



New Zealand Police

2014

CREWE HOMICIDE INVESTIGATION REVIEW



**Criminal Profiling Unit
Report on the CREWE
Murders (2013)**

APPENDIX 13



Appendix 13

Report on the CREWE Murders (2013),

[REDACTED] - Criminal Profiling Unit

New Zealand Police



CRIMINAL PROFILING UNIT

482 Great South Road

Otahuhu

Auckland 1062

New Zealand

30th October 2013

Offence: **Murder (x2)**
Victims: **Jeannette Lenore Crewe**
David Harvey Crewe
Offence Date: **17th June 1970**

BACKGROUND IN BRIEF

1. On the 17th June 1970, Jeannette and Harvey Crewe were murdered in their Pukekawa home. Their bodies were wrapped and weighted, then disposed of in the Waikato River.
2. Five days later on the 22nd June 1970, 18 month old Rochelle Crewe was found alone in her cot in the home of her late parents. She was hungry, soiled, and distressed.
3. After a five month Police investigation, Arthur Allan Thomas, a Pukekawa farmer was tried and convicted of the Crewe murders. Upon legal appeal, Arthur Thomas was granted a new trial. He was convicted of the murders again in 1973.
4. Arthur Thomas served a total of nine years in prison before being granted a royal pardon in 1979. A Royal Commission of Inquiry was established the following year. It found a key piece of prosecution evidence was planted.
5. Due to episodic media interest and many revisionist publications, the Crewe murders have continued to intrigue the New Zealand public.
6. Unfortunately, the passage of time and the opinions of many have clouded, rather than clarified, the tragic events that overtook Jeannette, Harvey, and Rochelle Crewe.

7. In 2010, Rochelle Crewe asked the New Zealand Police to review their investigation into the murder of her parents.
8. As a result, the *Crewe Homicide Investigation Review Team* was established to re-examine the entire Police file, and conduct further enquiries as appropriate.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

9. In November 2012 the assistance of the Criminal Profiling Unit (CPU) was requested by Detective Superintendent Andrew Lovelock, the head of the Crewe Homicide Review Team.
10. Detective Superintendent Lovelock wanted a criminal profile of the perpetrator(s) responsible for murdering Jeannette and Harvey Crewe.
11. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
12. In the course of my work I consult on cases involving physical violence, sexual offending, homicide, and unusual criminal behaviour.
13. My work and research has given me considerable insight into both victim and perpetrator behaviour during serious criminal offending.
14. [REDACTED]
15. Detective Superintendent Lovelock provided ongoing information about Crewe Homicide Review Team enquiries regarding key pieces of evidence. This included the analyses of .22 rifles, 16 gauge wire, old Nash car axles, and whether Rochelle Crewe was fed or not.
16. This report is subsequently structured as follows:
 - 16.1 Information sources;
 - 16.2 Report caveats;
 - 16.3 Arthur Allan Thomas;
 - 16.4 Revisiting the evidence;
 - 16.5 An alternative scenario;
 - 16.6 Questions for the Crewe Homicide Review Team.

INFORMATION SOURCES

17. The following sources of information were reviewed:
 - 17.1 Witness statements;
 - 17.2 Scene photographs;
 - 17.3 Suspect statements;
 - 17.4 Police job sheets;
 - 17.5 Post mortem reports;
 - 17.6 Report by the 1980 Royal Commission of Inquiry;
 - 17.7 2013 Police analytical report;
 - 17.8 Other 1970 Police case material;
 - 17.9 Biographic / non-fiction books and articles, and;
 - 17.10 Relevant research literature.
18. The entire Crewe homicide file was not reviewed due to time constraints.
19. It is presumed the reader is well versed with details of the Crewe murders because a full summary and timeline are outside the scope of this report.

REPORT CAVEATS

20. Criminal profiling¹ is a term that applies to a broad variety of techniques used to assist criminal investigations (Davies & Dale, 1997; Gudjonsson & Copson, 1997; Kocsis, 2006).
21. A comprehensive criminal profile is supposed to provide the Police with a composite of the likely offender(s). It usually includes common demographic variables such as; age, ethnic background, and marital status, through to more specific considerations like; past criminal history, possible motive(s), and likely area of residence (Norris, 2006).

¹ Criminal profiling is known by a variety of names including; *investigative profiling*, *offender profiling*, *criminal personality profiling*, *psychological profiling*, *criminal investigative analysis*, and *behavioural profiling* (Annon, 1995; Canter, 1994; Douglas & Burgess, 1986; Grubin, 1995; Turvey, 2002).

22. Criminal profiling is a fallible process. Accordingly, the opinions submitted in this report are inferential, not evidential.
23. This report is not a comprehensive criminal profile. The primary source information is 43 years old and has many limitations.
24. Witness and suspect statements made in 1970 were Police narratives. This statement style involved leading questioning and the recording process omitted much detail. Consequently accuracy and detail is considered to be much lower than the modern recorded cognitive interview (Bembibre & Higuera, 2011; Fisher, Geiselman & Raymond, 1987; Kohnken, Milne, Memon & Bull, 1999; Memon, Meissner & Fraser, 2010).
25. Pertinent information that emerged in the days, months, years, and decades subsequent to the Crewe murders is also vulnerable to the *misinformation effect*. This is where the original memory of an event is impaired by related, but misleading, information (Centofanti & Reece, 2006; Chan, Thomas & Bulevich, 2009; Loftus, 2005; Zaragoza, Belli & Payment, 2006).
26. Furthermore, research has found that how misleading information is encountered impacts upon accuracy (Gabbert, Memon, Allan & Wright, 2004). Therefore the high level of public and media interest in the Crewe murders has potentially had a *misinformation effect*.
27. It is also recognised that eyewitness accuracy declines with age and the passage of time (Henry, MacLeod, Phillips & Crawford, 2004; Karpel, Hoyer & Togli, 2001; Mitchell, Johnson & Mather, 2003; Roediger & Geraci, 2007; Rönnlund, Nyberg, Bäckman & Nilsson, 2005). The Crewe murders were 43 years ago. Many of the witnesses are no longer alive, others are elderly.
28. In sum, the original eyewitness evidence may be inaccurate due to the style of Police statement taking back in 1970. The misinformation effect potentially affected eyewitness evidence gathered during, and subsequent to, the original investigation. Finally, the passage of time and eyewitness ageing has probably reduced accuracy further.
29. Time constraints prevent discussion about every aspect of evidence in the Crewe homicide file. Therefore this report should be considered a synopsis of the writer's thoughts.
30. Despite the caveats stated, this report is submitted as a means of offering another perspective on the murders of Jeannette and Harvey Crewe.

ARTHUR ALLAN THOMAS

31. Arthur Allan Thomas was arrested and convicted twice for the murders of Jeannette and Harvey Crewe. His culpability warrants discussion.
32. Essentially, the prosecution case was based upon the premise that Arthur had longstanding unrequited emotional feelings for Jeannette that evolved into jealousy and hatred, and ended in two murders.
33. There is Police file information indicating Arthur was besotted with Jeannette. They went to the same primary school and Arthur admitted he had a boyhood crush on her².
34. As young adults Arthur attempted to court Jeannette. Apparently she was friendly but gave him minimal encouragement. There are conflicting accounts of Arthur *pestering* Jeannette at local dances³. Someone close to Jeannette stated that Arthur was often present at the local dances but they did not recall anything specific or memorable about his interactions with Jeannette⁴.
35. In 1960 Jeannette was posted to Mangatangi to teach. She boarded at a teaching hostel in Maramarua. Arthur arrived in the area to work seven days later. He acknowledged calling on Jeannette several times but she discouraged him with the claim of a boyfriend⁵.
36. Jeannette went overseas with friends in January 1961. Arthur visited Jeannette's father who apparently gave out his daughter's contact details⁶. If Arthur was such a *pest*, this is a surprising act by the parent of the victim. One would assume more protective behaviour if Arthur had harassed Jeannette in the preceding years.
37. Arthur corresponded with Jeannette while she was overseas. The known written content appears to be friendly. Arthur perhaps desired greater contact than Jeannette hence the gift of a writing set. Jeannette reciprocated however, with what seems like platonic gratitude rather than active romantic encouragement⁷.

²

■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

⁷ Demler, J. (1961). *A letter from Jeannette Demler to Arthur Thomas dated 24.02.1961*. Crown Exhibit 346.

38. It seems Arthur was rejected by Jeannette again in December 1962. When she returned from overseas Arthur called upon her with another gift⁸. Jeannette told Arthur again that she had a boyfriend, but this was untrue. Arthur's gift was accepted even though Jeannette's father told her to return it. Perhaps Jeannette did not wish to humiliate Arthur further. This gift was found in the Crewe home after the murders, opened but unused in a spare room dresser drawer.
39. According to a witness Arthur asked a fortune teller in 1963 or 1964 if he was going to marry Jeannette and apparently he received a favourable answer⁹. Apart from this visit, there is a real dearth of information in the Police file about Arthur disclosing any further romantic feelings for Jeannette beyond December 1962. The account of the fortune teller visit seems anomalous.
40. In 1963 Jeannette taught in the Maramarua district for a school term then moved to Wanganui. Arthur, on the other hand, worked at various jobs in the Auckland and Wellsford districts.
41. Arthur met Vivien Carter in January 1964. She had come to stay with family in the Wellsford district. Arthur subsequently courted Vivien and they married on the 5th November 1964.
42. Jeannette met and was courted by Harvey Crewe while living in Wanganui. They married in Auckland on the 18th June 1966 and moved to live in Pukekawa. Coincidentally Arthur and Vivien Thomas had also returned to the area on, or before, the 1st June 1966. Both couples commenced farming approximately nine miles apart.
43. On the 29th July 1967 the Crewe home was burgled. Jewellery and a brush and comb set belonging to Jeannette Crewe were taken¹⁰. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
44. On the 7th December 1968 the Crewe house caught fire. A room possibly destined to be the baby nursery was badly damaged. It is unknown where Arthur was on the day of the fire.
45. Rochelle was living proof of Jeannette's love for another man. Rochelle's future nursery was possibly the arsonist's target. Was this Jeannette's punishment for having spurned Arthur approximately six years beforehand? [REDACTED]
[REDACTED].

8 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

46.

47. On the 28th May 1969, a hay barn on the Crewe farm was destroyed by fire¹². Approximately 800 hay bales and the barn structure were lost. It is unknown where Arthur was when this fire occurred.
48. Destruction of hay just prior to winter could be interpreted as punishing Jeannette and Harvey Crewe. Such an act would cause significant farming and income disruption thereby exacerbating any pre-existing distress and fear. This act could be considered consistent with research whereby the rejected suitor's rival is often targeted (MacKenzie et al., 2009).
49. Something on or before the 17th June 1970 allegedly triggered Arthur into perpetrating murder. Vivien and Arthur Thomas, and possibly Jeannette and Harvey Crewe, were in Pukekohe on the afternoon of the 17th June (New Zealand Police, 2013). Perhaps their paths crossed?
50. Arthur had access to a .22 rifle, 16 gauge wire, and the Nash axle because they are circumstantially linked to the Thomas farm. He left the property to kill without Vivien, or his cousin Peter, knowing. Alternatively Vivien and Peter have maintained a lie to alibi him.
51. Arthur then drove approximately nine miles under the cover of darkness to the Crewe farm. It was the eve of Jeannette and Harvey Crewe's wedding anniversary. Perhaps Arthur's aim was to forever deprive them of their special day? A day that he perceived should have been special for him and Jeannette?
52. Arthur approached the house, possibly by the tree line to surveil the lounge (McPherson, personal communication, 12th July 2013). He shot Harvey Crewe first, then apparently assaulted and shot Jeannette Crewe.
53. Arthur then tried to clean up and dispose of evidence. This was followed by a car trip to the Waikato River where the weighted bodies of Jeannette and Harvey Crewe were dumped in the flooded current. Given his prior work experience on the Mercer Ferry, Arthur would be aware of the poor water clarity and how quickly a weighted object could disappear from view.
54. When combined with the circumstantial evidence, Arthur's rural Pukekawa knowledge, and his long-standing interest in Jeannette make quite a persuasive criminal case.

¹²

CRITIQUE

55. The scenario of Arthur's unrequited interest in Jeannette evolving into homicidal jealousy is problematic.
56. Arthur's early behaviour towards Jeannette is consistent with research regarding relationships that do not flourish. Males are more likely to experience unrequited love and misinterpret any discouraging signals from their love interest (Baumeister, Wotman, & Stillwell, 1993; Sinclair & Frieze, 2005).
57. Research has also found the majority of males who experience unrequited love do not go on to murder their love interest (Baumeister et al., 1993; Sinclair & Frieze, 2005).
58. When unrequited love turns malignant, the closest psychological fit is someone with *erotomania*, or *pathological jealousy*.
59. Erotomania is a delusional disorder where the sufferer believes without foundation, that someone is deeply in love with them (Sadock & Sadock, 2003).
60. People with erotomania frequently come to clinical or Police attention as morbidly infatuated/erotomaniac stalkers (MacKenzie et al., 2009).
61. Based upon the Police information reviewed, it seems Arthur's behaviour is inconsistent with being morbidly infatuated.
62. The morbidly infatuated tend to have a history of past fixations and few relationships (MacKenzie et al., 2009). In contrast, file information indicates Arthur was a typical young man, pursuing young women his own age, many girlfriends, and sexual intimacy if possible¹³.
63. The morbidly infatuated individual contrives to be close to his love interest because closeness is a substitute for direct intimacy. It appears from the Police file material however, that contact between Arthur and Jeannette was fleeting and very rare after December 1962.
64. In fact, Arthur courting and marrying Vivien during 1964 suggests he had accepted Jeannette's rejection and had found someone special who reciprocated his affections. This timeline is consistent with most males who experience unrequited love. They eventually accept rejection and their interest wanes. Unrequited love rarely develops into psychopathology.

¹³ [REDACTED]

65. Had Arthur been morbidly infatuated with Jeannette, some of the following behaviours would be expected.
- 65.1 Reports of contact by Arthur with Jeannette after 1966, either contrived or accidental.
 - 65.2 Reports of Arthur being seen in the vicinity of the Crewe farm.
 - 65.3 Reports of domestic discord between Arthur and Vivien Thomas as Arthur became increasingly detached from his marital relationship.
 - 65.4 Episodes of emotional leakage by Arthur. Perhaps wistful comments about Jeannette and the life they could have had together?
 - 65.5 Memento collecting behaviour by Arthur. Interestingly, the 1967 burglary possibly had a memento collecting dimension. Personal items belonging to Jeannette were taken. Objectively though, a financial motive cannot be discounted because all the stolen items were of high value.
 - 65.6 During the Crewe murder investigation Arthur freely volunteered to the Police that he had kept some correspondence from Jeannette. He was also able to demonstrate he kept correspondence from other women he had been friendly with. Therefore keeping Jeannette's correspondence was not out of character.
 - 65.7 Arthur voluntarily turned over Jeannette's correspondence to the Police. This would seem unusual if he were morbidly infatuated because this memento would probably be too precious to relinquish.
 - 65.8 Finally, more behavioural caution by Arthur would be expected in response to Police enquiries about Jeannette. In fact the opposite appears to have occurred. Arthur was happy to talk about Jeannette and was very cooperative with the Police.
66. The burglary and fires would be counter-productive if Arthur was morbidly infatuated. They had the potential to drive Jeannette away from Pukekawa. Consequently Arthur would lose contact with his love object.

67. When the morbidly infatuated individual finally realises the futility of their love they can become dangerous to self or others (MacKenzie et al., 2009). Some become depressed and suicidal. Others act out violently, destroying what they cannot have.
68. Harvey could conceivably be a target because he thwarted Arthur's dreams of happiness with Jeannette. Perhaps Arthur's antipathy towards the couple began with their return to Pukekawa as newlyweds?
69. Some of the following behaviours would be expected as Arthur's fixation on Jeannette evolved into hatred for the couple.
- 69.1 Evidence of emotional and behavioural deterioration in Arthur, especially from 1966 through to 1970.
- 69.2 Interpersonal problems between Arthur and other people as his emotional well-being declined.
- 69.3 Greater neglect of usual routines and obligations by Arthur.
- 69.4 Episodes of negative or hostile emotional leakage by Arthur. Perhaps harsh or critical comments about Jeannette, the outsider Harvey Crewe, or the Crewe couple?
- 69.5 Incidents of overt or covert confrontation between Arthur and Jeannette and Harvey Crewe. It is acknowledged however, the burglary and fires could be interpreted as covert confrontation.
70. In my opinion, harbouring such intense, long-standing, and hostile feelings would be hard to hide from others. It is quite possible Arthur engaged in many of the behaviours described. However, individuals privy to these behaviours exhibited by Arthur were possibly unaware of their significance, or never disclosed their observations to the Police.
71. In my opinion, there is little in the current Police file to suggest that Arthur's interest in Jeannette continued beyond December 1962. Nor is there any significant information indicating Arthur pathologically despised Jeannette and Harvey Crewe.

72. In fact, the Police file information as it currently stands suggests Arthur was enamoured with Jeannette and made several attempts to court her. His feelings were unrequited and eventually he moved on, finding love and fulfilment with Vivien Carter.
73. Despite two murder trials, imprisonment, and divorce, Vivien persisted until death in providing Arthur with an alibi (Birt, 2011). With the emotional bonds of marriage gone, Vivien had ample opportunity to accuse Arthur, the man who was supposedly obsessed with another woman during their marriage. But Vivien never implicated Arthur thereby adding credence to her alibi.
74. Peter Thomas has always maintained that his cousin, Arthur, was at home throughout the night of the 17-18th June 1970. Peter Thomas is adamant in this regard.
75. Arthur has always maintained he was framed¹⁴. Therefore, if he did not murder Jeannette and Harvey Crewe, then who did?

REVISITING THE EVIDENCE

76. The Police file information was reviewed again from the standpoint that if Arthur Allan Thomas was not the perpetrator, then was there information that pointed to someone else?
77. I am of the opinion there is a reasonable alternative scenario to explain the Crewe murders that warrants discussion and investigation if appropriate.
78. It is acknowledged the following commentary is a profiling interpretation of the Police file material. No doubt others will have differing opinions of the same information.
79. ***At least three prior events were linked to the Crewe murders.***

- 79.1 As stated before, the Crewe house was burgled on the 29th July 1967. Apparently Jeannette and Harvey thought it was committed by someone who knew their movements and/or was watching them because they were not away from home for long¹⁵.

¹⁴ [REDACTED]

- 79.2 On the 7th December 1968 the Crewe house caught fire. The insurance adjustor's official assessment of the cause was a wiring fault¹⁶.
- 79.3 Jeannette and Harvey told friends this fire was deliberately lit and items were stolen¹⁷. A cutlery canteen was apparently taken after the fire was extinguished.
- 79.4 Soon after the house fire, the brake lines on the Crewe car were allegedly cut (Wishart, 2010). However, this information emerged long after the murders and its veracity is doubtful (New Zealand Police, 2013).
- 79.5 In 2012 a witness provided a third-party account of Harvey Crewe returning home to find wood stacked up under the house like an *Indian Fire* (New Zealand Police, 2013).
- 79.6 When this *Indian Fire* occurred is unknown, but by implication it was either a veiled threat directed at Jeannette and Harvey Crewe, or Harvey had interrupted an arsonist before he could set the house alight. Unfortunately, this allegation has not been advanced any further.
- 79.7 On the 28th May 1969, a hay barn on the Crewe farm was destroyed by fire¹⁸. The cause of the hay fire was put down to spontaneous combustion by an insurance assessor¹⁹.
- 79.8 Spontaneous combustion tends to occur soon after baling hay that is too damp. Heat combined with the high internal moisture content results in fermentation and fire. It is very rare though for hay to spontaneously combust months after baling and at the onset of winter when outside temperatures are lower [REDACTED] personal communication, 6th February 2013).
- 79.9 Harvey was overheard saying "*who would have done this to me*" with reference to the hay barn fire²⁰. This indicates he believed it was deliberately lit.
- 79.10 Jeannette confided in someone close that she felt somebody "*had it in for them*". Jeannette also said she was scared to be home alone during the day²¹.

16 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

79.11 Jeannette also told her oldest friend that she thought someone was watching her²².

79.12 In correspondence and conversations with another close friend, Jeannette and Harvey Crewe seemed convinced the burglaries and fires were committed by the same person who knew them well, and knew their movements²³.

79.13 In 2011 a witness came forward and claimed that Jeannette contacted [REDACTED] in a distressed state a few days or weeks prior to the 17th June 1970 (New Zealand Police, 2013). Due to the passage of time this information has not been advanced any further.

79.14 A family acquaintance visited Jeannette on the morning of the 17th June 1970. She described Jeannette as *tense*²⁴. Jeannette's strained demeanour was possibly the result of not knowing her visitor that well. Alternatively Jeannette might have been upset about the lack of warning regarding the visit. Interestingly though, Jeannette's tension was consistent with her growing nervousness in the years prior to the murders.

79.15 Supposing the fires were not deliberate malicious events. This would mean Jeannette and Harvey were the victims of an unfortunate series of coincidences.

79.16 Given the prevalence of rural crime in New Zealand in that era though, the likelihood of four (possibly six) unrelated and significantly adverse events happening to one farming couple completely confounds the odds.

79.17 At face value, the alleged and confirmed events indicate there was a persisting pattern of harm directed at Jeannette and Harvey Crewe that frightened Jeannette in particular.

79.18 If the events were placed on a chronological continuum, there is an escalating criminal progression from property theft, to property destruction, then finally murder.

79.19 In my opinion, Jeannette and Harvey Crewe's fears were well founded. Someone did not like them and their hatred was evolving over time. The burglary and fires were precursor offences by the perpetrator of the murders.

21

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

80. ***The perpetrator acted alone.***

- 80.1 This is contentious because practical crime scene aspects and witness evidence also indicate more than one perpetrator. This would suggest either an active co-offender or an accomplice after the murders.
- 80.2 Harvey weighed approximately 14 to 16 stone (89 to 102 kilograms) at the time of death²⁵. Logically his lifeless body would be very hard to shift by one person alone.
- 80.3 Two cooking pots containing different diluted blood groups were found in the kitchen. The blood groups were consistent with Jeannette and Harvey Crewe²⁶. Intuitively, two people, each with a pot, tried to clean up the crime scene.
- 80.4 Two days after the murder, a witness stated he saw a woman near a vehicle at the Crewe house gate²⁷. The vehicle looked similar to the Crewe car.
- 80.5 This unidentified woman made no attempt to conceal her presence from the witness and was about 64 to 183 metres away when this sighting occurred²⁸. This woman was implicated in feeding 18 month old Rochelle Crewe between the 18th and 22nd June 1970.
- 80.6 Given the distance involved however, and brevity of the sighting, this witness described an adult female, not necessarily an identifiable adult female²⁹. Subsequent contradictory statements indicate this witness was unsure of who he actually saw (New Zealand Police, 2013). At face value, the witness appeared to be describing Jeannette Crewe.
- 80.7 Three days after the murders, another witness reported seeing a child standing at the front gate of the Crewe farm, and a vehicle parked up by the house³⁰. The child wore clothing consistent with items from Rochelle's wardrobe at the time. Furthermore, the car resembled a model previously owned by Jeannette and Harvey Crewe.
- 80.8 This witness sighting was equally brief. A small child of unknown sex was seen moving around in clothing normally worn during the day. This child was never identified as Rochelle³¹. The witness however, was very certain about the date of the sighting.

25

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

- 80.9 When found on the 22nd June, Rochelle was dressed for bed³². Furthermore, there was diverging medical opinion at the time about Rochelle being able to walk due to malnourishment³³. These factors suggest the timing of the sightings might be mistaken.
- 80.10 Research has found that eyewitness accuracy is fallible due to intervening variables like; distance, visual acuity, duration of witnessed activity, and interview process (Buckley & Kleiner, 2002; Sharps, Janigian, Hess & Hayward, 2009).
- 80.11 In my opinion, it is quite possible these sightings occurred, but not necessarily on the days given in their statements. As stated before, the Police process of eliciting witness information and recording it had significant flaws back in 1970.
- 80.12 Furthermore, both witnesses were interviewed several times by the Police. Consequently the misinformation effect may have occurred when the witnesses were spoken to again.
- 80.13 In my opinion, it is very difficult to reconcile why the offender, or an accomplice, would allow themselves or Rochelle, to be seen at the Crewe property during daylight hours so soon after the murders. Such acts would significantly increase their risk of being implicated in the crime. Furthermore, overt sightings are inconsistent with the level of precautionary effort displayed by the perpetrator in other aspects of this offence.
- 80.14 Interestingly, there are a number of factors that negate the presence of more than one person at the Crewe farm during, or after the murders.
- 80.15 Milk and bread were left uncollected on the 18th and 19th June. Newspapers were left uncollected on the 18th, 19th and 20th June³⁴. Therefore no one collected deliveries to the Crewe letterbox from the 18th June on.
- 80.16 The clothes dryer in the Crewe house was found running on the 22nd June³⁵. Wire insulation was breaking down from excessive heat indicating it had been running constantly for days³⁶. Electrical assessment established the fan was not working prior to the murders. The dryer contained a pair of men's work socks and a pair of men's underwear.

32

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

- 80.17 Intuitively, the 17th June was a wet day and Harvey was last seen shifting stock outdoors. Jeannette or Harvey started the dryer some time after he returned home to dry his wet smalls. Fan silence meant the offender had no idea the dryer was on. Constant operation from the 17th to the 22nd June resulted in the excessive heating and insulation failure.
- 80.18 The Police found the Crewe house rear outside light and the kitchen light on when they arrived on the 22nd June³⁷. The majority of witness statements regarding the lights describe them as on from the 17th June³⁸.
- 80.19 The Police found one curtain closed and seven blinds were down upon arriving at the Crewe house on the 22nd June. The others were open, or there were no curtains or blinds. The majority of witness statements confirmed closed curtains dating back to the 17th June³⁹.
- 80.20 A witness stated the Crewe dogs had no food or water on the 22nd June⁴⁰. Another witness stated the dogs had water (possibly from rainfall) but no food⁴¹. This suggests the dogs were not fed or watered for some days.
- 80.21 In totality, there appears to be a trend in the file information indicating that adult human contact with the Crewe property ceased on the night of the 17-18th June 1970. This makes sense because revisiting the crime scene would significantly increase the risk of the offender or an accomplice being seen, heard, or interrupted.
- 80.22 I am of the opinion however, that the perpetrator acted alone when he committed the murders. To involve someone else before, during, or after the act raised the risk of disclosure significantly.
- 80.23 Anecdotal experience of other New Zealand homicide cases with more than one perpetrator has found that inculpatory information leakage is inevitable.

37

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

■ [REDACTED]

81. ***Rochelle Crewe was not fed.***

- 81.1 Leaving Rochelle alone in her cot is linked to the lone perpetrator scenario. However, it warrants separate discussion.
- 81.2 When found, Rochelle was dehydrated, could not stand, had sunken bloodshot eyes, and was significantly soiled⁴². Descriptions vary as to how emaciated she was.
- 81.3 A dirty nappy was found in Rochelle's cot suggesting she had been changed⁴³. Jeannette's nappy hygiene habits however were quite relaxed so this was not out of character.
- 81.4 When found on the 22nd June 1970 Rochelle was wearing two nappies. This is consistent with having a *night nappy*⁴⁴.
- 81.5 There was no evidence in Rochelle's cot that she had been fed⁴⁵. A half-used bottle of milk on the bench was found to be very sour⁴⁶.
- 81.6 Back in 1970 two doctors opined that Rochelle was probably fed 48 to 72 hours prior to being found on the 22nd June 1970⁴⁷.
- 81.7 In contrast two other doctors believed that it was possible Rochelle had starved since waking on Thursday the 18th June⁴⁸.
- 81.8 In 2012 Professor Carole Jenny⁴⁹ was engaged by the Crewe Homicide Review Team to provide an opinion about Rochelle being fed, or left to starve, between the 18th and 22nd June 1970.
- 81.9 Professor Jenny opined that Rochelle was healthy and *"would be able to tolerate deprivation better than a frail child"*⁵⁰.
- 81.10 However in final summation, Professor Jenny concluded that Rochelle's condition was *"clinically incompatible with complete starvation and lack of fluid for five days"*⁵¹.

42

43

49 Professor Jenny is a Professor of Paediatrics at Warren Alpert Medical School at Brown University, Rhode Island, USA.

50 New Zealand Police. (2013). *Expert witness report by Carole Jenny to the New Zealand Police*. Unpublished.

- 81.11 In my opinion, Professor Jenny's conclusion is sound but derived from unreliable witness information. As stated previously, there are conflicting descriptions of Rochelle in the days subsequent to her discovery. There are indicators of Rochelle being starved. Equally there are indicators of Rochelle being fed. A major deciding factor for Professor Jenny appears to be a witness description of a wet nappy and bedding that was handled on the 22nd June⁵².
- 81.12 The description of Rochelle's wet nappy and bedding first emerged at a depositions hearing held in December 1970⁵³. It was not present in the first statement from this witness⁵⁴. A recent interview did not advance the matter further, but this is not surprising given the passage of time⁵⁵. However, the evolution in detail back in 1970 suggests the witness either remembered more information, or confabulated.
- 81.13 Of note, neither the original statement taking, nor evidential questioning at court allowed for free recall by this witness. In fact the style of questioning potentially reduced the accuracy of the information elicited and increased the risk of a misinformation effect. Again this highlights the problems associated with eyewitness information in this case.
- 81.14 Of further note, Rochelle being fed more ably suited the prosecution case at the first trial of Arthur Allan Thomas. His wife's alibi evidence was significantly undermined because she was implicated as the mystery woman who fed Rochelle Crewe (Yallop, 1978).
- 81.15 Vivien Thomas was never prosecuted as her husband's accomplice. Furthermore, Vivien was never implicated as the mystery woman at the second trial. Paradoxically, the prosecution asserted there was no mystery woman and Rochelle was not fed.
- 81.16 In sum, there is information on file suggesting Rochelle was either fed, or she starved. There is also information indicating no one returned to the Crewe house after the murders. Equally there is some eyewitness evidence suggesting some adult may have visited the house. On balance, neither position is definitive.
- 81.17 In my opinion, the perpetrator ceased contact with the Crewe house on the night of the 17-18th June, and did not return to feed Rochelle. The risk of returning was too high.

⁵¹ New Zealand Police. (2013). *Expert witness report by Carole Jenny to the New Zealand Police*. Unpublished.

⁵² New Zealand Police. (2013). *Expert witness report by Carole Jenny to the New Zealand Police*. Unpublished.

⁵³ [REDACTED]

⁵⁴ [REDACTED]

⁵⁵ [REDACTED]

82. ***The perpetrator is a healthy male.***

82.1 Most perpetrators of burglary, arson, and homicide in New Zealand are male⁵⁶.

82.2 Moving the 89 to 102 kilogram body of Harvey Crewe required physical strength most consistent with being a healthy male.

83. ***Perpetrator absence was unnoticed on the night of the 17-18th June 1970.***

83.1 Due to the amount of blood seepage, the perpetrator clearly spent some time at the Crewe house on the night of the 17-18th June 1970⁵⁷. This suggests he did not have to explain his absence to a significant other such as; a spouse, parent, sibling, or similar.

83.2 Alternatively, the perpetrator used the ruse of legitimate activity that could explain away his absence.

83.3 On the night of the 17th June 1970 there was a ratepayers meeting at the Pukekawa Hall, indoor bowls at Glen Murray, and a table tennis tournament at Opuatia Hall (Birt, 2012; New Zealand Police, 2013). One of these events may have been used to justify the perpetrator's absence from home.

83.4 Another possibility is that the perpetrator used an excuse like adverse weather conditions on the night of the 17th June to check on; stock, a fence line, outbuildings, or similar.

83.5 Both scenarios suggest the perpetrator was a local.

84. ***The perpetrator displayed good knowledge of the rural Pukekawa district.***

84.1 The perpetrator accessed a .22 firearm with ammunition. These rifles were commonplace in the rural community as evidenced by the number quickly collected by the Police during the 1970 murder enquiry⁵⁸.

84.2 The perpetrator was comfortable approaching the Crewe house in darkness without raising the alarm from the occupants, or their dogs. This suggests he was familiar with navigating around rural properties, perhaps the Crewe property specifically.

⁵⁶

■

■

85. ***The perpetrator was patient and calculated.***

- 85.1 This observation is linked to the prior offences being precursor events to the murders. In totality, the offending took place over a four year period with significant latency between the crimes. This suggests the perpetrator had inconsistent access to the Crewe property, or was very wary about being identified. The latter suggests he knew the Jeannette and Harvey Crewe well.
- 85.2 The perpetrator burgled the Crewe home indicating a willingness to break the law, violate personal privacy, and take property belonging to others. He then went on to commit arson twice in subsequent years. This suggests the perpetrator was willing to cause significant property damage in order to distress and disrupt the lives of others.
- 85.3 There was an escalation in offending from burglary, to repeated arson, then double murder. This suggests the perpetrator initially wanted to intimidate Jeannette and Harvey Crewe, possibly to drive them out of the district. When this did not eventuate, the offending became deadly.
- 85.4 The perpetrator sought out Jeannette and Harvey Crewe in their own environment. He approached their dwelling by stealth. Jeannette and Harvey Crewe were murdered whilst engaged in their usual evening routine.
- 85.5 The perpetrator executed Harvey with one head shot while he was sitting in his usual evening chair. Jeannette was probably assaulted about the body and face before being executed with one shot to the head.
- 85.6 The perpetrator's actions orphaned 18 month old Rochelle Crewe. By abandoning Rochelle, he placed her in grave danger of dying alone from starvation or hypothermia.
- 85.7 The perpetrator displayed many forensic precautions. He attempted to clean up victim blood, a cushion and a hearth rug were burnt on the fire, and the wheel barrow was possibly cleaned⁶³. No shell casings matching the fatal slugs were found (Price, 2011).

85.8 The perpetrator also went to considerable lengths to dispose of the bodies. He wrapped them in bedding and affixed weights to them with wire. He then disposed of both bodies in a permanently dirty river in flood probably assuming they would never be found.

85.9 Body disposal raises the risk of the perpetrator being seen, heard, or interrupted (Lundrigan & Canter, 2001). Moving a body however, suggests some criminal and forensic awareness (Rossmo, 2000).

86. ***There are indicators of perpetrator improvisation.***

86.1 The perpetrator's attempt to clean up victim blood was thorough but futile, and eventually abandoned. He left obvious evidence of his clean-up efforts⁶⁴.

86.2 The perpetrator used bedding taken from the Crewe house⁶⁵ as opposed to bringing coverings. This suggests that body disposal was a decision made subsequent to the murders. Perhaps he did not initially anticipate moving the bodies?

86.3 The perpetrator used a wheel barrow at the scene to move the bodies (New Zealand Police, 2013). Again this suggests he did not initially anticipate moving them. In my opinion, wheel barrow use suggests the offender was acting alone.

86.4 The perpetrator burned a cushion and hearth rug at the scene⁶⁶. This suggests he took advantage of the fire at the Crewe house as opposed to anticipatory planning about evidence removal and disposal.

86.5 The perpetrator used short pieces of both copper and 16 gauge galvanised steel wire, akin to off-cuts. Much of the wire joins were twisted without locking it⁶⁷. This suggests these were done by hand, rather than using pliers or the like. Tool use or a single length of wire would indicate anticipatory planning.

86.6 In my opinion, something about the perpetrator's relationship to the victims meant that he spent far more than a cursory amount of time disposing of evidence. Time spent at the Crewe house significantly increased his risk of being implicated, but it was a risk he was willing to take.

⁶⁴



[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

87. ***The perpetrator used his motor vehicle.***

- 87.1 Intuitively, moving the Crewe bodies to the Waikato River required vehicular transport.
- 87.2 If the perpetrator used his motor vehicle, it precluded awkward explanations to others about its use. It also created a window of time to destroy any inculpatory evidence transfer.
- 87.3 Borrowing or stealing a motor vehicle would be problematic as it might generate questions or arouse suspicion. There was also the problem of time required to destroy any inculpatory evidence transfer.

88. ***Jeannette was not sexually assaulted.***

- 88.1 When a woman dies in suspicious circumstances, sexual assault is frequently considered as a motive. Suppose Harvey Crewe was murdered so the perpetrator could sexually assault Jeannette. The perpetrator then killed her and disposed of both bodies as a means of covering up the sexual assault (Wishart, 2010).
- 88.2 Of note though, the bodies of Jeannette and Harvey Crewe were fully clothed when recovered from the Waikato River⁶⁸. There was some clothing deterioration but this may be explained by the months of immersion in water.
- 88.3 At post mortem the undergarments of Jeannette and Harvey Crewe were found to be intact and in place⁶⁹. There was no evidence of cuts or damage to any of their clothing⁷⁰.
- 88.4 Ante mortem sexual assault with redressing is possible. There is no evidence to confirm or refute this possibility.
- 88.5 It is also possible Jeannette was forced to orally gratify the perpetrator with no clothing disturbance. Again there is no evidence to confirm or refute this possibility.
- 88.6 In my opinion, post mortem sexual assault with redressing is highly unlikely because necrophilic behaviour is very rare (Aggrawal, 2009; Rosman & Resnick, 1989).
- 88.7 Due to the absence of any obvious confounding evidence, it appears that sexual assault did not occur. In my opinion, sexual assault was not the motive to kill.

68

■ [REDACTED]
■ [REDACTED]

AN ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO

89. This part of the report describes an alternative hypothesis based upon Harvey Crewe being the primary target. Jeannette's death and Rochelle's abandonment were most probably tragic collateral necessities.
90. Police file information indicates Harvey was a decent hard-working man who was devoted to Jeannette, Rochelle, and farming⁷¹. It also appears he was loyal to his mother and dutiful to his in-laws⁷². There is no information in the file of Harvey being violent towards Jeannette.
91. Harvey Crewe was also described as having a dual personality, a quick temper, and demanding with many people⁷³. Apparently he was quite particular and a perfectionist. He liked to have his own way and was a domineering person⁷⁴.
92. After the 1968 house fire, the chief fire officer, insurance adjustor, and carpenter reported finding Harvey very difficult to deal with⁷⁵. In fact, one repair account was still in dispute 18 months later when Jeannette and Harvey Crewe vanished⁷⁶. Furthermore, a decorator was harassed on a weekly basis by Harvey due to a wallpaper fault⁷⁷.
93. These interactions indicate that Harvey was very obstinate at times, and adverse interactions could be very protracted.
94. [REDACTED]. As a teenager Harvey Crewe reportedly had morose moody periods⁷⁹. Mental health problems often first appear in adolescence. It is possible Harvey Crewe was manifesting symptoms of a mood disorder. However, there is too little information on file to progress this beyond speculation.

71 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

95. A close friend of Harvey Crewe reported a marked change came over Jeannette and Harvey Crewe not long after their marriage on the 18th June 1966. They became particularly reserved and did not mix with many people. It was apparently more noticeable with Harvey⁸⁰.
96. This close friend also observed that Jeannette and Harvey Crewe rarely went on holiday⁸¹. This may be explained by Harvey's desire to build up the farm and make it prosperous. Alternatively, Jeannette and Harvey Crewe were perhaps too apprehensive about leaving the property for fear of further theft or damage.
97. There may have been other adverse events affecting Jeannette and Harvey Crewe that passed unnoticed, or were not reported. Common vandalism acts that affect farmers include; damaged fences, irrigation obstructions, gates left open allowing stock to wander, pasture damage, and implement/vehicle tampering (██████, personal communication, 6th February 2013).
98. Contractors described Jeannette and Harvey Crewe as atypical farming people who did the minimum to interact and were not trusting of others⁸². Again this may be behaviour motivated by fear and distrust due to past victimisation.
99. As stated before, Jeannette was far more nervous after the burglary. Apparently she did not like staying at home alone. Of note, on the afternoon before the murders Jeannette chose to spend almost three hours in a car with a toddler in cold wet weather at a stock sale. She could have stayed at home by the warmth of the fire, with other household comforts around her.
100. The file information clearly indicates that over time Jeannette became nervous and even more reserved. Harvey was equally reserved and could be very difficult with people he did not know well. Some of these individuals ended up very frustrated and upset after interacting with Harvey Crewe.
101. In my opinion, one of these individuals went on to commit the murders.
102. This individual's initial and ongoing contact with Harvey Crewe was conceivably adverse. As a result their frustration and annoyance accumulated over time.

80

████████████████████

████████████████████

██

103. The original issue may have been minor but this individual felt aggrieved by whatever Harvey had done. As a result he began to brood and ruminate. This individual wanted remedy but perhaps appropriate legal or social avenues were not possible, thereby amplifying his sense of isolation and frustration with Harvey.
104. As Jeannette and Harvey Crewe prospered, noticeable signs of success would have become visible (i.e. a new tractor, or car, new fences, stock purchases and the like). If money was involved in the original dispute, any sign of Crewe prosperity may have incensed this individual.
105. Initially the individual perpetrated burglary as a means of exacting revenge; a means of frightening Jeannette and Harvey Crewe, and perhaps an attempt to extract financial compensation. Burglary was an indirect act that did not necessitate confrontation. This suggests the perpetrator lacked the courage to confront Harvey directly. Harvey was a big man.
106. The sense of grievance however was continuing to build, triggered perhaps by intermittent adverse contact with Harvey, or misinterpreted observations. Perhaps Jeannette was included as a target through unconscious behaviour that was perceived by the perpetrator as arrogant or vindictive. Over time the sense of injustice evolved into a distorted desire to punish.
107. The next act was dramatic, but again not directly confrontational. It is likely the perpetrator learned when Jeannette was in hospital through a newspaper birth notice or word of mouth in the Pukekawa district. This individual knew, or anticipated, the new father would visit his wife and first born regularly.
108. With both Harvey and Jeannette Crewe absent, the perpetrator attempted to destroy their home. At the very least, burning a room destined to be the baby nursery would significantly frighten and disrupt the lives of new parents.
109. The failure to burn the house down probably fuelled the perpetrator's hostility and resentment. It would be perceived as Harvey's fault for returning home early, not the perpetrator's inept arson skills.

110. The third and last indirect act was to burn down a hay barn just prior to winter. This had the potential to severely disrupt Harvey's farming and the Crewe family income. Furthermore, talk of spontaneous combustion would be a humiliating blow to Harvey's good farming reputation.
111. Perhaps through the earlier acts, the perpetrator wanted to drive Jeannette and Harvey Crewe off their property and ultimately out of the Pukekawa district. Harvey was perceivably an outsider and not really fitting in. Maybe the perpetrator justified his behaviour with distorted thoughts about helping the district. Essentially, getting rid of the Crewes would be good for Pukekawa.
112. There appears to be no overt reaction from either Jeannette or Harvey Crewe after either fire. In fact, what was lost was repaired or rebuilt thereby adding to the perpetrator's aggravation.
113. At some point the perpetrator's hostility evolved into something far more deadly. Indirect covert acts were not having the desired effect. Escalation was necessary. The perpetrator's focus shifted to destroying Harvey and/or Jeannette forever.
114. The perpetrator acquired a weapon. He would not want to use his own. Perhaps from prior experience, he knew the Thomas .22 rifle was left in a number of different places around the property including the cow shed. Perhaps its absence could easily be overlooked.
115. The perpetrator then drove to the Crewe farm. Ultimately he was still too scared to confront Harvey directly, so he approached by stealth and executed him with one shot to the head.
116. Jeannette either saw the perpetrator or could work out who he was, therefore she had to be despatched. Blows to the body and face would easily stun Jeannette, giving the perpetrator an opportunity to reload the rifle and kill her with one shot to the head.
117. The heightened emotion and fulfilment from destroying Harvey was probably short-lived. Two corpses and spreading blood stains meant a quick return to some sense of rationality. The perpetrator responded by trying to clean up. These efforts proved to be too time-consuming and were eventually abandoned.

118. Hiding the bodies became urgent, hence the improvisation with bedding, wire, a weight, and disposal in a flooded river. One route from the Crewe farm to the Waikato River goes past the Thomas farm. Wire off-cuts and possibly an old car axle sourced from the farm rubbish tip would not be missed. The rubbish tip was some distance from the house.
119. In my opinion, body disposal was primarily about self-preservation. The perpetrator thought he would be implicated quite quickly in the murder of Jeannette and Harvey Crewe. Therefore, if they disappeared, any investigation would be delayed or seriously compromised. Linking blood stains in an empty house to a common farm rifle would be extremely difficult.
120. Rochelle Crewe was ignored because the perpetrator's primary grievance was with her father. Perhaps there was some conscious thought, but this individual drew the line at killing a child. He was predisposed to perpetrate arson, yet he did not burn down the house. Instead he spent a lot of time trying to clean it. Perhaps he had children of his own?
121. Post offence, the perpetrator probably struggled with emotions, for instance; exhilaration, relief, and fear. Conceivably there would be intense anxiety immediately after the offence. Normal routines were probably disrupted by sleep and appetite problems.
122. The perpetrator was probably hyper-vigilant to officialdom and far more cautious. Behaviourally he would have to reduce his usual activities because he needed to devote time to staying alert to developments that might implicate him.
123. Unaware observers may have innocently dismissed the quieter behaviour and reduced activity by assuming the perpetrator was deeply affected by the murders. In conversation about the Crewe murders this individual would have been an active listener, rather than a participant.
124. After the arrest of another, the pressure and vigilance probably started to ease. The perpetrator may have felt more confident with increased activity levels. Possibly he made plans to leave Pukekawa or cut ties to the area in order to distance himself from the murders.
125. However, the long term stress of perpetrating double murder and staying silent probably had a corrosive effect on this person's mood and behaviour. If there was a relationship at the time of the murders, it would have failed. There would be employment problems, and possibly substance abuse as a means of managing the vigilance.
126. With the passage of time though, these symptoms may have eventually subsided as the perpetrator became more confident that he would never be identified and apprehended.

CRITIQUE

127. The alternative scenario explains the prior criminal acts. However, there is no supporting circumstantial evidence. In fact this evidence as it currently stands tends to negate it.
128. For this hypothesis to hold, the perpetrator had to acquire a .22 rifle from the Thomas farm prior to the murders without its absence being noticed. En route to the Waikato River, he probably stopped by the Thomas farm to locate wire and weights. Furthermore, all this activity had to have occurred without attracting the attention of Arthur, Vivien, or Peter Thomas.
129. This motive is not truly logical either, if Harvey Crewe was the primary target. The perpetrator could conceivably kill Harvey somewhere out on the Crewe farm and decamp. Going to the home of a young farming couple, murdering them, then spending some time cleaning up evidence and disposing of not one, but two, bodies was fraught with risk.
130. In my opinion, the alternative scenario given in this report may be too complicated. Why go to such an effort regarding body disposal? Why not just shoot Jeannette and Harvey Crewe then leave?
131. Clearly delaying the discovery of the murders was vital to the perpetrator. Maybe he thought he would be implicated in the crime very quickly?

QUESTIONS FOR THE CREWE HOMICIDE REVIEW TEAM

132. The circumstantial evidence as it stands is quite damning. Three significant physical items had a past or current association with the Thomas farm at the time Jeannette and Harvey Crewe were murdered.
133. Arthur Allan Thomas is an obvious suspect due to his past unrequited interest in Jeannette.
134. Based upon the current Police file information available however, I am not convinced that Arthur Allan Thomas murdered Jeannette and Harvey Crewe.
135. Apart from a visit to a fortune teller, there is little to suggest that Arthur's interest in Jeannette lasted beyond December 1962. I acknowledge however, there are significant information gaps about Arthur's demeanour and activities from 1966 through to 1970.

136. Nevertheless, I would anticipate any hostility by a jealous and vindictive man to be more persistent over time with greater focus on Jeannette personally, rather than the Crewe farm.
137. With full acknowledgement of the age and accuracy of the Police file material I believe there is an alternative murder motive.
138. A healthy male had a long-standing and escalating grievance with Harvey Crewe. This grievance was not common knowledge. This male targeted Harvey's wife, home, and farm, initially wanting to drive him from the district. When this failed he murdered Harvey, then Jeannette Crewe. At a minimum, this person had episodic contact with the Pukekawa district.
139. The nature of the circumstantial evidence strongly indicates this individual had easy access to the Thomas farm.
140. Therefore, are there any individuals who had links to Harvey Crewe and the Thomas farm:
- 140.1 Members of the Thomas or Crewe families;
 - 140.2 Thomas or Crewe family friends;
 - 140.3 Pukekawa farm contractors;
 - 140.4 Pukekawa neighbours, or;
 - 140.5 Other individuals?
141. Alternatively, who had adverse contact with Harvey Crewe possibly dating back to 1966:
- 141.1 What was the nature of this contact, and;
 - 141.2 Did this individual have contact with the Thomas farm?
142. I am mindful that 43 years have passed since Jeannette and Harvey Crewe were murdered. Is it realistic that all of these individuals can be identified?



Criminal Profiling Unit

REFERENCES

- Aggrawal, A. (2009). Forensic and medico-legal aspects of sexual crimes and unusual sexual practices. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Annon, J. S. (1995). Investigative profiling: A behavioural analysis of the crime scene. *American Journal of Forensic Psychology*, 13(4), 67-75.
- Baumeister, R. F., Wotman, S. R., & Stillwell, A. M. (1993). Unrequited love: On heartbreak, guilt, scriptlessness, and humiliation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(3), 377-394.
- Bembibre, J., & Higuera, L. (2011). Differential effectiveness of the cognitive interview in a simulation of testimony. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 17(6), 473-489. doi: 10.1080/10683160903321540
- Birt, C. (2011). Who fed the baby? The phantom woman of Pukekawa. *North and South*, June, 36-49.
- Birt, C. (2012). *All the commissioner's men: Inside the Crewe murders inquiry*. Auckland, NZ: Stentorian Publishing.
- Buckley, A., & Kleiner, B. H. (2002). The accuracy of eyewitness testimony. *Managerial Law*, 44(1/2), 86-91. doi: 10.1108/03090550210770650
- Canter, D. (1994). *Criminal shadows: Inside the mind of a serial killer*. London, UK: Harper Collins.
- Centofanti, A. T., & Reece, J. (2006). The cognitive interview and its effect on misleading postevent information. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 12(6), 669-683. doi: 10.1080/10683160600558394
- Chan, J. C. K., Thomas, A. K., & Bulevich, J. B. (2009). Recalling a witnessed event increases eyewitness suggestibility: The reversed testing effect. *Psychological Science*, 20, 66-73.
- Davies, A., & Dale, A. (1997). *Locating the stranger rapist (Special Interest Series Paper 3)*. London, UK: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- Douglas, J. E., & Burgess, A. E. (1986). Criminal profiling: A viable investigative tool against violent crime. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 55, 19-23.
- Fisher, R. P., Geiselman, R. E., Raymond, D. S. (1987). Critical analysis of police interviewing techniques. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 15, 177-185.
- Gabbert, F., Memon, A., Allan, K., & Wright, D. B. (2004). Say it to my face: Examining the effects of socially encountered misinformation. *Legal & Criminological Psychology*, 9(2), 215-227.

- Grubin, D. (1995). Offender profiling. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*, 6, 259-263.
- Gudjonsson, G. H., & Copson, G. (1997). The role of the expert in the criminal investigation. In J. L. Jackson & D. A. Bekerian (Eds.), *Offender profiling: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 61-76). Chichester, UK: John Wiley and Sons.
- Henry, J. D., MacLeod, M. S., Phillips, L. H., Crawford, J. R. (2004). A meta-analytic review of prospective memory and aging. *Psychology and Aging*, 19(1), 27-39. doi:10.1037/0882-7974.19.1.27
- Karpel, M. E., Hoyer, W. J., & Toglia, M. P. (2001). Accuracy and qualities of real and suggested memories: nonspecific age differences. *Journals of Gerontology Series B - Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 56, 103–110.
- Kocsis, R. N. (2006). *Criminal profiling: Principles and practice*. Totowa: Humana Press.
- Kohnken, G., Milne, R., Memon, A., & Bull, R. (1999). The cognitive interview: A meta-analysis. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 5, 3-27.
- Lezak, M. D. (1995). *Neuropsychological assessment* (3rd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Loftus, E. (2005). Planting misinformation in the human mind: A 30-year investigation of the malleability of memory. *Learning & Memory*, 12(4), 361-366. doi: 10.1101/lm.94705.
- Loftus, E. F., & Hoffman, H. (1989). Misinformation and memory: The creation of new memories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 118(1), 100-104.
- Lundrigan, S., & Canter, D. (2001). A multivariate analysis of serial murders' disposal site location choice. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 21, 423-432.
- MacKenzie, R. D., McEwan, T. E., Pathé, M. T., James, D. V., Ogloff, J. R. P., & Mullen, P. E. (2009). *Stalking risk profile: Guidelines for the assessment and management of stalkers*. Melbourne, Australia: Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science, Monash University and Forensicare, the Victorian Institute of Forensic Mental Health.
- Memon, A., Meissner, C. A., & Fraser, J. (2010). The cognitive interview: A meta-analytic review and study space analysis of the past 25 years. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law*, 16(4), 340-372. doi: 10.1037/a0020518

- Mitchell, K. J., Johnson, M. K., & Mather, M. (2003). Monitoring and suggestibility to misinformation: Adult age-related differences. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 17*, 107–119.
- Norris, G. (2006). Criminal profiling: A continuing history. In W. Petherick (Ed.), *Serial crime: Theoretical and practical issues in behavioral profiling* (pp. 1-14). Burlington, MA: Academic Press.
- Payne, D. G., Togila, M. P., & Anastasi, J. S. (1994). Recognition performance level and the magnitude of the misinformation effect in eyewitness memory. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 1*(3), 376-382.
- Price, C. (2011). *A multivariate approach to discriminating between batches of cartridge cases using design changes in the headstamp*. University of Auckland, NZ: Unpublished Master of Forensic Science Thesis.
- Roediger, H. L., & Geraci, L. (2007). Aging and the misinformation effect: A neuropsychological analysis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 33*(2), 321-334. doi: 10.1037/0278-7393.33.2.321
- Rönnlund, M., Nyberg, L., Bäckman, L., & Nilsson, L-G. (2005). Stability, growth and decline in adult life-span development of declarative memory: Cross-sectional and longitudinal data from a population-based study. *Psychology and Aging, 20*(1), 3-18.
- Rosman, J. P., & Resnick, P. J. (1989). Sexual attraction to corpses: A psychiatric review of necrophilia. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 17*(2), 153-163.
- Rossmo, D. K. (2000). *Geographic profiling*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Sadock, B. J., & Sadock, V. A. (2003). *Kaplan & Sadock's synopsis of psychiatry: Behavioral sciences / clinical psychiatry* (10th Ed.). Philadelphia, PN: Wolters Kluwer | Lippincott New Zealand Police & Wilkins.
- Saunders, J., & MacLeod, M. D. (2002). New evidence on the suggestibility of memory: The role of retrieval-induced forgetting in misinformation effects. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 8*(2), 127-142. doi: 10.1037/1076-898X.8.2.127
- Sharps, M., Janigian, J., Hess, A., & Hayward, B. (2009). Eyewitness memory in context: Toward a taxonomy of eyewitness error. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 24*(1), 36-44. doi: 10.1007/s11896-008-9029-4
- Sinclair, H. C., & Frieze, I. H. (2005). When courtship persistence becomes intrusive pursuit: Comparing rejecter and pursuer perspectives of unrequited attraction. *Sex Roles, 52*(11/12), 839-852. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-4203-4

- Turvey, B. E. (2002). *Criminal profiling: An introduction to behavioural evidence analysis* (2nd Ed.). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- New Zealand Police. (2013). *Crewe homicide investigation review*. Auckland, New Zealand: Unpublished Police analytical report.
- Wishart, I. (2010). *Arthur Allan Thomas: The inside story. Crewe murders: New evidence*. Auckland, NZ: Howling at the Moon Publishing.
- Wishart, I. (2010, October 26). Killer tried to murder Crewes twice: Jeannette's brakes cut in 1969. *Investigate Magazine*. Retrieved 8 February 2013 from http://briefingroom.typepad.com/the_briefing_room/2010/10/news-previously-unreported-attempt-on-jeannette-crewes-life.html
- Yallop, D. A. (1978). *Beyond reasonable doubt? An enquiry into the Thomas case*. Auckland, New Zealand: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Zaragoza, M. S., Belli, R. S., & Payment, K. E. (2006). Misinformation effects and the suggestibility of eyewitness memory. In M. Garry & H. Hayne (Eds.). *Do justice and let the sky fall: Elizabeth F. Loftus and her contributions to science, law, and academic freedom*, (pp. 35-63). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.