 61, 63, 64-65. (David Fate Norton & Mary J. Norton eds., Oxford Univ. Press 2000). Our impressions of experienced causes and effects become ideas that are imbued with belief that then give the causal link more force than it should have and render it, unfortunately, beyond further critical inquiry. Id. at 67-68.
But in spite of these empirical objections, the instruction persists. Having determined that it is not a *mandatory presumption* that improperly shifts the burden of proof, courts have passively accepted it as a fixture in many jurisdictions without further, critical analysis. Such analysis, however, reveals that it is a false echo of the true

---


The validity of the permissive inference in one form or another has also been recognized in at least the following jurisdictions:

Fifth Circuit: *Pattern Crim. Jury Instructions. 5th Circuit, §2.55 – 2.56 (2001)*
Sixth Circuit: *United States v. Garcia-Meza*, 403 F.3d 364 (6th Cir. 2005)
Ninth Circuit: *United States v. Houser*, 130 F.3d 867 (9th Cir. 1997); *United States v. Wilson*, 2007 U.S. App. LEXIS 3895 (9th Cir. 2007)
District of Colombia: *Belton v. United States*, 382 F.2d 150, 154-55 (D.C. Cir. 1967); 1-1 Criminal Jury Instructions for DC Form Instruction 4.17
Iowa: *State v. Shanahan*, 712 N.W.2d 121 (Iowa 2006)
essence of malice, a debasement of history disguised as the dangerous illusion we call “permissive inference.” For malice is not a mystery the jury needs fatal simplicities to understand. Malice is the art work of the people, a concept subject to continual enactment and redefinition by the most powerful force operating in a democratic society, the rational consensus of the governed. That same force has created a process for its implementation in each case that trusts in the reasoned judgment of a jury, instructed by a court but unimpeded by judicial overreaching in the demarcation of murder from manslaughter and manslaughter from justified killing. This inference perverts the substance and betrays the process of malice in ways that call profoundly for its elimination.

The case for elimination can only be made by understanding that malice and the jury trial process that implements it are our society’s current, best answer to the basic cultural question of how to deal with the situation in which one person causes the death of another. It is a question of substance and process, and its answer defines us most profoundly. We will pose that question first in a state of nature mode, and then sketch the historical evolution of its answer in the Anglo-American tradition. Next, we will consider the democratic forces that power that evolution, brilliantly described by John Rawls. Throughout, we will see that this instruction is not faithful to this compelling history or its crucial undercurrents. Other solutions for its mischief or continued benign neglect of its errors must be rejected in favor of its total elimination from the law.

---

9 See infra Part I.
10 See infra Part II.
11 See infra Part III.
12 See infra Part IV.
In its place, we would leave a tribute to the law a free people have created and the gathering of those people who apply it in the noble role as juror. We would also correct a wrong in a part of the law where wrongs must not be overlooked.

I. Stating the Problem in Nature: Og and the Death of Rok

Ever since humans first walked erect, occupied the same geography, and thus became potentially dangerous to each other, we have faced the problem of what to do if Og causes the death of Rok. In the days before society, the answer would largely depend on how many of Rok’s friends were otherwise disposed to exercise an instinct for revenge. But society complicates the matter by demanding that the question take on broader implications requiring the process of rule-making.

What rule will govern this situation largely depends on who writes it. If we believed, for example, that a divine power had given us a rule that causing a death is an unmitigated, unforgivable, and unpardonable sin that merits as much retribution as possible, would be retributive with gusto as soon as the “causer” was identified.

Then again, if we are in a tradition that has undergone the Enlightenment, we will view the rules of society as not coming from some heavenly source whispering in the ears of a select few who assure us that they hear such commands clearly. Rather, we rely on reason for rules and process and, since reason is not the province of the elite, negotiation among all reasoning members of society is the preferred course. We will take responsibility for drafting rules and we will consent to their imposition.

---

13 Any resemblance between these fictional characters and fellow members of my or any other law school faculty is purely coincidental.
14 John Adams put it succinctly and categorically: “It is Consent alone, that makes any human Laws binding.” THE REVOLUTIONARY WRITINGS OF JOHN ADAMS 143 (C. Bradley Thompson ed., Liberty Fund Indianapolis 2000). This conception of consent of the governed was even more profound for Americans than their British counterparts. Our constitution was to be a written charter of power that entrusted power directly from the people to their government without reliance on custom and precedent. THE ANTI-
The very act of taking that responsibility shapes those rules profoundly. When we negotiate the rule about “causing death,” we know that we are writing a rule that someday may apply to us. We could be Rok, the one who ends up dead at the hand of Og and, in that spirit, we are motivated to write a rule that by its severity might prevent Og from acting or, at least, vanquish him for extinguishing from the earth that which we value most highly, our own life.

But we also could be Og. We could innocently cause a stone to fall from the scaffold upon which we are working, killing a stranger named Rok on the street below, or we could kill Rok as he lunges at us with a knife, or find him coupling with our beloved and kill him in a sudden, jealous rage. Without deprecating the value of Rok’s life in absolute terms, as Og we demand consideration of circumstances before anything approaching our vanquishment is authorized. Minimally, reasoned self-interest demands contemplation of a range of societal responses in the final rule we write.

The rule will not, however, merely reflect the personal interests of the Og and Rok in each case as it is neither written by, nor exclusively for, the parties themselves.

The rule defines contractual relations between my society and me. I want something out

---


15 The Federalist Papers begin with this challenge:

It has been frequently remarked that it seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question, whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force. THE FEDERALIST PAPERS 27 (Clinton Rossiter ed., Signet Classic 1999). Indeed, Hamilton would remark in Federalist No. 22 that one of the deficiencies of the government under the Articles of Confederation was that it was based on the unsteady, delegated authority of the states alone, and not on the people directly. THE FEDERALIST PAPERS, at 148. There is a necessity, he wrote, “of laying the foundations of our national government deeper than in the mere sanction of delegated authority. The fabric of the American empire ought to rest on the solid basis of the consent of the people. The streams of national power ought to flow immediately from that pure, original fountain of all legitimate authority.” Id. Anti-federalists agreed on the importance of the consent of the governed but disagreed that the proposed form of government would actually maintain such consent for long. THE ORIGINS OF THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION, x (Michael Kammen ed., Penguin Books 1986).
of any rule that empowers my society to exercise authority over me when it claims I have done wrong and requires me to agree that the societal response will be sufficient for me if I were a wronged party. I do not expect a perfect world where no one will ever again cause the death of another. But I do want lives I care about to be protected from the kinds of wanton, dangerous acts that no society can permit if its members are to be free equally from the oppression of government and the terrorization of their neighbors.16

So in defining those acts and the range of societal responses, we seek a rule we can live with regardless of whether we become Og or Rok, or live on their street. Whatever factors we use, be it the degree of control Og exercised over the act (premeditated v. inadvertent), the social utility of the act itself (was Og defending himself from unlawful aggression or aggressively pursuing ignoble ends), or what weapon he used, all must serve the end of a livable rule.

Once the substance of the rule is reached, we need a process to implement it. A bad process, indeed, may denude the rule of its efficacy by frustrating consideration of all pertinent factors. Process is also a fail-safe way to harness government, a creature we created from need but fear has an appetite for tyranny.17 Applying the rule to Rok’s death may authorize government to exercise ultimate power and take Og’s life. Can we trust

---

16 In The Common Law, Holmes observed:

For it is to be remembered that the object of the law is to prevent human life being endangered or taken; and that, although it so far considers blameworthiness in punishing as not to hold a man responsible for consequences which [57] no one, or only some exceptional specialist, could have foreseen, still the reason for this limitation is simply to make a rule which is not too hard for the average member of the community. As the purpose is to compel men to abstain from dangerous conduct, and not merely to restrain them from evil inclinations, the law requires them at their peril to know the teachings of common experience, just as it requires them to know the law. Subject to these explanations, it may be said that the test of murder is the degree of danger to life attending the act under the known circumstances of the case. /1/

O.W. Holmes, Jr., The Common Law 56-57 (Little, Brown, & Co. 1881).

this creature to both apply and implement the rule or does reasoned self interest caution
that the final power to fix the price Og owes to society lie elsewhere?\(^{18}\)

History shows our long struggle with ourselves to find a just societal response to
the Og/Rok scenario and a fair process to implement it. In this ongoing struggle, we
formed certain core elements into an integrated whole, a gestalt, the art form of malice.

The art form of malice was poetry. A poem, Robert Frost tells us, “begins as a
lump in the throat”\(^{19}\) and happens when “an emotion has found its thought and the
thought has found words.”\(^{20}\) The “lump in the throat” that spawned malice was a
counterbalance of perceptions that while strict liability murder was impractically austere,
even when one did not specifically intend to kill another, his actions might still be so
dangerous that calling them murder was not too strong a term. Words were needed to
capture this thought and the emotion that underlie it.

The words formed an epic poem so intricate that it could not be known from one
fact alone but not so inscrutable that only our best minds could discern it. We are its
scriveners and we have entrusted the process of finding it to ourselves in the body of a

---

\(^{18}\) In extolling the virtues of the English system of giving the citizen “two branches of popular power”,
namely, voting for members in the House of Commons and sitting on juries, John Adams proclaimed them
as “essential and fundamental to the great end of it, the preservation of the subject’s liberty, to preserve the
balance and mixture of the government, and to prevent its running into an oligarchy or aristocracy.” THE
REVOLUTIONARY WRITINGS OF JOHN ADAMS 55 (C. Bradley Thompson ed., Liberty Fund Indianapolis
2000). He called these powers the “heart and lungs” without which the body would die and government
become arbitrary. \textit{Id.} They are the “fortifications against wanton, cruel power” and in them “consist wholly
the liberty and security of the people.” \textit{Id.; See also} Bruce A. Antkowiak, \textit{The Ascent of an Ancient
Palladium: The Resurgent Importance of Trial by Jury and the Coming Revolution in Pennsylvania

\(^{19}\) Letter from Robert Frost (1874-1963), U.S. poet, to Louis Untermeyer, poet and anthologist (Jan. 1,
1916) (The Letters of Robert Frost to Louis Untermeyer (1963)).

\(^{20}\) \textit{Id.}
jury. It is, we hope, the best of our reason. We have, as Henry Ward Beecher said of all artists, dipped our brush into our own soul and painted our own nature into this picture.21

II. A Short History of Anglo-American Murder

A. Simplicity Evolved

Murder today is not the simple legal matter the deadly weapon inference makes it seem. The Model Penal Code requires inquiry about whether the death was caused purposefully or knowingly, recklessly under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference to human life, or negligently.22 Pennsylvania, like many other states, adopts this general formulation, but retains specific reference to malice as the key definitional term.23 Principles of justification and excuse24 complete the complex pattern of aspects

21 “Every artist dips his brush in his own soul and paints his own nature into his pictures.” Henry Ward Beecher, Proverbs from Plymouth Pulpit, 1887.
23 The Pennsylvania Jury Instruction on homicide begins as follows:
1. The defendant is charged with taking the life of [name of victim] by criminal homicide. There are [six] [number] possible verdicts that you might reach in this case—not guilty or guilty of one of the following crimes: [murder of the first degree] [murder of the second degree] [murder of the third degree] [voluntary manslaughter] [involuntary manslaughter].
   [The remainder of this instruction should be tailored to the individual case and reference made ONLY to those degrees of homicide or defenses actually before the jury]
2. Before defining each of these crimes, I will tell you about malice, which is an element of murder but not of manslaughter. A person who kills must act with malice to be guilty of any degree of murder. The word “malice,” as I am using it, has a special legal meaning. It does not mean simply hatred, spite, or ill-will. Malice is a shorthand way of referring to any of three different mental states that the law regards as being bad enough to make a killing murder. The type of malice differs for each degree of murder.
3. Thus, for murder of the first degree, a killing is with malice if the perpetrator acts with: first, an intent to kill, or as I will explain later in my definition of first-degree murder, the killing is willful, deliberate, and premeditated.
4. For murder of the second degree, or “felony murder” as second-degree murder is commonly called, a killing is with malice if the perpetrator engages in one of certain enumerated felonies and a killing occurs, since the law, through the felony murder rule, allows the finder of fact to infer that the killing was malicious from the fact that the actor was engaged in a felony of such a dangerous nature to human life that the perpetrator, as held to the standard of a reasonable man, knew or should have known that death might result from the felony.
   [First Alternative]
5. For murder of the third degree, a killing is with malice if the perpetrator’s actions show his or her wanton and willful disregard of an unjustified and extremely high risk that his or her conduct would result in death or serious bodily injury to another. In this form of malice, the Commonwealth need not prove that the perpetrator specifically intended to kill another. The Commonwealth must prove, however, that he or she took action while consciously, that is, knowingly, disregarding the most serious risk he or she was creating, and that, by his or her disregard of that risk, he or she demonstrated his or her extreme
we now deem pertinent to a finding of murder. This complexity is an evolved state. Over the period of Anglo-American legal history, however, the urge to make murder simpler often overwhelmed us.  

While Noah may have had other reading material on the Arc, the Model Penal Code was not in his library. So when he finally got to dry land, he needed a short course on the law of homicide. He learned one that admitted of few subtleties: “Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God has God made man.” A jury instruction based on this passage would be precisely simple: if Og caused the death of Rok, Og is guilty of murder.

Moses, evidently, had registered for the advance course on homicide. When he recorded the governing principles, subtleties had crept into the equation. The 35th Chapter of the Book of Numbers recites a laundry list of ways in which a person can smite another with some object (an instrument of iron, a stone, a weapon of wood) and become a murderer. However, one should not make the mistake of reading Numbers as

________________________________________________________________________
[Second Alternative]

5. For murder of the third degree, a killing is with malice if the perpetrator acts with [a wickedness of disposition, hardness of heart, cruelty, recklessness of consequences, and a mind regardless of social duty indicating an unjustified disregard for the probability of death or great bodily harm and an extreme indifference to the value of human life] [a conscious disregard of an unjustified and extremely high risk that his or her actions might cause death or serious bodily harm].

6. On the other hand, a killing is without malice if the perpetrator acts under circumstances that reduce the killing to voluntary manslaughter. I will tell you what those circumstances are when I define voluntary manslaughter.

[7. A killing is [likewise] without malice if the perpetrator acts with lawful justification or excuse. Lawful justification or excuse not only negates malice but also is a complete defense to any charge of criminal homicide. I shall say more about this when I charge you on the defense of [self-defense] type of defense].

PA SSJI (Crim.) § 15.2501A

24 See MODEL PENAL CODE ART. 3, and § 210.3.

25 What follows is certainly not an attempt at an exhaustive history of murder. It is simply to view our current endpoint and cast an eye back to moments along the way here that illustrate the ebb and flow about the degree of complexity murder should exhibit.


27 Numbers 9-19 reads as follows:
a biblical justification for the malice/deadly weapon inference by omitting the rest of that
passage that shows the spirit of the attack is far more vital than the weapon of choice. 28

But if he thrust him of hatred, or hurl at him by laying of wait, that he die;
Or in enmity smite him with his hand, that he die: he that smote him shall surely
be put to death; for he is a murderer: the revenger of blood shall slay the
murderer, when he meeteth him.29

Indeed, the revenger of blood was to be frustrated by the congregation if enmity in the
taking of the life is absent, regardless of weaponry:

But if he thrust him suddenly without enmity, or have cast upon him any thing
without laying of wait, Or with any stone, wherewith a man may die, seeing him
not, and cast it upon him, that he die, and was not his enemy, neither sought his
harm: Then the congregation shall judge between the slayer and the revenger of
blood according to these judgments: And the congregation shall deliver the slayer
out of the hand of the revenger of blood, and the congregation shall restore him to
the city of his refuge, whither he was fled: and he shall abide in it unto the death
of the high priest, which was anointed with the holy oil. 30

9 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying,
10 Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye be come over Jordan into the
land of Canaan;
11 Then ye shall appoint you cities to be cities of refuge for you; that the slayer may flee thither,
which killeth any person at unawares.
12 And they shall be unto you cities for refuge from the avenger; that the manslayer die not, until
he stand before the congregation in judgment.
13 And of these cities which ye shall give six cities shall ye have for refuge.
14 Ye shall give three cities on this side Jordan, and three cities shall ye give in the land of Canaan,
which shall be cities of refuge.
15 These six cities shall be a refuge, both for the children of Israel, and for the stranger, and for the
sojourner among them: that every one that killeth any person unawares may flee thither.
16 And if he smite him with an instrument of iron, so that he die, he is a murderer: the murderer
shall surely be put to death.
17 And if he smite him with throwing a stone, wherewith he may die, and he die, he is a murderer:
the murderer shall surely be put to death.
18 Or if he smite him with a hand weapon of wood, wherewith he may die, and he die, he is a
murderer: the murderer shall surely be put to death.
19 The revenger of blood himself shall slay the murderer: when he meeteth him, he shall slay him.

Numbers 9-19 (King James).
28 This error appears in Professor Greenleaf’s treatise on the law of evidence. SIMON GREENLEAF, A
Greenleaf mistakenly found that “[t]he doctrine of presumptive evidence was familiar to the Mosaic Code,
even to the letter of the principle stated in the text,” so if a man uses a “hand-weapon” and his victim
perishes, he is a murderer. Id.
29 Numbers 35:16-21 (emphasis added).
30 Numbers 35: 22-25.
Post-Arc enmity might not equate with the eventual epic poem of malice, but something beyond an absolute, strict liability understanding of murder was now realized.31

As the ancient world gave way to the medieval, the law of murder was formed to a considerable degree by “one of the most significant portions of the criminal law in Scandinavia, Germany and Anglo-Saxon England” the system of “blood feud and vengeance.”32 Without highly developed governmental structures, the family became a primary means of dealing with the Og/Rok problem.33 But vengeance was not absolute, or always bloody. Physical reprisals gave way to a system of payments of property,34 and the feud process itself took into account of some of the circumstances of the initial slaying in determining whether all out reprisal was warranted. Professor Johnson writes:

Despite its barbarity, vengeance progressed upon fixed rules which tended to limit its scope and ferocity. . .Clans or kindred groups were careful to restrain the violence of their members because misbehavior that resulted in injury or death beyond the clan triggered revenge and brought disrepute upon the slayer’s group. A rough sort of public opinion operated to discourage the exaction of revenge when the victim’s behavior might have justified the homicide.35

Professor Rosenthal has commented that the “rules” for blood feuds made it so that some deaths could not be avenged, “either because the slayer had acted honorably, e.g. fighting to protect his leader, or the slain one acted dishonorably, e.g. while attempting an ambush or assassination.”36 Again, in an era not regarded for the rule of reason, some sort of societal consensus was afoot to make exceptions and gradations about homicides at least

31 Excellent discussions of the application of the ancient laws of the Israelites and other cultures regarding murder may be found in ISRAEL DRAPKIN, M.D., CRIME AND PUNISHMENT IN THE ANCIENT WORLD (Lexington Books 1989), and HERBERT A. JOHNSON, HISTORY OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE 24-25 (Anderson Publishing Co. 1988), as well as Blackstone’s observations concerning them in W. BLACKSTONE, COMMENTARIES ON THE LAWS OF ENGLAND OF PUBLIC Wrongs 206, 210, 216 (Robert Malcolm Kerr trans., Beach Press 1962).
32 JOHNSON, supra note 31, at 46.
34 Referred to variously as “wergild” and “doom.” See JOHNSON, supra note 31, at 47.
35 Id. at 46.(emphasis added).
36 Rosenthal, supra note 33, at 135.
in terms of matters of justification and excuse. Vengeance and feuds, lusty as they might be, had to be reasonable.

When the common law emerged from the primordial soup of the ancient codes and practices that preceded it,\textsuperscript{37} it once again conceived of homicide as a very simple creature. Homicide, unless done at the direction of the King, was murder, and murder was punishable by death.\textsuperscript{38} It was virtually a strict liability offense, Genesis \textit{redux}.\textsuperscript{39}

Of course, liability so strictly applied with irreversible consequences is likely to lose its theoretical charm once it begins to be applied in practice. Not surprisingly, various means arose to soften the harsh effects of such absolute rules. The King was called upon to issue pardons, judges resorted to hyper-technical interpretations of law to divert the perceived unjust result, and the benefit of clergy was eventually extended to those who could read, whether of clerical rank or not.\textsuperscript{40}

These modifications, however, all shared the feature of arbitrariness and had the potential to excuse inexcusable killings as long as the killer was sufficiently politically allied to receive such a dispensation. Parliament responded by limiting both pardon and benefit of clergy by making them inapplicable where the murder exhibited the phenomenon of “malice prepensed” later rendered “malice aforethought.”\textsuperscript{41} Coke called


\textsuperscript{40} Perkins, \textit{supra} note 38, at 540; \textit{Id.} at 542; and Oberer, \textit{supra} note 38, at 1566.

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Id.}; Sornarajah, \textit{supra} note 39, at 847; and Perkins, \textit{supra} note 38, at 542-43.
this “a calculated intention to kill in the formation of which the accused had opportunity
for deliberating on the likely consequences of his action”.

42 This became the dividing line between manslaughter, which was clergyable, and, murder which was not.

43 Oberer, supra note 38, at 1566; and Perkins, supra note 38, at 543.

44 Oberer, supra note 38, at 1567; and BLACKSTONE, supra note 31, at 207.

45 Brown, supra note 42, at 310-12; and BLACKSTONE, supra note 31, at 207.

46 Brown, supra note 42, at 310-12.

47 Id. at 313; and Oberer, supra note 38, at 1567.

48 Oberer, supra note 38, at 1567
atmosphere and producing “frequent quarrels involving a stabbing with short daggers.”49

Parliament responded in 1604 by passing the Statute of Stabbing, making it a capital

crime outside the benefit of clergy to:

“. . . stab or thrust any Person or Persons that hath not then any Weapon drawn, or
that hath not then first stricken the Party which shall so stab or thrust, so as the
Person or Persons so stabbed or thrust shall thereof die within . . . six Months then
next following, although it cannot be proved that the same was done of Malice
aforethought.”50

Considered by some to be an emergency measure,51 the Act had a primary aim of making

manslaughter dependent not on the suddenness of the occurrence of the affray but on the

sufficiency of the provocation that brought about the killing.52 It was seen to embody a

common law principle that suddenness did not equate with provocation, a principle to be

affirmed against “the inconveniences of juries” who thought it was.53 On the surface, the

Act was a stark retrenchment from a complex articulation of malice and, by focusing on

the means of death alone in some respects, a return to strict liability principles of the past.

But, while it lasted on the books for 150 years or so, something happened to the Act

almost immediately after its passage that reflects a profound truth about our disposition

as rule-makers. After all, reasoned self-interested negotiation is relentless.

The Act was rendered “a striking example of a highly penal law the operation of

which was effectively restricted by the courts almost immediately after it had been passed

by the Legislature.”54 Professor Radzinowicz has brilliantly traced the course of

interpretation the English courts gave this statute and the multiple exceptions and

49 LEON RADZINOWICZ, A HISTORY OF ENGLISH COMMON LAW AND ITS ADMINISTRATION FROM 1750, 630
(Stevens & Sons Ltd. 1948).
50 Id.; and Brown, supra note 42, at 314.
51 RADZINOWICZ, supra note 49, at 20.
52 Oberer, supra note 38, at 1567-68.
53 Id. at 1568.
54 RADZINOWICZ, supra note 49, at 695-97.
qualifications they placed upon it that effectively restored the common law principles of provocation and excuse the statute ostensibly sought to eliminate.\textsuperscript{55}

Blackstone himself had a profound insight about the interpretation of this Act.\textsuperscript{56} Since it was a statute “of a temporary nature,” he said, it “ought to have expired with the mischief it meant to remedy.”\textsuperscript{57} However, its ultimate repeal was \textit{a fait accompli} as “the benignity of the law construed the statute so favorably in behalf of the subject, and so strictly when against him, that the offense of stabbing stood under the statute almost upon the same footing as it did at the common law.”\textsuperscript{58} The root of this benignity was, very importantly, an exercise of reason that should be recalled when any union of the ideas of malice and deadly weapons is attempted. Blackstone writes:

For in point of solid and substantial justice, it \textit{cannot be said} that the mode of killing, whether by stabbing, strangling or shooting, \textit{can either extenuate or enhance the guilt}; unless where, as in the case of poisoning, it carries with it an internal evidence of cool and deliberate malice.\textsuperscript{59}

Standing alone, the weapon of death is just too equivocal and inanimate to allow us to make the complex judgment of malice murder requires. The judges who systematically dismantled the Stabbing Act did so because they like the juries whose “inconveniences”\textsuperscript{60} in finding manslaughter where the Crown wanted murder spurred the passage of the Act in the first place understood the enlightened, rational insight that malice is a gestalt the use of a deadly weapon alone cannot explain if the law is to be just.

\textsuperscript{55} Some of these were: throwing a hammer or sword was outside the act; an attack by multiple parties allowed a stabbing response against any of them, regardless of whether each was armed; a broad interpretation was given to when the victim had a weapon drawn, and many more. RADZINOWICZ, supra note 49, at 695-97; \textit{See also} BLACKSTONE, supra note 31, at 215-16 n.d.
\textsuperscript{56} BLACKSTONE, supra note 31, at 215-16 n.d.
\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{58} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{59} \textit{Id.} (emphasis added).
\textsuperscript{60} Oberer, \textit{supra} note 38, at 1568.
The evolutionary path of the Anglo-American view of homicide was hardly in a straight line. But a consensus to take into account the varied factors we now embrace persistently emerged. Simplistic strict liability homicide never thrived for long and the epic poem of malice, what Blackstone called “the grand criterion” distinguishing murder from other sorts of killing, was the dominant and recurring theme. For society to declare a death a murder, science could help us find a cause of death, but it was in the high art of malice that we based our final judgment.

B. The Crafting of Malice

The word “malice” was conscripted into the law and surrounded with a distinct “aura of mystery.” Holt would call it “a design formed of doing mischief to another,” and murder, Blackstone would say, arises “from the wickedness of the heart” that is malice. An English court in 1727 said that while in “common acception malice is took to be a settled anger (which requires some length of time) in one person against another, and a desire of revenge”, in the legal sense, “it imports a wickedness, which includes a circumstance attending an act, that cuts off all excuse.” Wickedness here was not just morally aberrant but embraced broader societal considerations of dangerousness.

For while malice could manifest itself as an act willful and deliberate against one particular other, Blackstone observed that it “is not so properly spite or malevolence to the deceased in particular, as any evil design in general” making it “the dictate of a
wicked, depraved and malignant heart.”\textsuperscript{68} Where a workman deliberately flings a stone or timber into the street of a populous town killing passersby, the act is murder where “he knows of their passing, and gives no warning at all, for then it is malice against all mankind.”\textsuperscript{69} The language had a moralistic patina, but evinced a strong sense that malicious acts were at their core ones of extremely negative social utility.

The trinity of malice was forming. Blackstone adapted Coke in saying that murder was an act occurring when a sane adult unlawfully kills another person with malice aforethought expressed or implied.\textsuperscript{70} An unlawful killing was a deliberate act done “without warrant or excuse” and largely involved considerations of causation.\textsuperscript{71} Express malice and implied malice were not two different species, just different manifestations of the same phenomenon, best understood if we disabused ourselves of the notion that the killer’s subjective mental state was the only matter at issue.\textsuperscript{72}

Blackstone’s venerable definition of express malice is, on the one hand, all about mental state:

Express malice is when one, with a sedate deliberate mind and formed design, doth kill another; which formed design is evidenced by external circumstances discovering the inward intention; as lying in wait, attendant menaces, former grudges, and concerted schemes to do him some bodily harm.\textsuperscript{73}

But shortly thereafter, he remarks that “if even upon a sudden provocation one beats another in a cruel and unusual manner, so that he dies, \textit{though he did not intend his death},

\hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{68} Id. at 221-22.
\hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{69} Id. at 215. This is a fine illustration of the malice component in what the MPC calls “extreme indifference” murder, what some jurisdictions call Second Degree Murder and what Pennsylvania courts list as Third Degree Murder. \textsc{Model Penal Code} § 210.2(1)(b); \textsc{PA SSJI (Crim.)} § 15.2502C. It is also referenced in the widely cited case of \textit{Commonwealth v. York}, 50 Mass. 93 (Mass. 1845), where the court observes that the degree of “carelessness, cruelty and malignity” allows for the finding of malice.
\hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{70} \textsc{Blackstone}, supra note 31, at 218
\hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{71} Id. at 218-19.
\hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{72} Perkins, supra note 38, at 547.
\hspace{1cm} \textsuperscript{73} \textsc{Blackstone}, supra note 31, at 221-22.
yet he is guilty of murder by express malice; that is, by an express evil design, the
genuine sense of malitia."⁷⁴ And, like Coke, he identifies at least four situations in which
malice will be implied in which either no “external circumstances” hint at the malignant
heart or in which no intent to kill is present at all:

- The willful poisoning of another even though “no particular enmity can be
  proved”;

- A sudden killing without any provocation, “for no person, unless of an abandoned
  heart, would be guilty of such an act, upon a slight or no apparent cause”;

- The killing of a policeman who is “in the execution of his duty”; and,

- Where “one intends to do another felony, and undesignedly kills a man, this is
  also murder”.⁷⁵

While “intent is latent in the mind, and can seldom be known otherwise than by the act
which is done,”⁷⁶ the second type of express malice and much of the implied malice
scenarios show that we are not defining malice as merely a state of mind to be inferred
from a particular state of facts.⁷⁷ While “deliberate” conduct is required across the board
for murder, the deliberate intention to kill the victim clearly is not.

A malicious killing is a blend of act and mind but, more broadly, it is the
demarcation of violent, deliberate conduct so dangerous, unjustified and inexcusable that
when death results, no less than the label of murder must be affixed to it to vindicate all
proper societal concerns. We are always free to choose a focal point other than
dangerousness as the hallmark of this demarcation or alter the rendering of malice that

⁷⁴ Id. (emphasis added).
⁷⁵ Id. at 223. See also Sornarajah, supra note 39, at 848. JOHN HENRY THOMAS & JOHN FARQUHAR
 FRASER, THE REPORTS OF SIR EDWARD COKE, KNT. IN THIRTEEN PARTS (The Lawbook Exchange, Ltd.
 2002). An extended category of implied malice circumstances was announced by the Court in The King v.
  Oneby, supra note 66, at 1488.
⁷⁶ Trial of John Woodburne & Arnold Coke, Y.B. 8 George 1, 67 (1722).
⁷⁷ Professor Perkins discusses brilliantly the “fiction” of believing we may impute a state of mind in this
  regard. Perkins, supra note 38, at 546-47.
guides it but until we do, we must read malice as the integrated whole that it is. None of its elements, like the words of any epic poem, may be excised or improperly emphasized without fundamentally altering its internal harmony.

With the poetry of malice, murder became a profoundly multi-layered offense. In expressing its elements, however, the common law did so in a way that assigned the burden of proof of them in ways different than the current Supreme Court would countenance. Nonetheless, all the elements of the definition of murder were there:

“[W]e may take it for a general rule that all homicide is malicious, and of course amounts to murder, unless where justified by the command or permission of the law; excused on the account of accident or self-preservation; or alleviated into manslaughter, by being either the involuntary consequence of some act, not strictly lawful, or (if voluntary) occasioned by some sudden and sufficiently violent provocation. And all these circumstances of justification, excuse, or alleviation, it is incumbent upon the prisoner to make out, to the satisfaction of the court and jury; the latter of whom are to decide whether the circumstances alleged are proved to have actually existed; the former, how far they extend to take away or mitigate the guilt. For all homicide is presumed to be malicious, until the contrary appears upon evidence. 78

While the language presuming malice might seem a vestige of the old days of strict liability,79 the presumption of murder when Og caused the death of Rok was hardly a fast track to the gallows.80 The causing of death alone, even with a deadly weapon,81 had to be examined in light of all the qualifications, exceptions and mollifications the law now recognized as part of the definition of murder which had evolved. Malice, the most vital term of that definition, was a gestalt that only a wide camera lens could capture. Would the use of a deadly weapon really make that judgment easy for a jury?

C. The Incidental Role of Deadly Weapons

78 BLACKSTONE, supra note 31, at 224
79 Sornarajah, supra note 39, at 847.
80 Oberer, supra note 38, at 1568-69.
81 Perkins, supra note 38, at 549
The Stabbing Act was an anomaly as the common law did not need to refer to deadly weapons to define malice. The deliberate use of a deadly weapon may evidence deadly intent but it neither intensifies the presumption of malice nor negates the importance of assessing all possible issues of justification, excuse or alleviation.\footnote{Perkins, supra note 38, at 549; See also Oberer, supra note 38, at 1572-73.}

Reference to the use of such weapons may, in fact, have primarily served to inform a collateral issue regarding the extent of corporal discipline society was willing to tolerate.

As between parent and child, master and apprentice or officer and criminal, “the act of correction” within the bounds of moderation was lawful.\footnote{BLACKSTONE, supra note 31, at 205-6. See also, extended discussion in Oberer, supra note 38 at 1569-72.} But, “immoderate correction is unlawful”\footnote{BLACKSTONE, supra note 31, at 205-6.} and became excessive “either in the manner, the instrument, or the quantity of punishment.”\footnote{Id.} Where “death ensues” the end result could be manslaughter or murder. For example, when a blacksmith corrected his apprentice by crushing his skull with an iron bar, the Court found that its use may support a finding of malice prepensed since objects of that nature are not “instruments of correction.”\footnote{Oberer, supra note 38, at 1569-70.}

But, of course, it was not\textit{ just} the iron bar that made this murder. The definition of a “deadly weapon” even today hardly reads like a manufacturer’s catalog describing the engineering of the thing itself. Rather, it speaks of its “use” and the intention with which it is used, emphasizing that its deadliness can only be traced to the sentient being using it to a malicious end.\footnote{The Pennsylvania definition states that a “deadly weapon” includes: Any firearm, whether loaded or unloaded, or any device designed as a weapon and capable of producing death or serious bodily injury, or any} To know if the apprentice died by malice, the jury had to consider “the whole evidence” not just the bar that surely would have been Exhibit A at trial.\footnote{Id.}
Courts applying these common law principles understood this. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court decision in *Commonwealth v. Drum* in 1868 is a paradigm example.89

other device or instrumentality which, in the manner in which it is used or intended to be used, is calculated or likely to produce death or serious bodily injury.

18 PA.C.S. § 2301 (2006). The focus is not on the instrument itself, but on the manner in which it is used, specifically whether it is employed in a way that evidences the actor’s intent to cause death or serious bodily injury. For example, the Superior Court of Pennsylvania held that a tire iron, when thrown by a defendant toward his victim, constituted a deadly weapon. *Commonwealth v. Scullin*, 607 A.2d 750, 752 (Pa. Super. 1992). The *Scullin* court observed:

Although deadly weapons are commonly items one would traditionally think of as dangerous (e.g., guns, knives, etc.), there are instances when items which normally are not considered to be weapons can take on deadly status. The definition of deadly weapon does not demand that the person in control of the object intend to injury or kill the victim. Instead, it gives objects deadly weapon status on the basis of their use under the circumstances. *Id.* at 753 (citations omitted).

In *Commonwealth v. McKeithan*, 504 A.2d 294 (Pa. Super. 1986), the Court highlighted the importance of the phrase “in the manner in which it is used or intended to be used.” The surrounding circumstances of a crime make evident the requisite intent to use the weapon in a deadly manner to further a particular crime. *Id.* at 301, citing 18 PA. C.S. § 2301 (2006).

In *Commonwealth v. Thomas*, the Court found that a vehicle was a deadly weapon when driven in the reckless way the defendant operated it since “a deadly weapon need not be, of course, an inherently lethal instrument or device.” 656 A.2d 514, 518 (Pa. Super. 1995).

See also, *Commonwealth v. Scott*, 752 A.2d 871, 874 (Pa. 2000)(five pound dumbbell); *Commonwealth v. Brown*, 587 A.2d 6 (Pa. Super. 1991) (dry-wall saw was a deadly weapon when defendant stabbed his ex-girlfriend ten times with it); *Commonwealth v. Cornish*, 589 A.2d 718 (Pa. Super. 1991) (fireplace poker was a deadly weapon when used by defendant to beat his victim); and *Commonwealth v. Raybuck*, 915 A.2d 125 (Pa. Super. 2006) (commercial mouse poison was a deadly weapon when used by defendant to poison her husband’s food).

88 Commonwealth v. Dougherty, 7 SMITH, LAWS OF PA. 695 (1807).
89 Commonwealth v. Drum, 58 Pa. 9 (Pa. 1868). A wedding reception in 1795 also provided the venue for the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania to discuss certain of these principles in *Respublica v. Mulatto Bob*, 4 U.S. 145, 146 (Pa. 1795). A brawl broke out among a number of the guests but had calmed down when the defendant grabbed a club and then an axe from a handy woodpile, ignoring the counsel of others to calm down. *Respublica*, 4 U.S. at 146. The defendant then struck the axe into the ground swearing that he would “split the skull of any fellows who should be saucy.” *Id.* at 145-46. He next attributed sauciness to one “David” striking him twice in the head with the axe, killing him.

In determining that this was premeditated, first degree murder, the court readily found the intention “collected from [the defendant’s] words and actions.” *Id.* This was an easy conclusion, since the defendant “actually killed the deceased in the way which he had menaced.” *Id.*

But the court added this parenthetical: “But, let it be supposed, that a man, without uttering a word, should strike another on the head with an axe, it must, on every principle by which we can judge of human actions, be deemed a premeditated violence.” *Id.* This is presumed malice in a situation in which no other attendant facts would dilute the conclusion of an intentional killing. Absent insanity, if there were truly no other circumstances in a case but the fact that a defendant calmly armed himself with an axe and parted the skull of a “saucy” adversary, the act would support a first degree finding in the same way it would if the death blows were by fist or strangulation. The Court did look at the attendant circumstances before it, dismissed the prior fight as insufficient provocation, pondered the words of the defendant before the fatal blows, and reached an integrated decision that did not turn on the mere use of an axe alone.
While the motive for their affray was not the relative merits of James I, the brawl between William Drum and Daniel Mohigan was much in the nature of the 17th century chance medley/Stabbing Act affair where one man’s facility with a knife was the ultimate and decisive factor. The trial arising out of the brawl focused on why Drum armed himself with a knife (anticipation of an assault on Mohigan versus a “hunting excursion”) and who started and continued the fight in which the knife became the instrument of death.\(^90\) The case was no whodunit, and the issues before the jury ranged over premeditation, malice, manslaughter, provocation and self-defense.

The court charged the jury on the basic elements of murder in language echoing Coke and Blackstone.\(^91\) As to malice, the court issued what became a classic formulation of malice in Pennsylvania law to this day\(^92\):

> The distinguishing criterion of murder is malice aforethought. But it is not malice in its ordinary understanding alone, a particular ill-will, a spite or a grudge. Malice is a legal term, implying much more. It comprehends not only a particular ill-will, but every case where there is wickedness of disposition, hardness of heart, cruelty, recklessness of consequences, and a mind regardless of social duty, although a particular person may not be intended to be injured. Murder, therefore, at common law embraces cases where no intent to kill existed, but where the state or frame of mind termed malice, in its legal sense, prevailed.\(^93\)

Pennsylvania’s Legislature had, by this time, broken down murder into First degree (premeditated killing and felony murder), and Second degree (all other types of murder, that is, homicide with malice).\(^94\) By the nature of the killing, the jury could presume the

---

\(^90\) *Drum*, 58 Pa. at 19.

\(^91\) “At the common law murder is described to be, when a person of sound memory and discretion unlawfully kills any reasonable creature in being and under the peace of the Commonwealth, with malice aforethought, expressed or implied.” *Drum*, 54 Pa. at 15.


\(^93\) *Drum*, 58 Pa. at 16.

\(^94\) *Drum*, 58 Pa. at 15-16.
crime was murder in the Second degree, since “all homicide is presumed to be malicious, that is, murder of some degree, until the contrary appears in evidence,” but the Commonwealth bore the burden of proving First degree.

Premeditation required further explanation and, in the context of this case, the use of the knife was to be contemplated. The Court instructed on intent in a way to demonstrate how integrated the consideration of the knife had to be. See if you can find the inference in the thicket of qualifications that surround it:

The proof of the intention to kill, and of the disposition of mind constituting murder in the first degree, under the Act of Assembly, lies on the Commonwealth. But this proof need not be express or positive. It may be inferred from the circumstances. If, from all the facts attending the killing, the jury can fully, reasonably, and satisfactorily infer the existence of the intention to kill, and the malice of heart with which it was done, they will be warranted in so doing. He who uses upon the body of another, at some vital part, with a manifest intention to use it upon him, a deadly weapon, as an axe, a gun, a knife or a pistol, must, in the absence of qualifying facts, be presumed to know that his blow is likely to kill; and, knowing this, must be presumed to intend the death which is the probable and ordinary consequence of such an act. He who so uses a deadly weapon without a sufficient cause of provocation, must be presumed to do it wickedly, or from a bad heart. Therefore, he who takes the life of another with a deadly weapon, and with a manifest design thus to use it upon him, with sufficient time to deliberate, and fully to form the conscious purpose of killing, and without any sufficient reason or cause of extenuation, is guilty of murder in the first degree. All murder not of the first degree, is necessarily of the second degree, and includes all unlawful killing under circumstances of depravity of heart, and a disposition of mind regardless of social duty; but where no intention to kill exists or can be reasonably and fully inferred. Therefore, in all cases of murder, if no intention to kill can be inferred or collected from the circumstances, the verdict must be murder in the second degree.

The knife was also relevant in the final stage of the deliberation, assessing whether Drum proved circumstances reducing the crime to manslaughter or establishing

---

96 Drum, 58 Pa. at 16-17.
97 Id. (emphasis added).
self defense outright. In making this final, overall judgment, however, the jury was not instructed in the simplistic way it would have been today:

When death ensues from the use of a deadly weapon, in a quarrel or affray, the jury must scan closely the conduct of both parties, their former relations and behavior, and the current of events; the character of the weapon, the manner of its use, and circumstances attending it; and by a careful survey of the evidence, must endeavor to arrive at the true motive and cause which prompted the fatal blow. Has there been a former difficulty? What feeling did it produce, and what design did it beget? Was the weapon prepared, and was the blow given coolly and without rage, or was it a sudden and impetuous impulse, causing the act to be committed rashly and without reflection? Were the parties engaged in mutual combat when the blow was given, or was it given when the prisoner was not fighting? Did he use the weapon when he might have avoided it, or was the attack commenced by the deceased, and continued by him until the fatal wound was given? Was the prisoner hemmed in and without means of escape? Was he in danger of life or great bodily harm, and did he give the blow with the knife under the influence of excitement and fear of loss of life, or the infliction of great injury to his person?

Again, the nature of the weapon, and the place and character of the wound, are important to be considered. Was it a deadly instrument, a knife, a dagger, or dirk knife? The deadliness of the weapon tends to indicate the intention with which it is used. The place where the thrust is made also throws light on the intention. If used upon the arms or legs it may indicate only an intention to cut and wound; if used upon a vital part of the body it may indicate an intention to kill. All these are most pertinent inquiries to be made in this case, in order to apply the results drawn from the evidence to the case as presented by each side.

This was no dissertation on the process of inference. The Court was defining malice and specific intent by trying to illustrate (in excruciating detail) all the circumstances that surround the incidental detail of the deadly weapon that truly explain the complex terms at issue. *Drum* realized what the United States Supreme Court did in three reversals of murder convictions in the 1890’s: even *arming oneself* with a deadly weapon in anticipation of trouble did not automatically negate defenses to murder like self-defense.

---

98 *Id.* at 18. “He must show all the circumstances of alleviation or excuse upon which he relies to reduce his offence from murder to a milder kind of homicide, unless, indeed, where the facts already in evidence show it.” See also *Mika*, 33 A. at 65; *Reed*, 83 A. at 576, and *Commonwealth v. Winebrenner*, 265 A.2d 108, 114 (Pa. 1970).
99 *Drum*, 58 Pa. at 18.
or provocation. Malice could not be equated with merely having the weapon or using it since “particular circumstances” necessarily “qualify the character the offense, and it is thoroughly settled that it is for the jury to determine what effect shall be given to circumstances having that tendency whenever to appear in the evidence.”

If reference to the weapon was to made at all, attaching massive amounts of mind-numbing qualifications was a necessary evil since otherwise an incomplete definition of the terms would be given. This continued through the 1970’s with the intentional use of a weapon concept drenched in qualifications to make it clear that only when the use was “without legal excuse or justification” could first degree murder be found.

The Drum charge was wrong in that, as the Pennsylvania Supreme Court recognized in 1978, the murder statute required the Commonwealth to prove both the unlawfulness of the killing and malice, thus making the practice of assigning the burden of proof to negate those to the defense unconstitutional. But the old, confusing charge did at least try to identify for the jury all the proper elements of murder and present them in an integrated way. If, indeed, a jury found that a sane person killed deliberately, without justification from the doctrine of self-defense, and without mitigation from sufficient provocation, he would be guilty of murder. The same equation, of course,

100 Thompson v. United States, 155 U.S. 271 (1894); Wallace v. United States, 162 U.S. 466 (1896).
101 Wallace, 162 U.S. at 476.
102 The qualifying language was also reflected in Massachusetts. See Commonwealth v. York, 50 Mass. 93, 101-3, 115-16 (Mass. 1845) (“A sane man, a voluntary agent, acting upon motives, must be presumed to contemplate and intend the necessary, natural and probable consequences of his own acts. If, therefore, one voluntarily or wilfully does an act which has a direct tendency to destroy another's life, the natural and necessary conclusion from the act is, that he intended so to destroy such person's life. So, if the direct tendency of the wilful act is to do another some great bodily harm, and death in fact follows, as a natural and probable consequence of the act, it is presumed that he intended such consequence, and he must stand legally responsible for it. So, where a dangerous and deadly weapon is used, with violence, upon the person of another, as this has a direct tendency to destroy life, or do some great bodily harm to the person assailed, the intention to take life, or do him some great bodily harm, is a necessary conclusion from the act.”).
103 Winebrenner, 265 A.2d at 112. See also Dougherty, 7 SMITH, LAWS OF PA. 695; Mika, 33 A. at 65; Reed, 83 A. at 603.
would apply whether a weapon was used or not. Reference to the weapon in the old instruction complicated matters to a dangerous extreme. Reference to it in the unqualified current permissive instruction is even worse.

Indeed, qualifying language was so vital that in 1864, the Kentucky Supreme Court reversed the conviction in *Smith v. Commonwealth* in part because insufficient qualifying language accompanied the inference at the time it was given:

The court instructed the jury that “if homicide be committed by a deadly weapon in the previous possess of the slayer, the law implies malice in the perpetrator”. As given, without qualification as to how or for what purpose the weapon happened in the perpetrator’s possession, or whether, having it for a lawful purpose, he used it in self-defense, or under sudden and provoked heat of passion, this instruction was certainly wrong and misleading.\(^{105}\)

The error here, however, goes even deeper as same court realized in 1878 when it reversed a death penalty verdict in *Farris v. Kentucky*.\(^{106}\) Farris did not deny shooting the victim but raised self defense and heat of passion. The trial court told the jury that malice was “implied” from the deliberate use of a deadly weapon on the victim.\(^{107}\) The appellate court found this instruction overly simplistic and thereby erroneous. State law permitted carrying a weapon and using it in self-defense; using it under conditions of sufficient provocation also negated malice by mitigating murder to a lesser charge.\(^{108}\) Substantively, the implication failed as a matter of deductive reasoning.

Adorning the instruction with a myriad of qualifications was not a proper option either as such extensive qualifications were a sure way to chart a course to jury confusion. In commenting on the *Smith* ruling, the *Farris* Court observed:

---

\(^{105}\) *Smith v. Commonwealth*, 1 Duv. 226, 227 (Ky. 1864)

\(^{106}\) 77 Ky. 362 (Ky. 1976).

\(^{107}\) *Farris*, 77 Ky. at 368.

\(^{108}\) *Id.* at 369-70, 374.
It might well be said that this amounted to holding, inferentially and argumentatively, that the instruction would be good if given with the qualifications indicated. But two things are to be considered in this connection: First, the point that the law implies malice does not appear to have received the attention of the court; the objections pointed out being sufficient to destroy the instruction, the court was content to stop them. Secondly, the improbability of being able to draft an instruction containing all the suggested qualifications and exceptions mentioned that might not mislead the jury to the prejudice of the accused.\textsuperscript{109}

Jury instructions, after all, “should be so drafted that they may be taken and applied in their literal sense, for the jurors, unlearned in the law, are not required to be able to do more than to make a literal application to the particular case of the law given them.”\textsuperscript{110}

Attempts to fashion one that put the deadly weapon into a proper context, where issues of its deliberate use and concepts of self-defense and provocation would immediately surround it, would convert it into a novella likely to leave the jurors in a stupor. Indeed, “the chances are that its necessary prolixity would be more apt to mislead and confuse the jury and defeat the ends of justice than if no instruction were given on the point.”\textsuperscript{111}

But the Court went further, holding that even making the instruction a permissive inference would not cure the problem.

This conflict could have been avoided by telling the jury that they might infer malice from the circumstances of the killing, \textit{but such an instruction would be objectionable because of the undue prominence that would be given to the fact of killing with a deadly weapon}.\textsuperscript{112}

No one would doubt that the murder weapon is admissible as evidence. But giving a jury instruction relating it directly to malice is to give it “undue prominence” of the first order. Malice is not death by deadly weapon. Suggesting to a jury that malice may be

\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Id.} at 374.

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Id.} at 374-75.

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Farris,} 77 Ky. at 369-70 (emphasis added). The Georgia Supreme Court has disdained the use of a deadly weapon inference instruction even with qualifying language, \textit{Harris v. State,} 543 S.E.2d 716 (Ga. 2001), but a liberal harmless error rule for such instructions is in place. See, for example, \textit{Brown v. State,} 575 S.E.2d 505 (Ga. 2003).
inferred from the intentional use of a deadly weapon alone falsely reflects its true history and errs by confusing and corrupting the process that we hope will bring us justice. Like the elephant in the John Saxe poem that six blind men argue to describe because one thinks him “like a wall” and the others a spear, a tree, a snake, a rope or a fan because they each touch only a part of him, malice can only be known incompletely and, thereby falsely, by incidentals like deadly weapons.113

The older courts realized this and either smothered the deadly weapon with qualifications or, like Farris, disdained its use as an inference entirely. Perhaps they shared Blackstone’s view that it “cannot be said that the mode of killing, whether by stabbing, strangling or shooting, can either extenuate or enhance the guilt,”114 or found its relevance to a finding malice only so modestly probative that it should be evidence, but nothing more.115 Perhaps they realized that a weapon, standing alone, has no capacity to fulfill any of the natures of the trinity of malice and that the context of its use is far more vital to issues of consequence than the length of its blade or its caliber.

But they realized more. The “undue prominence” also carried an ominous procedural side-effect since it was the judge saying that an inferential link possibly existed here. The State’s argument of this inference would come only with such force as any advocate’s words might carry, not with the imprimatur of judicial integrity that threatened an invasion of the jury process. 116 Malice, after all, “is no more within the

114 BLACKSTONE, supra note 31, at 215-16 n.d.
115 Farris, 77 Ky. at 375.
116 Note also that in Quercia v. US, 289 U.S. 466 (1933), the Court did not excuse the trial judge’s remark that the defendant’s act of rubbing his hands while testifying signified that he was lying, even though the judge made it clear to the jury that was his opinion only, not binding on them. Querica, 289 U.S. at 471-72. Since the court’s curious insights about body language were made “with all the persuasiveness of judicial
province of the court to determine than the fact of death, or the character of the weapon used to inflict it.” 117 Respecting the sovereignty of the jury within its domain is as vital a reason to avoid such “instructions” as is the confusing nature of the instruction itself. 118

The substance of the historical concept of malice is thus not the only concept this inference betrays. Shortcuts to the substance of malice invariably short circuit the jury process as well. However lightly or heavily the judge’s foot falls there, it is wrong. History, again, makes the point forcefully.

D. The Central Role of Jury

Finding the hallowed place of the jury in the history of the Anglo-American system of government is not difficult. As long as “this palladium remains sacred and inviolate,” Blackstone intoned, the “liberties of England will abide.” 119 Story traced its origin to the earliest times of this tradition, labeling it the “great bulwark” of liberty. 120 It found articulation in the Declaration of Independence, the state Constitutions written before 1787, the body of the federal Constitution and three of the first eight Amendments, a claim virtually no other right could make. 121

The jury trial is much more than an individual right of a criminal defendant. 122 It also has a place of unique and supreme importance as a structural feature of the republic

---

117 Farris, 77 Ky. at 371-73.
118 Id.
122 I have argued this extensively in a previous work. See Antkowiak, supra note 18, at 22-37.
which, like federalism and separation of powers, is designed to operate as an objective check, internally and externally, on the tyrannical tendencies of government.\textsuperscript{123}

No matter how well regarded the judiciary or a given judge might be, they are the government and not to be invested with unqualified trust when the issue is whether a citizen should be condemned for a crime.\textsuperscript{124} Justice Scalia called the jury trial right “no mere procedural formality, but a fundamental reservation of power in our constitutional structure. Just as suffrage ensures the people's ultimate control in the legislative and

\textsuperscript{123} “The jury trial right was, however, more than just an external hedge. In a very real way, it was an extension of the structural theory of government. Even more profoundly than federalism and separation of powers, it was meant to be an integral part of the blueprint of the collective machine, a part not controlled by the branches of government, but left in the hands of the mortal creators of the machine itself: the reasoned voice of the people.” Id. at 30; See also Amar, \textit{supra} note 121, at 1187-89.

Political theorists have seen the structural importance of juries for some time. In John Rawls’ terms, the jury legitimizes a system that facilitates the proper goals of punishment while limiting the risk of outcomes that are undesirable, mainly, the punishment of the innocent. \textit{John Rawls, Two Concepts of Rules, in John Rawls: Collected Papers} 26-28 (Samuel Freeman ed., Harvard Univ. Press 1999). Individual outcomes can be unjust, but certain kinds of institutions minimize that risk by preventing the exercise of arbitrary power. \textit{Id.} at 26-28, 42.

The jury is an institution of Phillip Pettit’s famous concept of antipower. A passage from a previous article is appropriate here:

This need for structural protection of liberty finds further articulation in the philosophical writings of Phillip Pettit and his concept of antipower. \textit{See} Philip Pettit, \textit{Freedom as Antipower}, 106 ETHICS 576 (1996); For Pettit, the traditional notion of freedom, one he argues the Framers embraced, held that true freedom exists in a system that subjects no person to the arbitrary power of another, regardless of whether arbitrary conduct actually occurs. Pettit, \textit{Freedom as Antipower}, at 576-78. Describing “freedom as antipower,” he explains that

I am free to the degree that no human being has the power to interfere with me; to the extent that no one else is my master, even if I lack the will or the wisdom required for achieving self-mastery. The account is negative in leaving my own achievements out of the picture and focusing on eliminating a danger from others. \textit{Id.} at 578.

The actual act of interference is not nearly as critical as the elimination of an arbitrary power that allows a dominating entity to act without fear of opposition or consequence. Such power denies to the one subjugated either the capacity to assert himself in response, or to petition a neutral body to assert his position and punish such arbitrary transgressions. \textit{Id.} at 579-80. The best way to achieve antipower, Pettit argues, is to consider the introduction of protective, regulatory, and empowering institutions. I do not say that every institution will necessarily increase antipower, of course; some may have indirect, counter production effects, and empirical work will be required to determine which mix of institutions does best. I say only that protective, regulatory, and empowering institutions represent the sorts of options that we ought to be considering if we are interested in the promotion of antipower in a society. \textit{Id.} at 590.”


\textsuperscript{124} \textit{See} Antkowiak, \textit{supra} note 18, at 30-34.
executive branches, jury trial is meant to ensure their control in the judiciary."\textsuperscript{125} Professor Amar labeled it the “dominant strategy to keep agents of the central government under control was to use the populist and local institution of the jury.”\textsuperscript{126} He quotes Tocqueville as observing that “the institution of the jury . . . places the real direction of society in the hands of the governed, . . . not in that of the government.”\textsuperscript{127}

Those who would usurp the jury’s power by creating presumptions and inferences that seek less to explain the law than to influence the outcome of its process are not disturbing the mere fringes of the system; they meddle with its core. Professor Nesson rebuked statutory presumptions by admonishing legislators to “respect the jury’s peculiar ability to function as a sort of institutional ‘black box’ into which a complex of relevant facts is placed and out of which comes an authoritative answer on the issue of guilt or innocence to which the general public will defer.”\textsuperscript{128}

That “black box” is as vital a legacy of our negotiation over the terms of a just society as the epic poem of malice. That legacy is no accident. The forces that brought it about demand our respect and the recognition that they continue in operation today.

Poetry is being written. The legacy lives. And democracy corrects.

III. The Power of Democratic Consensus: Who Instructs Whom?


\textsuperscript{126} Amar, \textit{supra} note 121, at 1183. The view that juries of citizens, not specially selected professionals, should sit in judgment on criminal matters is a long-standing. I have previously observed that “[b]oth Professors Sheppard and Clark, respectively quoting G.K. Chesterton and Plato, agree that the ultimate decision on guilt or innocence should remain not with a professional class of individuals but with the collection of ordinary citizens empowered to oversee the state's effort to incarcerate or execute a defendant.” Antkowiak, \textit{supra} note 125, at 570.

\textsuperscript{127} Amar, \textit{supra} note 121, at 1183 (quoting \textsc{A. De Tocqueville}, \textit{Democracy in America} 293-94 (Vintage ed. 1945)); \textit{see also} Antkowiak, \textit{supra} note 18, at 33.

While our tradition flirted with strict liability murder, we have never walked down the aisle with it for long. We have, in vexatious times, let fear cloud reason and indulged measures of simplistic severity like the Stabbing Act. In doing so, as Montesquieu observed, we risked doing lasting harm by responding to a perceived problem with laws so unreasoned that they could leave our minds either “corrupted” by our refusal to obey them or “habituated to despotism” by submitting to them, something he called “an incurable evil.” But where democratic institutions are in place, the evil is not incurable. Great minds may have thought to enshrine the jury trial process and found the words for the epic poem of malice, but the emotion that spawned both is decidedly populist in origin.

We have reasserted the gestalt of malice and the process of the jury trial not because we are philosophers, but because we are citizens who must live with the rules we write. We do it through a process of rational correction that taps into forces primal in nature and compelling in aspect. Courts are creatures of that process but hardly its driving force. Indeed, while we speak so much of judges instructing juries, the fundamental machinery of our republic works in quite the opposite direction.

To be sure, judges do strike balances in interpreting constitutional precepts and legislative acts. But, as Justice Harlan wrote, while this balancing is a rational process, it is not one “where judges have felt free to roam where unguided speculation might take them.” They must read a balance struck by the country as a whole.

---

having regard to what history teaches are the traditions from which it
developed as well as the traditions from which it broke. That tradition is a
living thing. A decision of this Court which radically departs from it could not
long survive, while a decision which builds on what has survived is likely to
be sound.\textsuperscript{131}

John Rawls would agree. The Constitution “is not what the [Supreme] Court says it
is” but is “what the people acting constitutionally through the other branches
eventually allow the Court to say it is.”\textsuperscript{132} By amendment or “by a wide and
continuing political majority” the people instruct the Court. That instruction comes
through processes he describes as the “original position,” reflective equilibrium, and the
phenomenon of public justification. Malice in Anglo-American law and our belief in the
jury are the product of these forces, giving them the most powerful foundation in the
political universe, the reasoned consensus of the governed.

Rawls both proscribes and describes a process of reasoning conducive to the best
advancement of this republic.\textsuperscript{133} In arguing that Rawls’ approach may be of great
importance to reviving the probable cause standard, I have condensed his concept of the
“original position” in this way:\textsuperscript{134}

A well-ordered society, Rawls writes, is one in which everyone accepts the same
political conception of justice that everyone else accepts. The society then
employs, as its main political and social institutions, structures that serve those
principles of justice. Implemented in a “fair system of cooperation,” these
principles of justice are not derived from an “authority distinct from the persons
cooperating” or from “natural law.” Rather, they proceed from an agreement
among its members, as “free and equal citizens,” who negotiate them rationally
and with an eye to what they regard as their “reciprocal advantage.” This societal
agreement arises in the first instance in the Rawls’ process of “original position.”

\textsuperscript{131} Antkowiak, \textit{supra} note 123, at 601-606; Ledewitz, \textit{supra} note 130, at 392-295.
\textsuperscript{132} Antkowiak, \textit{supra} note 123, at 605.
\textsuperscript{133} A full treatment may be found in Antkowiak, \textit{supra} note 130. See also Bruce A. Antkowiak, \textit{An Essay:
Courts, Judicial Review and the Pursuit of Virtue}, 45 DUQ. L.
REV. 467 (2007); See also \textit{CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL PHILOSOPHERS} (Anthony de Crespigny & Kenneth
Minogue eds., Dodd, Mead, & Co. 1975); and \textit{THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO RAWLS} (Samuel Freedman
\textsuperscript{134} This quote includes the original footnotes except where indicated.
Rawls assumes that persons acting on self-interest and employing reason come together for the purpose of negotiating rules that will govern them after a veil of ignorance lifts and their society forms. They negotiate these governing rules without knowing who they will be once that veil of ignorance rises, but knowing that the principles and rules they negotiate will bind them in future circumstances regardless of what position they find themselves in when their society forms. When a member of society negotiates principles of justice without knowing where on the social ladder he will stand when society materializes, he calculates his judgments to ensure he could tolerate life in that society regardless of his ultimate social position. The negotiator will write the rules dispassionately, before exigencies cloud his judgment; rationally, using his best faculties; with self interest in mind; and blindly, such that he can live in the world his rules will govern.135

But they will not write them amorally. Stripped of the knowledge of their “class position, assets and abilities,”136 the negotiators will operate under limits that will force them to look broadly to rules that transcend whatever visceral instincts they would indulge if they knew they were at liberty to act from a position of assured power.137 This becomes thus a “moral” process faithful to the Golden Rule and the highest plane of moral reasoning in terms of Kant’s categorical imperative.138 While they will recognize with Holmes that the

---

136 THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO RAWLS, supra note 133, at 369.
137 Id.
138 Id. Professor Gorovitz has likened Rawls’ approach to Kant’s categorical imperative. CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL PHILOSOPHERS, supra note 133. I have also previously observed:

Rawls’ approach has been compared with, or at least spoken of in the same context as, a political application of the biblical Golden Rule. See David Barnhizer, Truth or Consequences in Legal Scholarship?, 33 HOFSTRA L. REV. 1203, 1229 (2005); George M. Cohen, When Law and Economics Met Professional Responsibility, 67 FORDHAM L. REV. 273, 282 n.50 (1998); Louis Kaplow & Steven Shavell, Fairness Versus Welfare, 114 HARV. L. REV. 961, 1016 n.106 (2001).

It is also an approach that resonates of John Locke. In his Second Treatise, Locke writes that reason, which is the law of Nature, teaches that “no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty or possessions.” JOHN LOCKE, THE SECOND TREATISE ON CIVIL GOVERNMENT 396 (Prometheus Books 1986). Charity towards all is, apparently, good political science. Even earlier than Locke, Richard Hooker extolled reason as a matter of divine origin but one so universal that it would bind all men as rational beings, regardless of whether they ascribed to sacred scripture. While complete knowledge required scripture and reason, reason could provide a common basis for governance and a justification for all positive law. See DANIEL F. EPPELEY, THE REFORMATION THEOLOGIANS: RICHARD HOOKER (1554-1600) 258 (Carter Lindberg ed., 2002); DEBORA KULLER SHUGER, HABITS OF THOUGHT IN THE ENGLISH RENAISSANCE: RELIGION, POLITICS, AND THE DOMINANT CULTURE 27-28 (1997); W.D.J. CARGILL THOMPSON, THE PHILOSOPHER OF THE “POLITIC SOCIETY” 26-27 (W. Speed Hill ed., 1972).

Antkowiak, supra note 123, at 597 n.130.
“first requirement of a sound body of law is, that it should correspond with the actual feelings and demands of the community, whether right or wrong,” they will disdain visceral passions that do not “cover the whole ground” and require individual considerations to be subordinated “to that of the public well-being.”  \(^{139}\)

Of course, the process of consensus the original position “thought experiment” describes does not end when the veil is lifted. Through reflective equilibrium, a process whereby we account for the principles of justice others espouse and forge a core justice concept “affirmed in everyone’s judgments,”\(^{140}\) consensus will be sought on the “constitutional essentials” that govern the structure of government and the basic privileges and rights of citizenship. This, in turn, leads to “public justification,” political and social cooperation “on terms all can endorse as just.”\(^ {141}\) Finally, the well-ordered society will embrace “public reason,” a conception of justice “we endorse, not for the different reasons we may each discover, and not simply for reasons we happen to share, but instead for reasons that count for us because we can affirm them together. This spirit of reciprocity is the foundation of a democratic society.”\(^ {142}\)

We seek a well-ordered society by trying to make our rules the product of our best reasoning and by using structures designed to effectuate those mutually affirmed principles. As we are human, we do not always succeed. We sometimes forget that good rules anticipate, but are not produced by, the passions of the moment. But no epic poem

\(^{139}\) Holmes, supra note 16, at 41, 47.  
\(^{140}\) Antkowiak, supra note 123, at 600, citing Rawls, Justice as Fairness: A Restatement, supra note 135, at 31.  
\(^{141}\) Antkowiak, supra note 123, at 600, citing Rawls, Justice as Fairness: A Restatement, supra note 135, at 28.  
we ever wrote is etched in stone tablets. We can continue to use the process of rational consensus and, when we do it well, “we cannot do better than that.”

We have sought to do that by reasoning, through time, a workable rule about when to label Og a murderer. We do not want to live in a dangerous world where people are free to act in ways virtually certain to bring about another’s death. People who intend to cause a death or deliberately engage in conduct so inherently dangerous that a death is expected are thus candidates for such a label. But we want a world fair as well as safe. Og may have intended to kill but did so from a need any of us would have felt to defend against an unjustified attack or from provocations external to his control that displaced his reason in ways that could afflict any of us and account for, though not wholly justify, a deadly venting. We keep returning to these considerations not from theological mandate, but because they are consonant with our nature.

That weapons have never been a distinct element in this calculus is telling for our purposes. The means of causing death is incidental to the central, societal considerations of dangerousness at the heart of the rule. Even making weapons part of an illustration of malice is a bad metaphor since malice identifies archetypes of conduct we condemn as most socially injurious regardless of how they are perpetrated. Shamrocks may be a metaphor for some trinities, but deadly weapons are not effective for the trinity of malice.

---

144 A time period arguably longer than we have embraced such other conceptions as probable cause. See Antkowiak, supra note 123, at 587-588; and Jack Weber, The Birth of Probable Cause, 11 Anglo-Am. L. Rev. 155, 166 (1982).
The malice/deadly weapon instruction betrays our historical efforts. By using it, courts force a “union of ideas” of these two phenomena where none essentially exists and where, by that forced conjugation, they distort the core meaning they are trying to convey. However, the error of the courts is not pathological. It is more likely the product of benign neglect. After all, the process of democratic correction takes time. But this error is a betrayal and the correction process should begin. Options abound. One good one emerges.

IV. Possible Solutions

A. Change the Consensus?

My colleague Bruce Ledewitz once suggested a change in our view of murder that would eliminate this permissive inference. Surprisingly, however, that change would reject the epic poem of malice the democratic process has produced in favor of the elevation of the theory of Ludwig Wittgenstein on the evanescence of intent. With that elevation would come the return of mandatory presumptions about intent to better align homicide law with Wittgensteinian doctrine. While summarizing a friend is a perilous task, let me set out what I understand to be his principle points:

- The common law and the MPC “share a certain understanding of human conduct: people know what they are doing.” This assumption is a “mental state structure

---

146 When experience leads us to believe there is, David Hume argues, a “union of ideas” we fixate that union around one of three principles: resemblance (this looks like that); contiguous to (this appears with that), or connected with (cause and effect). This inference suggests the second principle at a minimum, and could readily be heard by the jury to involve the third. In truth, it fits none of the principles well. HUME, supra note 8, at 64-65.
147 Bruce Ledewitz, Mr. Carroll’s Mental State or What is Meant by Intent, 38 AM. CRIM. L. REV. 71 (2001).
148 I say “surprisingly” because Professor Ledewitz is a staunch advocate of the legitimacy and force of democratic principles. See Ledewitz, supra note 130; and BRUCE LEDEWITZ, AMERICAN RELIGIOUS DEMOCRACY (Praeger Publishers, 2007).
149 Ledewitz, supra note 147, at 81.
[that] is . . . a holdover from a more expressly theological time”; however, what we are still “seeking to punish in criminal law is sin.”\textsuperscript{150}

- Wittgenstein shows, however, that our conception of intent is illusory. Its existence, to the degree it can be said to exist in describable terms, dematerializes rapidly, making it ill suited to a finding in the criminal law.\textsuperscript{151}

- The Supreme Court’s constitutional analysis about mandatory presumptions “is itself premised on just the sort of confusion over intention” that Wittgenstein exposes.\textsuperscript{152} Indeed, what is “needed in order for criminal law to deal more coherently with mental states is greater acceptance of such inferences or presumptions” (including the deadly weapon one) since they would “obviate the need for inquiry into mental states.”\textsuperscript{153}

- Leaving intent in the law is dangerous: it allows juries to exercise “rough mercy” or, worse, make arbitrary judgments on “race, sexual preference or class.”\textsuperscript{154}

I must disagree. The decision we ask the jury to make about malice is neither theological nor psychiatric; it is democratic. We do not read to them from scripture nor ask them to make a stand-alone finding of intent by pulling out the therapist’s couch and a time machine to scientifically determine the mental conversation in the head of the defendant when he dropped the stone or pulled the trigger. The verdict is not a test of their psychiatric acuity or their state of grace. The defendant has caused a death. Malice asks for a solemn, societal judgment about whether he was responsible for that death by

\textsuperscript{150} Id. at 82.
\textsuperscript{151} Professor Ledewitz writes:
In light of the evanescence of intention, its use in criminal law seems unwarranted in general and certainly unwarranted as the critical test of liability and punishment. When a defendant sets fire to a house in order to harm someone in any way—including just scaring the victim—it should not be a matter of needed investigation whether the defendant had a stray hope or thought that no one would be physically hurt. The defendant might have had such a thought or might not. The defendant might have had a thought that burning a house is really dangerous or might not. The defendant might have hoped that maybe the person in the house would die or not die, or might not. Or all these thoughts might have been present at different times. And many other emotions might have been present as well. To force a name to this jumble, whether intent to kill or intent to accomplish something else, should not be the law’s task. Insofar as intention matters, the meaning and role of intention should be different.

\textsuperscript{152} Id. at 97.
\textsuperscript{153} Id. at 98-102.
\textsuperscript{154} Id. at 109.
bringing about a situation so unnecessarily dangerous to human life that empowering government to exercise its most ominous authority is the only rational societal response.

Intent to kill is not the point of demarcation; dangerousness is. Intent to kill does not even figure into two-thirds of the situations in which malice is present: felony murder and the “conscious disregard” killing.\textsuperscript{155} The intent to engage in a robbery or to fire a gun into an occupied building is enough. The resulting act creates such a dangerous situation that deaths from it are products of malice.

Dangerousness remains the key in the third type of malice as well, the premeditated killing. It requires intent to kill but such intent is also present in killings in self-defense, the heat of passion and under the unreasonable belief that deadly force is required.\textsuperscript{156} These three subsets of intended killings are non-malicious, however, because the situations in which they arise not as systematically dangerous as where someone “capable of cool reflection” kills anyway.\textsuperscript{157} Acts of legitimate self-defense stop dangerous conduct by the deceased; they are restorative of, not dangerous to, the social order. Killings in the heat of passion or under unreasonable belief are not condoned since self-restraint and good judgment in deadly affairs is a reasonable societal expectation; but these are reactive killings in situations featuring sudden and not readily replicated circumstances that discount their dangerousness in absolute terms.

The premeditated killing, however, is an act that seeks to cause another’s death undiscounted by social utility or situational context. It is dangerousness in a pure state. The motive for it, while probative of intent, is immaterial in this calculus. The contract

\textsuperscript{155} \textit{Model Penal Code} § 210.2
\textsuperscript{156} \textit{Model Penal Code} § 210.3 calls manslaughter a killing committed “under the influence of extreme mental or emotional disturbance for which there is a reasonable explanation or excuse”. See \textit{Pa SSJI (Crim.)} § 15.2503A.
\textsuperscript{157} \textit{Pa SSJI (Crim.)} § 15.2502A
killer and the one who willfully but mercifully ends the life of a dying loved one may be at opposite poles morally, but both acted with malice.

By striking down mandatory presumptions, or the equally intrusive permissive inferences, we are not engaged in a “fruitless search for intent as a separate event or entity that characterizes criminal law generally.”158 It is, rather, an effort to recognize that democratic peoples have designated themselves, not the elite of the courts, to make that solemn judgment as the authors of the rule and the ones whose consent to its imposition justifies it. As Jeffrey Abramson has written:

After all, there would be little point to a jury system if we expected jurors always to decide cases exactly as judges would decide them. The whole point is to subject law to a democratic interpretation, to achieve a justice that resonates with the values and common sense of the people in whose name the law was written. . . [t]o resent the intrusion of such popular conceptions of justice into the judicial process now strikes me as a resentment against democracy. In a democracy, the legitimacy of the law depends on acceptance by the people. And the jury remains our best tool for ensuring that the law is being applied in a way that wins the people’s consent.159

The consensus on malice reaches substance and process, in equal measure, inextricably intertwined. Intent, to be sure, is part of the epic poem of malice and new insights about its nature are valuable. But such insights can deceive us into thinking that they alone are the keys to understanding it or, worse, justifying its elimination. Like the blind men in Saxe’s poem in search of a complete understanding of the elephant, having a more refined view of his tail may simply lead us to believe that he is a snake too dangerous to let live instead of a magnificent beast to be celebrated.

B. Keep It In a Safe Harbor and Pretend It Does No Harm?
   i. The Illusion of the Permissive Inference

---

158 Ledewitz, supra note 147, at 103.
Returning to the age of mandatory presumptions will not work to preserve the
best of malice and honor the jury system that protects it. But is eliminating this
permissive inference overkill? The United States Supreme Court evidently believes so.
Once that Court “cured” the problem that mandatory presumptions improperly shifted the
burden of proof, the “undue prominence” criticisms Farris offered about such inferences
were tragically overlooked. In fact, the Court went to a polar opposite standard that
liberally accepted permissive inferences without critically examining their true nature or
impact. Today, permissive inferences are a safe harbor seldom found to create a
reasonable likelihood of a wrongful conviction160 even while equally improper mandatory
and rebuttal presumption instructions have been struck down.161

Years ago, Professor Charles Nesson identified critical problems in the legislative
practice of enacting permissive inferences.162 Such inferences were enacted to assuage
legislative fears that prosecutors might have a difficult time proving the elements of
offenses with the facts available.163 The inherent danger, however, is that they “modify
the procedural framework for adjudicating criminal cases in ways which erode
constitutional underpinnings.”164 Permissive inferences have that potential because they
purport to offer viable shortcuts to the finding of complex elements when using them
really requires the juror to disregard aspects of those elements in the name of expediency:

    The key problem with permissive inferences is that they isolate and abstract a
single circumstance from the complex of circumstances presented in any given
case, and, on proof of that isolated fact, authorize an inference of some other fact
beyond reasonable doubt. Conviction is authorized by the permissive inference in

161 Carella v. California, 491 U.S. 263 (1989); Yates v. Evatt, 500 U.S. 391 (1991); and Warden v. Franklin,
162 See Nesson, supra note 128.
163 Id. at 1187.
164 Id. at 1191.
all cases in which the predicate fact appears, even though the correlation between
the predicate fact and the element to be inferred is less than perfect. Permissive
inferences thus permit juries to avoid assessing the myriad facts which make
specific cases unique. Analysis, as Supreme Court opinions demonstrate, is
drawn to likelihoods. The thesis pursued here is that any structure which reduces
criminal cases to a simplified assessment of what might be called the “chances of
guilt” is fundamentally at odds with the concept of reasonable doubt, and hence to
be discouraged as a mode of determining the ultimate question of guilt or
innocence.165

The Supreme Court never sensed this problem. In County Court of Ulster, the
Court extolled inferences and presumptions as a “staple of the adversary system,”
assessing their legitimacy on the strength of the connection between the basic fact and the
elemental inferred and the degree to which the inference curtails the fact-finder in
performing its function.166 Since permissive inferences do not intrude into the fact-
finder’s world at all, the Court wrongly supposed, they are proper if the strength of the
connection meets this virtually non-existent test: unless no rational trier of fact could
make the inference permitted, the inference may be permitted.167 According to Yates, the
trial court may charge on the inference so long as it “would not be irrational.”168 While
the element inferred must be prove beyond a reasonable doubt, the inference of it need
only meet the “more likely than not” level.169

The due process standard for permissive inferences is set so low that even without
a running start, the average snail could leap over it with ease. As long as the suggested
inference does not make the judge appear to be a babbling idiot, it is arguably proper. The
standard is as low as that for relevance of proffered evidence under the Federal Rules,
that is, does it have “any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of

165 Id. at 1192 (internal citations omitted).
167 Ulster, 442 U.S at 157 (emphasis added).
168 Yates, 500 U.S. at 402.
consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence.”

However, proffered evidence, even while relevant, must still be assessed for potential prejudice under the rules, but the potential prejudice of such an inference is only assessed in passing beyond this bare threshold.

Jury instructions are critical, the Ulster dissent argued, as “[l]egitimate guidance of a jury’s deliberation is an indispensable part of our criminal justice system.” While the majority in Ulster made a fine jury argument for the instruction it permitted, it did not appreciate that instructions are not arguments but teachings about law that should be more than more likely than not correct explanations of critical legal principles. While

---

170 FED. R. EVID. 401.
171 Rule 403 provides: “Although relevant, evidence may be excluded if its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion of the issues, or misleading the jury, or by considerations of undue delay, waste of time, or needless presentation of cumulative evidence.” FED. R. EVID. 403.
172 Ulster, 442 U.S. at 169 (Powell, J., dissenting).
173 Id. at 163-65 (majority opinion). The Ulster court argued for the instruction stating:

Even if it was reasonable to conclude that she had placed the guns in her purse before the car was stopped by police, the facts strongly suggest that Jane Doe was not the only person able to exercise dominion over them. The two guns were too large to be concealed in her handbag. The bag was consequently open, and part of one of the guns was in plain view, within easy access of the driver of the car and even, perhaps, of the other two respondents who were riding in the rear seat.

Moreover, it is highly improbable that the loaded guns belonged to Jane Doe or that she was solely responsible for their being in her purse. As a 16-year-old girl in the company of three adult men she was the least likely of the four to be carrying one, let alone two, heavy handguns. It is far more probable that she relied on the pocketknife found in her brassiere for any necessary self-protection. Under these circumstances, it was not unreasonable for her counsel to argue and for the jury to infer that when the car was halted for speeding, the other passengers in the car anticipated the risk of a search and attempted to conceal their weapons in a pocketbook in the front seat. The inference is surely more likely than the notion that these weapons were the sole property of the 16-year-old girl.

Id. at 163-65 (internal footnotes omitted).
reversals of permissive inference cases do occur, the broader issue is if the best we can say for an instruction is that it did no real harm, why should we keep it?

An interesting application of this standard in the lower courts is found in *United States v. Warren*. *Warren* approved the deadly weapon/malice inference instruction before it, applying a test of whether it could be rationally drawn under the proven facts. Concerns that the instruction intruded into the role of the jury by making it seem the judge had predetermined the outcome were eased by numerous other instructions dissipating that suggestion. Similarly, strong facts dissipated fears that the instruction might be unduly suggestive on the intent element and others dissipated concern that the jury, hearing this instruction, might overlook other exculpatory evidence.

Clearly, a whole lot of dissipating was needed, raising the question whether there was some positive value this permissive inference actually added or some profound justification for having it in there in the first place. It is, after all, part of an instruction to a jury, a teaching to help them perform their vital constitutional role. If it has to be surrounded by reams of instructions to dissipate its potential prejudice, and if its benefit is speculative at best, why give it at all?

The *Warren* Court realized this.

---

174 Hanna v. Riveland, 87 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 1996) (court affirmed grant of writ of habeas corpus because of an improper instruction that allowed the jury to infer reckless driving from excessive speed alone); Commonwealth v. Kelly, 724 A.2d 909 (Pa. 1999) (conviction reversed where the trial court’s instruction to the jury created an impermissible mandatory presumption concerning the element of intent).
175 United States v. Warren, 25 F.3d 890 (9th Cir. 1994).
177 *Warren*, 25 F.3d at 899; See also United States v. Houser, 130 F.3d 867, 870 (9th Cir. 1997); Commonwealth v. Jones, 912 A.2d 268, 280 (Pa. 2006); Commonwealth v. Carson, 913 A.2d 220, 260 (Pa. 2006).
178 *Warren*, 25 F.3d at 899; See also Daniel, 1999 U.S. App. LEXIS at * 15-16; *Hall*, 830 A.2d at 544; *Jones*, 912 A.2d at 280; and *Carson*, 913 A.2d at 260.
179 *Warren*, 25 F.3d at 899; See also Pursell, 187 F.Supp.2d at 368; *Hall*, 830 A.2d at 550; *Houser*, 130 F.3d at 870; and McNabb v. Alabama, 887 So.2d 929.
Our fact-intensive review makes us question the effectiveness of permissive inference instructions. They are most effective when least appropriate: where the evidence supporting the inference is sparse and the inference is most crucial to the government's case. Where extensive background facts support the inference and reduce the likelihood that the verdict will be tainted, the instruction is far less likely to play a significant role in the jury's deliberations. Perhaps we are emphasizing the opposite ends of a spectrum; there may be a middle ground where a permissive inference instruction assists the jury without being overly intrusive or misleading. Still, closing argument affords the government and defense counsel ample opportunity to argue which inferences may be drawn from the evidence. By inviting the district court to join in this process, the government risks introducing error, without gaining much tangible benefit.180

The concurring opinion was even more direct:

While I agree that it was not reversible error to give the permissive inference instruction on malice in this case, I must say that inference instructions in general are a bad idea. There is normally no need for the court to pick out one of several inferences that may be drawn from circumstantial evidence in order for that possible inference to be considered by the jury. Inferences can be argued without benefit of an instruction; indeed, inferences are more appropriately argued by counsel than accentuated by the court. Further, because they are a detour from the law which applies to the case, inference instructions tend to take the focus away from the elements that must be proved. In this way they do a disservice to the goal of clear, concise and comprehensible statements of the law for laypersons on the jury. Balanced inference instructions are also difficult to craft. And, as this case demonstrates, inference instructions create a minefield on appeal. For all these reasons, as a practical matter it seems to me both unnecessary and unwise for inference instructions to be requested, or given.

But lessening appellate minefields is not the best reason to eliminate the deadly weapon/malice inference. This inference is what it always has been when a court used “malice” and “deadly weapon” in the same sentence: an attempt to define malice. The safe harbor of “permissive inference” that purports to justify it is a dangerous illusion unworthy of the law. It is an illusion because no one “permits” inferences; it is dangerous because it simultaneously debases the substance and process of malice.

ii. Exposing the Dangerous Illusion

180 Warren, 25 F.3d at 899-900. This point echoed the Farris Court. See Farris, 77 Ky. at 376.
Do jurors need the court’s permission to infer something? The answer is, of course not. Telling jurors they “may” infer is akin to telling them they have leave of court to breathe. Jean Piaget describes the stage of human development in which inference happens, permitted or not:

The child of twelve to fifteen of course does not establish the relevant laws of logic, nor will he write down the formula for the number of all possible combinations of the colored counters. But it is remarkable that at the level at which he becomes capable of combining elements by an exhaustive and systematic method he is also capable of combining ideas or hypotheses in affirmative or negative statements, and thus of utilizing propositional operations hitherto unknown to him: implication (if-then), disjunction (either-or, or both), exclusion (either-or) or incompatibility (either-or, or nether-neither), reciprocal implication, etc.\textsuperscript{181}

Inference is part of the inevitable process of affective and cognitive growth, forming a component of intelligence Piaget describes as “the form of equilibrium towards which all structures arising out of perception, habit and elementary sensory-motor mechanisms tend.”\textsuperscript{182} Humans must deal with concepts and objects that are not immediately subject to their current perception; jurors need to reason out past events as the alleged crime is never played out for them in real time.\textsuperscript{183} They can do this because the evolution of “our mental activity from perception and habit to symbolic behavior and memory, and to the higher operations of reasoning and formal thought”\textsuperscript{184} allows them to do so.

Thus, if we keep using jurors over the age of 15, we must recognize that instructions we claim are solely for the purpose of telling them “how” to reason are disingenuous. The process of inference will happen if a juror is disposed to relate two

\textsuperscript{181} \textsc{John Piaget & Bärbel Inhelder, The Psychology of the Child} 135 (Basic Books 1966).
\textsuperscript{182} \textsc{John Piaget, The Psychology of Intelligence} 7-8 (Malcolm Piercy & D.E. Berlyne trans., 1950).
\textsuperscript{183} Social scientists who study juror inference process make the highly obvious assumption that they are, in fact, occurring whether the court permits them or not. \textsc{Inside the Juror: The Psychology of Juror Decision Making} 136-38 (Reid Hastie ed., Cambridge Univ. Press 1993).
\textsuperscript{184} \textsc{Piaget, supra} note 182, at 9.
facts in inferential fashion. Telling them they “may” infer something does not permit the process but simply encourages the outcome the judge is suggesting.

Courts acknowledge the inevitability of inference in other contexts. Jurors must be told not to infer that a defendant who does not testify has something to hide. The court properly assumes this inference is taking place and must, constitutionally, discourage its end product. Likewise, “permitting” the inference of malice based on a woefully incomplete shortcut is “approving” the finding in subtle but undeniable terms. Hoping jurors will not be influenced by this promised approval is a foolish indulgence.

Jurors may not have studied Jean Piaget, but they know that being told they “may infer” something is not a short course in cognition. They also know, because the judge tells them plainly, that they are not free to disregard the law the judge gives them if they wish. When the authority figure in the room, in the context of explaining the law that must be applied to find a disputed element like malice, suggests that a jury “may” infer it from one fact, is this anything but a hint or, worse, an authoritative push?

Even if the judge speaks without verbal emphasis or the winking of an eye, it is the person of the judge, after all, who is saying it. It is not just testimony from a witness or argument by an advocate. Courts and scholars have understood for years that the

---

185 The Pennsylvania Instruction on this is typical:

The charge is an accusation, not proof that the defendant is guilty. A defendant is presumed innocent unless and until proven to be guilty beyond a doubt that would cause a reasonable and sensible person to hesitate in a matter of great importance to him or her. The defendant does not have the burden of proof and need not present any evidence to prove that [he] [she] is not guilty. Furthermore, a defendant has an absolute right founded upon the United States and Pennsylvania Constitutions not to testify. If he or she elects not to testify, you cannot hold that fact against him or her nor infer that the defendant is guilty because [he] [she] chose not to testify. PA SSJI (Crim.) § 2.01(2).

186 Jurors in Pennsylvania hear this:

It is my responsibility to decide all questions of law. You must follow my rulings and instructions on matters of law whether or not you agree with them. I am likely to give other instructions during the trial in addition to these preliminary instructions and my final charge. You should consider all of my instructions as a connected series. Taken together, they constitute the law that you must follow. PA SSJI (Crim.) § 2.01 (emphasis added).
honored place of the judge in the eyes of the jury renders whatever a judge says likely to be suggestive of an outcome in a way that merits caution and vigilance.

The trial judge is, after all, the “governor” of the trial, whose “influence . . . on the jury is necessarily and properly of great weight. . .his lightest word or intimation is received with deference, and may prove controlling.” While judges are permitted to sum up the evidence for the jury, they have always been admonished by their appellate brethren that “deductions and theories not warranted by the evidence should be studiously avoided [as they] can hardly fail to mislead the jury and work injustice.”

Moreover, appellate courts have warned that trial judges must not advance a party’s position, either by seeming to become an advocate or a witness for the side they favor. Justice is produced by a process in which actors play but one role at a time. When the referee in the adversary process seems to have chosen sides, the outcomes of that process can no longer be accorded meaning and dignity. In short, “argumentative matter. . .should not be thrown into the scales by the judicial officer who holds them.”

But even when they are not seeking to do so, judges influence juries in a myriad of ways, sometimes just by confusing them. While jurors see the judge as the

---

187 Querica, 289 U.S. at 469.
188 Id. at 470; quoting Starr v. United States, 153 U.S. 614, 626 (1894).
189 Id. at 624-26; Querica, 289 U.S at 470; Ferrer v. Trs. of the Univ. of Pa., 825 A.2d 591, 612-13 (Pa. 2002) (“The instructions to the jury are not intended to supplement the arguments of the opposing parties.”); Logue v. Dore, 103 F.3d 1040, 1045 (“[T]here are lines which a trial judge should not cross...the judge’s participation must be balanced; he cannot become an advocate or otherwise use his judicial powers to advantage or disadvantage a party unfairly.”) Indeed, studies have shown many judges do not sum up or comment on the evidence for fear of exerting undue influence. John P. Cronan, Is Any of This Making Sense? Reflecting on Guilty Pleas to Aid Criminal Juror Comprehension, 39 AM. CRIM. L. REV. 1187, 1253 (2002).
190 Starr, 153 U.S. at 626.
“embodiment of impartial justice”\textsuperscript{192} and attach great significance to what the judge conveys to them verbally and non-verbally,\textsuperscript{193} their cognitive understanding of the words used are not always equaled by the significance they attach to them. Various scholars report that the court’s goal of accurately conveying the law in a comprehensible way devoid of subtle messages that might subvert the jury function\textsuperscript{194} is not being met with regularity.\textsuperscript{195} Importantly for our purposes, permissive inference instructions do not adequately convey that the jury is free to disregard them,\textsuperscript{196} with one study concluding that the “subtle distinctions between the different presumption instructions are lost on jurors.”\textsuperscript{197} This confusion can only be compounded by trying to save such instructions by wrapping them in reams of qualifications as they were in \textit{Drum}.$^{198}$

What is not lost on jurors, however, is their sense of duty. Regardless of whether most jurors think that the “original position” is a term in a yoga class, they get “it”, “it” being the true mission they must fulfill. Studies indicate that juries may not spend hours parsing out the intricacies of the instructions (principally because they are confusing even


\textsuperscript{197}Id. The court in \textit{Farris v. Kentucky} recognized this. \textit{Farris}, 77 Ky. at 368. See infra notes 106-113 and accompanying text.

\textsuperscript{198}See infra note 97 and accompanying text. It should also be recalled that the \textit{Farris} Court cautioned against such qualifications as adding “prolixity” likely to further confuse a jury. \textit{Farris}, 77 Ky. at 374-75.
to jurors with prior knowledge of the law)\textsuperscript{199} but they aspire to a verdict that reflects “the severity of the crime as they perceive it,”\textsuperscript{200} grounding their decision in experience and “personal beliefs and values about what is right, wrong, and fair.”\textsuperscript{201} What they could use is proper guidance, not dangerous illusions.

At a minimum, they should not be misguided. Eliminating this inference from the law will at least accomplish that. While the epic poem of malice may be intellectually challenging for a judge to explain\textsuperscript{202} and its intent aspect hard to prove at times,\textsuperscript{203} the jury is not stupid. It is made up of the people whose consensus made malice in the first place. And malice has too noble a lineage to be given in a watered down version with shortcuts that convolute it into a modern day version of the Stabbing Act.\textsuperscript{204}

But is there more the judge can do besides not give this instruction? Yes. Once a solemn appreciation of what actually happens after the jury instruction ends and the process of producing a verdict begins, there is much more a judge can do.

C. Respect and Help the Jury

A verdict is a judgment of conscience, an exercise of civic and political virtue. While jurors should never feel cast as an ecclesiastical body, they are about the task of exercising such virtue at its highest level. Courts have recognized this for centuries. John Marshall charged the jury in the case of Aaron Burr that they should find a verdict as

\textsuperscript{199} INSIDE THE JUROR, supra note 183, at 200.
\textsuperscript{200} Id. at 47-48.
\textsuperscript{202} Cronan, supra note 192, at 1188-89, 1202-1203, 1214-15, 1258; Christopher N. May, "What Do We Do Now?": Helping Juries Apply the Instructions, 28 LOY. L.A. L. REV. 869 (1995); Ellsworth, supra note 196; and Devin, supra note 202.
\textsuperscript{204} Professor Nesson suggests eliminating elements “not suited to jury determinations,” but, in the end, his best advice is to trust juries. Nesson, supra note 128, at 1216.
their “own consciences may direct.” In 2007, the United States Supreme Court reminded that “before a jury can undertake the grave task of imposing a death sentence, it must be allowed to consider a defendant’s moral culpability” in light of a wide range of mitigating evidence to which they are to “respond . . . in a reasoned, moral manner [weighing] such evidence in its calculus of deciding whether a defendant is truly deserving of death”. What happens inside Professor Nesson’s black box is, for the republic and the juror, a supreme test of conscience and an accurate measure of our capacity for virtue.

205 Alschuler & Deiss, supra note 121, at 915, see also id. at 907 n.214.
207 In a prior work, I have argued that judges retain the right to take into account their residual doubts about the guilt of a defendant in sentencing him. See Antkowiak, supra note 125. Moral issues pervade the continuum between prosecution, conviction and sentencing and lay heavy upon those primarily responsible for passing the case to the next phase. The jury faces a significant moral crisis:

There is a deep moral sense to a jury's verdict. Professor Sheppard has bemoaned the effort to adjust the standard of proof beyond a reasonable doubt to limit a jury's discretionary judgment on the necessity of a conviction not only because that adjustment undermines the presumption of innocence but also because of its ethical reverberations:

The juror has been given a task that demands only one power, the discretion to reach an independent judgment. A limitation on the forms of judgment the juror may apply to the evidence presented in the trial is a limit on discretion, on the powers necessary to perform that task. Looking at the sum of moral notions that might apply in the state's obligations to the juror, there is no question that the limit of juror independence is an immoral burden placed by state officials on the citizen-juror. Steve Sheppard, The Metamorphoses of Reasonable Doubt: How Changes in the Burden of Proof have Weakened the Presumption of Innocence, 78 NOTRE DAME L. REV. 1165, 1241-42 (2003).

Besides placing an individual juror in such a moral quandary, an attempt to limit a juror's discretion renders the jury "the scapegoat for the law.

The juror immunizes the police, judge, and lawyers from mistakes prior to trial. Judges will not correct mistakes made by police or the lawyers or other judges unless the jury would likely have reached another decision if the mistake had not occurred. And, jurors immunize mistakes made after the trial. Judges need not much concern themselves that the condemned defendant is innocent, as that was the job for a jury. An actual error, the wrongful conviction of the innocent, is the fault of the jury. Sheppard, supra, at 1241-42.

... Professor Clark has also written extensively on the moral dimensions of the jury verdict in a criminal case. He argues that the entire jury process is one performing a compelling moral and social function:

The critical variable for purposes of this argument is the extent to which the procedures governing a criminal jury trial tend to engender in jurors a sense of personal responsibility for the fate of the accused. The meaning I attempt to ascribe to that variable is courage, or rather a particular quality of forthrightness and integrity for which courage
To aid in this quintessential moment of citizenship, the judge must be gatekeeper, teacher and inspiration. As gatekeeper, the judge must accept that juries will not always “get it right” as no institution made up of imperfect beings may ever indulge an arrogant pretense to perfection. The judge must realize that perhaps to have a jury “that resists the tyranny of the state, we must risk our freedom on the jury that practices its own petty tyranny.” But the judge must also be aware that my friend Professor Ledewitz is right that any given jury can be the conduit for bigotry born of the mob and recall Joseph Story’s admonition that the true object of the jury was to guard against both the tyranny of the rulers and “a spirit of violence and vindictiveness on the part of the people.”

Using voir dire to ferret out the bigots, scoundrels and ones who could never appreciate the solemnity of their office as jurors is a critical task the judge must perform.

As teacher, the judge need not fear that the instruction must be crafted like an inscription upon a blank slate. Those being instructed are citizens, heirs to and part of an ongoing consensus about rules that justly set off certain acts as meriting the awful label of “murder.” The teaching about malice is not an effort to apply “a defective and unreal psychology” that merely invites the jury to engage in the “exercise of mercy.” Properly done, it is an effort to remind them of the collected wisdom about what murder is as good a label as any. I suggest that we might admire those individuals and communities who are willing to stand behind what they do. We might want to count ourselves among those who confront, rather than evade responsibility for, the difficult things which we as a society find it necessary to do. In particular, we might consider it cowardly and base to construct a system through which others responsible for their actions - for that is what we do through the criminal justice system - any of us ever having to take responsibility for those assignments of responsibility. Sherman J. Clark, The Courage of Our Conviction, 97 Mich. L. Rev. 2381, 2401-02. (1989).

Antkowiak, supra note 125, at 567-568.
208 Abramson, supra note 159, at 5.
209 Antkowiak, supra note 18, at 34.
211 Id.
is in this society, a wisdom that lies within their rational instincts already, waiting to be confirmed. Without shortcuts or bad metaphors, the epic poem of malice can be made as accessible to jurors as any other concept critical to their republic. To fear that they cannot understand it is to indulge an arrogance of a different, elitist variety anathema to a system which sees those jurors as the source of power the elite seek to wield.

But the judge must do more than watch the gate or teach this most critical class. Story placed his great hope that juries would prevent the tyranny of rulers and the rule of the mob in a “firm and impartial verdict of a jury sworn to do right, and guided solely by legal evidence and a sense of duty.”212 The judge must inspire that sense of duty and passion to do right by exhorting the jury in the knowledge that the judgment that will be the legacy of the trial is theirs and theirs alone. They alone may imbue it with the best of conscience and the highest form of civic and political virtue, or they alone will fail.

Juries are not just fact-finders whose “verdict” is a long narrative of what and whom they believed, leaving to the judge the ultimate conclusion of whether the defendant is guilty of murder. While spoken in one or two words, their verdict is a new page in a great volume of thought, reason and judgment in a long tradition of self-governance by rational people. That verdict does not only do justice, it is justice. It is the application of the principles of the original position, the categorical imperative and the Golden Rule. It is the best we mere mortals can do. It is a noble effort. Inspiring the jury to embrace it in this spirit is far more important a task for instruction writers than tweaking the language of a deadly weapons inference that must be consigned to the scrapheap of legal history.

212 Id.
Something is and was very wrong in the giving of this instruction. By trusting ourselves as jurors, and humbling ourselves to the rational tide of history, we, too, can revel in the passion to do right.