

Nor is occupational therapy meant seriously as a training for future employment. At the same time, one lady wished to make use of the crafts she had learned, and took some examples of her work to one of the leading shops in town. She was told that if she would work exclusively for them, they would buy as much of her work as she cared to bring them. She feels that when she goes home she will be able to augment her income and be less dependent on her friends. This is only an isolated case, and though patients may afterwards continue the crafts they have learned, as hobbies, their effect is intended to be curative and not vocational.

We all know how we enjoyed the ten minutes' break in the middle of the morning's lessons at school. Every day that weather permits the men now have a game, and the ten minutes' play seems to have the same effect on the occupational classes as on the children. Even the duller brighten up, and come into the class-room afterwards much more awake, and ready to take fresh interest in their work.

The patients have learned to like the occupational class. They look forward to it as breaking the monotony of the day. One lady who has been twenty-five years in hospital, and who had done no constructional work until she came to the class, said, "Oh, I don't like Sundays because there is no class." Expressions like "It wouldn't be Gartnavel without the occupation class now," are very common, and show that it provides a real interest in their lives.

The Case of Richard Loeb and Nathan Leopold. By
M. HAMBLIN SMITH, M.A., M.D., and ANNE FAIRWEATHER,
M.B., B.S.

AMERICA has lately been the scene of a murder, and a consequent trial, both of which were remarkable even for that land of sensations. The circumstances of the crime were quite out of the ordinary. The questions discussed at the trial were of the utmost psychological and medico-legal importance. The local newspaper reports, together with many other details, were sent to us through the kindness of Mr. Stephen M. Reynolds, of Chicago. We thus have information which few, if any, in this country possess. The actual trial lasted thirty-two days. The mere reading of the reports was a heavy task. We then had to separate from the mass of journalism those points in the evidence which might be taken as established. And we think that a summary thereof may be of general interest.

On May 22, 1924, Mr. Jacob Franks, a wealthy resident of Chicago, received a typewritten letter, informing him that his fourteen-year-old son, Robert, had been kidnapped, and was being held for ransom. The sum of ten thousand dollars was demanded, in default of which payment the father was told that his son would be killed. Precise directions were given as to the manner in which the money was to be paid. It would appear that Mr. Franks was making preparations to hand over the money, when he received information that the murdered body of his son had been found in a culvert, on a road in a somewhat lonely district of Chicago. As would be expected, the occurrence aroused great excitement in the city. Not only the police, but also a large body of the inhabitants, occupied themselves with the attempt to trace the perpetrators of so apparently motiveless a crime. A few feet from the place at which the body had been discovered, there was found a pair of spectacles, the ownership of which was traced to one of two students at local universities. These two young men were arrested. Soon after their arrest they confessed to having committed the crime. And it is around them that the interest gathers.

The names of this pair, who will for ever stand prominent in medico-legal annals, were Richard Loeb and Nathan L. Leopold, jun. The former was eighteen and the latter nineteen years of age. Both had the distinction of having been the youngest graduates in the history of their respective colleges. Both were the sons of very wealthy parents, and had enjoyed the advantage (if such it be) of every luxury in their upbringing. Leopold was recognized as of quite exceptional intellectual powers. He was an authority on ornithology, and held classes in that subject at considerable fees. He had strayed from the paths of ordinary reading into those of sixteenth-century crime and emotional literature. Loeb, on the other hand, preferred to read detective stories. Later we shall see that these tastes in reading are of some importance. In their confessions they admitted that since November, 1923, they had contemplated committing a murder. Both their families were friendly with that of the murdered boy. They had no animosity against young Franks; indeed, he became the victim quite by chance. A son of any wealthy father would have done as well. They desired to commit a murder simply in order to experience a hitherto untasted "thrill" and to plan and carry out a "perfect crime." They had carefully considered every detail, and had taken every precaution to avoid detection. They lured the boy into a motor car, killed him by striking him on the head with a spanner, drove with the body around the city, even stopped at a restaurant for refreshments. They stripped the body, poured hydrochloric

acid over the face in order to prevent identification, and placed the body in the culvert. They then took pains to destroy all traces of the crime. And it was only the accidental dropping of Leopold's spectacles which put suspicion on their track. We must apologize for giving all these rather morbid details, but some knowledge of them is essential to any understanding of the crime. Although the confessions were obtained by methods which are unknown to our police procedure, there seems no reason to doubt their essentially genuine character, but the possibility of some element of fantasy must, however, be duly considered in its place.

Such, then, were the facts which first came under our notice. It may be well to pause and consider what we may already assert about the crime. Firstly, whenever we get a crime of this kind committed by two persons we may be sure that one of the two has been the master mind. We were at first disposed to think that, in this case, it was Leopold, on account of his pre-eminent intellectuality. We shall see that this conjecture was wrong, and that Loeb was the leader. Secondly, it has been pointed out by Healy⁽¹⁾ and others that in these cases we always get some sex bond between the parties, either some actual sex connection, or the joint possession of some sex secret. This was borne out here. The two had been concerned in some mutual sex perversions, either on four occasions or, as seems more likely, of four different varieties. We have no details. It would be interesting to know whether Leopold was the passive partner. Thirdly, what was the actual reason for the crime? It was said by many that the crime was the natural outcome of the lads' unrestrained and luxurious upbringing, and that it was simply due to pure "wickedness." Few of us will be content with so easy an "explanation." The question is clearly one for investigation. We must endeavour to explore the lads' unconscious, so far as this may be done, and to elicit the repressed complex which will always be found at the root of an offence of this character. Even Freud's opponents will, we think, be disposed to admit that the complex, in such a case as this, will be found to be of a sex character.

It is obvious that the defending lawyers could only suggest some mental aberration. Alienists from various parts of America were engaged to make examinations for the defence, and some were invited to come from Europe. The prosecuting lawyers, anticipating the line which the defence would take, also called in experts. And it is the evidence given by these rival experts which will provide the interest in this paper. A consultation between the two bodies of experts, with a view to some common report, was proposed by the defence, but rejected by the other side. In view of certain

proposals which have been made in this country, it would have been interesting to have seen what the "highest common factor" of such a joint report would have proved to be.

The trial began on July 23, before Judge Calverly, of the Chicago Criminal Court. There was, at once, a dramatic surprise. It had been expected that Mr. Clarence L. Darrow, the attorney for the defence, and the author of the well-known book, *Crime, Its Cause and Treatment*, would have tried for a verdict of "guilty but insane." He did not, however, adopt this course. He admitted the "legal sanity" of the accused, who on his advice pleaded "guilty." (The legal criteria of "irresponsibility" appear to be governed in Illinois by something akin to the McNaughton rules.) And he then announced his intention of bringing forward medical and psychological evidence, with a view to the mitigation of the sentence. The propriety of admitting this evidence occasioned a most acrimonious wrangle between Mr. Crowe, the prosecuting State's attorney, and the judge. The latter ruled that he would hear this evidence, and also any rebutting evidence which the prosecution saw fit to call. It is necessary to allude here to a most important difference between American and English criminal law. There is in this country only one sentence for the crime of wilful murder, although mitigating evidence can be placed before the Home Secretary when the sentence comes under his consideration. In America the law is quite other. Some States have abolished the death penalty. In the State of Illinois the death penalty has been retained. But there are other possible penalties for wilful murder, namely imprisonment for a period ranging from fourteen years to life. It was this last penalty which the defence invited the judge, in his discretion, to inflict.

There was another reason, of some psychological importance, which may have weighed with Mr. Darrow in his decision to avoid bringing the case before a jury. So sensational a crime naturally produced the usual sadistic desire for vengeance. There was a perfect howl for vengeance on the part of a certain section of the press. It is interesting to note that the parents of the murdered boy were by no means vindictive. They asked nothing more than a life sentence, and that for the sake of public safety. It is an illustration of what McConnell (2) has said, that the State, with its quite unrestrained power, may be a far more terrible avenger than any injured private person. The newspapers commented on the case with a freedom which would never have been permitted here. The lives of the judge, the defending counsel, and the medical witnesses were threatened by anonymous writers if they did anything to assist in releasing the prisoners from the death penalty.

And it is quite likely that no jury could have been empanelled which would have had any claim to the title of impartial.

The prosecution pressed for a death sentence, and took some days to place before the court the details of the commission of the crime. On the part of the prosecution the trial was conducted in a manner with which we are, fortunately, unacquainted in this country. For a parallel to the behaviour of Mr. Crowe we should have to go back to the old State trials for political offences. He vehemently urged a capital sentence, vilified the accused, described certain of the alienists as the "three wise men from the east," characterizing their evidence by the elegant term of "tommy-rot," hinted that Dr. Glueck could not be trusted not to falsify his notes, and finally accused the judge of being partial to the prisoners. For this last offence against professional etiquette and common decency he drew upon himself a severe and well-merited rebuke. The demeanour of Mr. Darrow, for the defence, was in striking contrast. Faced with a situation of appalling difficulty, he appears to have maintained a calm demeanour throughout, and his final speech was a masterpiece of forensic eloquence.

A preliminary report, upon which the defence, no doubt, acted, was made by Drs. H. S. Hulbert, of Chicago, and Karl Murdock Bowman, of Boston. This was based upon an examination which lasted over eight days, and was of a most exhaustive character. According to this report, Leopold "had been, in childhood, intensely nervous, not fond of games, much interested in various forms of religion, boastful and self-centred. At the age of 6 years he had appreciated sex a little, and at 7 years realized it to be taboo, but had no real conception of sex. At an early age he came under the influence of a governess who 'displaced' his mother, and who made difficulties between him and the other members of his family. There is some reason to think that this woman was feeble-minded. At the age of 15 he had his first sex experience with a girl. After this he had numerous sex relations, not because he wanted to, but because it was 'the thing to do.' He would boast of his sex relations with 'decent' girls, although this was not true. He had marked sex fantasies, especially one of a woman being ill-treated by a man. He was never really attracted by women, and did not look forward with any particular emotion to marriage. He got on well at school. At the age of 16 he went to college. He drank fairly heavily there. He took a course in Sanskrit, because he wanted to 'be different to other people.' He appears to have tried to repress his emotions, and wished to pose as a 'cold-blooded intellectual.' But he appreciates that he is actually a very sensitive individual with a marked feeling of inferiority, who-

adopts this pose as a defence reaction. He found it difficult to make friends, especially with women, and this produced a marked compensatory superiority. He had one remarkable fantasy, which he described by the name of the 'King and slave,' he, in nearly every case of this, being the slave. He always imagined himself as being good-looking and strong, and as saving the king's life. He also had a fantasy of a French girl being ill-treated by German soldiers. Once, when he was supposed to have appendicitis, he had the idea that "a balloon of pus was forming in his abdomen." (This may have been a fantasy of pregnancy.) "His note-book was full of erotic drawings and poems. There was one drawing of a bell hanging from a gallows, and labelled, 'Nathan's shrine, Eternity, Maternity.' He had vague hallucinations, but he tended to minimize these. He felt physically inferior to his companions, but intellectually superior." (And this last was certainly true.) "He admitted numerous delinquencies. He had stolen stamps and other things from his friends and relations. At Loeb's suggestion he had cheated at cards. With Loeb he had stolen electric cars, had let off burglar and fire alarms and made bogus telephone calls. He had started one fire, and probably more." (It may, of course, be that some of these alleged delinquencies were fantasies.) "The two had also robbed the 'fraternity' house at the university. He had made a pact with Loeb, which placed him absolutely under Loeb's orders, with the sole condition that he should not be asked to do anything which would make him look ridiculous in the eyes of his family. They had agreed to strangle their selected victim together, so that each should be equally guilty." (As a fact this was not done, and the actual murder was committed by Loeb.) "After the crime he had felt upset, and had said, 'My God, this is awful!' (This point was confirmed by Loeb.) "But he knew what he was doing, and had no remorse. He lacked ethical sense, and was very deficient in emotional reactions. He had a marked sex drive, which he was unable to satisfy in the normal manner, and this had upset his emotions."

It is clear that we have here a lad of high intellectual capacity, but with a strong inferiority complex. There are, obviously, marked homosexual traits, with masochistic tendencies, and feminine fantasies are apparent. Such fantasies, in which the subject pictures himself as a woman, are much more common than is generally known. Leopold may certainly be regarded as a psychopathic personality. And the split between his intellectual and his emotional processes make it at least likely that he may develop dementia præcox.

As regards Loeb, Dr. Hulbert says, "he was a sickly child until

he had his tonsils and adenoids removed at the age of $4\frac{1}{2}$ years. He worshipped his father. He began to stammer when he was 12, and still does this to some extent. He has had tremors of the face for the past three years, which are worse when he is at all excited. He had a governess of whom he was exceedingly fond, and who was fond of him. He preferred going out with her to being with other boys. She was extremely strict, and he used to tell her lies to prevent her punishing him. She appears to have occasioned some friction in the family, and to have made him think that he was not understood by his relations, and that he was not wanted at home. He was a physical coward. He was not afraid of new punishments, but he was very much afraid of punishments which he had already experienced. He looked forward to marriage with 'some one sweet and pretty rather than intellectual.' He had many girl friends, but no serious attachments. He had played at being a detective until he was 17 years of age. He had marked fantasies, in which he was always the leader. It is true that he often fantasied himself as in gaol, pushed about and abused, but this was because he was the 'master criminal.' He liked to imagine himself with a group of followers, who looked up to him. He liked to plan crimes which would be the sensation of the century, but in which his part would never be discovered. He talked in a boastful way about his successes with girls, and told tales of imaginary shooting bouts in which he had taken part." (These last may have been fantasies.) "He began to steal at the age of 8 years. He stole from a boy who lived next door. He started a lemonade stall with another small boy, and decamped with the contents of the stall and the money. His criminal exploits with Leopold have already been detailed. His basal metabolism was 17 *per cent.* below normal." There was other medical evidence which showed that he had sustained concussion as the result of a motor accident at the age of 15 years, and that he had fainting attacks in 1920.

Loeb may be regarded as a paranoid personality, or as a case of psychic constitutional inferiority (3). There is, as with Leopold, a marked inferiority complex here, for which the fantasies are an attempt at compensation. And this complex would seem to have been more repressed than in Leopold's case.

In his evidence in court Dr. Hulbert amplified his report. He stated that Loeb had thought of killing Leopold, because the latter knew too much. The kidnapping had been the main feature of the crime; the ransom was only introduced as a secondary consideration, because kidnapping without ransom would not appeal to the average person as a "normal" crime. For this last reason they had rejected a contemplated plan of murdering a member of

one of their families, on account of the difficulty of collecting the ransom. Loeb, feeling inferior to other boys, because he could not compete on equal terms with them in games, indulged in fantasies wherein he was superior to others, so achieving the superiority denied in actual life. The conflict was in the inner mental life, but affected his conduct towards others. There was a close relation between the abnormalities of Loeb's endocrine system and his mental condition. Intellectually he was above the average, but his emotional reactions were much below normal. He was childish in matters of judgment. This discrepancy was greater than normal. Of Leopold, Dr. Hulbert said that his pineal gland had calcified early; the thymus had involuted early; the sella turcica was small and was causing congestion of the pituitary body; the thyroid was definitely diseased, and was hyperactive; the adrenals were insufficient. He had early confused the Madonna with his own mother. He was of the verbalist type, and had the intelligence of a man of 30 years of age. Dr. Hulbert considered that the psychiatric cause for the pact was not to be found in either lad alone, but in the interplay between them. Their emotional deficiency was the driving power to the crime: their intelligence made them anxious not to be caught: their judgment was so immature that they never contemplated being caught. The friendship was not altogether pleasant to either, and was based on need rather than on desire. He regarded the crime itself as an eminent instance of defective judgment. And he considered that the selection by Loeb of easy courses at college was an example of his poor judgment.

Dr. Sanger Brown, of Kenilworth Sanitarium, also made a report. In his view Loeb was the leader and Leopold the subordinate. He regarded Loeb as a case of moral insanity. Loeb was unable to perceive, feel, or respond normally to the various obligations of social and moral life. Dr. Sanger Brown looked upon Leopold as the subject of a morbid condition. Leopold had a very strong feeling for Loeb, and regarded the possible loss of his favour as the supreme calamity. Leopold was compelled to conform to Loeb's wishes, partly from constant association, and partly from the development of a kind of philosophy in which he schooled himself to suppress his scruples. Loeb would not have to reckon with his conscience at all.

A third report was made by Dr. James Whitney Hall, who looked upon both lads as psychopathic inferiors. Their mental make-up entirely unfitted them for society. Loeb, the infantile adult, committed crime simply because he wanted to. Leopold had a definite philosophy based upon egocentric ideas. Dr. Hall considered

that the ransom only gave an additional "kick and thrill" to their plans.

Dr. William Healy, of Boston, also gave evidence. He considered Leopold to be of super-intellect, Loeb to be about normal in this direction. Loeb had a thoroughly diseased mental life. "He is a case of abnormal split personality, with obsessive thought and life. His acts are directly dependent upon, and are made possible by, his abnormal thought and life and his abnormal displaced emotional life. He is, in fact, a case of dual personality. He has a great desire for sympathy in childish and pathological ways." Dr. Healy regarded Leopold as definitely suffering from psychosis. Loeb had carried the fantasy life of infancy into the everyday life of action. Dr. Healy agreed that the crime was only made possible by the fusion of the two lads. Childish fantasy planned the crime, intellect carried it out. Planning for one's own defence was not unusual in cases of mental disease.

Dr. Bernard Glueck gave evidence. He stated that Loeb had felt that he was not wanted at home. His lack of emotion was only explicable on the grounds of a disordered personality. He had been sent to the university at the early age of 14½ years, and had thus been thrust into a life for which he was not ready. He was not regarded as grown-up by his college friends. (There was also lay evidence in support of this point.) In Loeb there was a profound discord between his intellectual and emotional lives. His fantasies, being continuous, had come to act like compulsive thoughts. Leopold was attractive to Loeb, because Loeb had the privilege of planning the details of crimes with an intellectually superior person. Leopold, Dr. Glueck regarded as having a paranoid conception of his ego. Leopold argued with a richness only found in those with a disordered mental background. Dr. Glueck considered him very near to the manic phase of manic-depressive psychosis. His fantasy life was real to him. Leopold found in Loeb the opportunity to go to the limit in abject submission to him whom he idealized as king. He was even jealous of the food and drink which Loeb took. Dr. Glueck also agreed that the crime was inexplicable save by the fusion of the two lads.

Dr. William A. White, of St. Elizabeth's, Washington, also gave evidence, but our report of this is, unfortunately, quite inadequate.

It will have been noticed that the defence, whilst admitting the "legal sanity" of the accused, put forward a number of alternative theories for the consideration of the court. It would be inaccurate to describe these theories as "defences," for the accused having pleaded guilty, there was, technically, no defence. Perhaps the theories can be best described as explanations, tending to minimize

the enormity of the crime, by showing that it was not the result of wilful and uncaused wickedness. For the final speeches showed that, whether the fact was fully recognized or not, this fundamental question was at the root of all the difference of opinion on the case. The explanations offered by the defence may be summed up as (a) split personality, (b) psychopathic personality, (c) constitutional inferiority, (d) glandular disorder, or inferiority, (e) dementia præcox. Of Leopold it was asserted that he was a case of manic-depressive psychosis, and of Loeb that he was a case of moral insanity. Without discussing all these various theories, for some of which the evidence at our disposal is not very convincing, and some of which are really questions of nomenclature, we may say that there seems much evidence that the crime was the result of repressed mental conflict in both the lads. These conflicts were of so peculiar a character that joint action by the two lads was necessary. Neither would have been capable of committing the crime alone. Such a crime is the product rather than the sum of the respective activities of the joint perpetrators. Fusion is necessary, as in a chemical reaction (4). If psycho-analysis were possible, the results would be of intense interest. There was evidence that the lads were really anxious to understand themselves, and, in that event, the necessary element of co-operation would not be wanting. From a scientific point of view the multiplication of theories is to be deprecated. But probably the mere number of them produced a cumulative effect upon the court, and assisted in attaining the end at which the defence aimed.

The prosecution was also provided with expert evidence.

Dr. Hugh T. Patrick was called. Hypothetical questions, containing part of the evidence of the alienists for the defence, were put to him, after the American fashion. He stated that, on these facts, he saw no reason to think that there was any mental disease in the accused. He had also examined the accused, with the same conclusion, apart from the fact that they had committed an atrocious murder. He held that fantasy was an entirely normal process. He considered that an inferiority complex was quite a normal thing in one who was not good at sports. He considered that the Hulbert-Bowman report showed that Leopold was fully developed emotionally.

Dr. Archibald Church, of Chicago, found no evidence of mental disease in either of the accused. He said that intellect and emotion could not be divorced, though he admitted that emotion could be instinctive. He found distinct lack of emotion in Leopold, but Loeb displayed some emotion. He had made no attempt to obtain their life-histories. He held that the endocrine glands had something

to do with conduct. Fantasies had an effect upon character, and modified conduct. Delusions might start as fantasies. He admitted that in playing detective until 17 years of age Loeb was somewhat abnormal.

Dr. Harold Douglas Singer, of Chicago, had seen nothing abnormal in the lads. Fantasies, he said, represented longings which could not be expressed without causing difficulties in life. Under modern social conditions fantasies were valuable. Fantasy life only became pathological when the individual became incapable of appreciating the difference between fantasy and reality. A paranoid personality was not a mental disease. "I imagine," he said, "that everyone has more or less splitting in personality. It is a condition in which certain experiences are pushed out of consciousness, but have an effect upon the way in which the person behaves." "A split personality develops most easily into psychosis during adolescence (14 to 21 years), and with persons of a high grade of intelligence. When such cases become psychotic, they often commit acts of violence, without apparent motive, and without remorse." But he considered that this last statement had no bearing on the present case. Changes in the endocrine glands, without alteration in the brain, probably affect conduct. Of course such changes in the glands were themselves "conduct."

Dr. William A. Krohn had seen no evidence of mental disease in either of the accused. Their memory, judgment and attention were good.

Dr. Rollin Turner Woodyatt was called as an expert on the endocrine glands. He said that very little was known of the influence of these glands upon conduct. He did not consider that the basal metabolism in the accused was outside the normal limits of variation.

The prosecution laid great stress upon the ten thousand dollar ransom, suggesting that the attempt to obtain this money had been the real motive for the crime. We do not think there is much in this argument. Both the lads had plenty of money in their banking accounts, and they were lavishly supplied with funds for luxuries. We do not think that the mere desire to handle the money has been shown to have any weight. It is true that to get the money in this exciting way was part of the "thrill," a thrill which would have been lacking had the money been obtained from their fathers by asking in the ordinary manner. This desire for a thrill was of sex origin. So ingenious a pair could have arranged a kidnapping, and obtained a ransom, without committing murder, had the ransom been the sole, or even the chief object.

It was urged by the prosecution that the accused might have lied

to the alienists for the defence. The fact that they had so lied was freely admitted, as regards certain parts of their story, by these alienists. Equally might they have lied to the State examiners. Dr. Healy said that, in his judgment, the lads were, in the main, speaking the truth, because they really wanted to understand themselves, and why they had committed the crime. Dr. Hulbert considered that Loeb's story showed too much wealth of detail for a malingerer. We may admit that the "master criminal fantasy" might have been invented as an afterthought. But that of the "slave and king" bears all the marks of genuineness. And it may well be asked which side was the more likely to have arrived at accurate conclusions—the alienists who conducted the intensive examination, the results of which we have summarized above, or those for the State who made what would appear to have been a comparatively superficial examination. Two of the latter alienists had conducted their examination of Leopold in a room in which fifteen other persons had been present. And another admitted that he had arrived at his conclusions without having asked either of the accused a single question.

Something was made by the prosecution of the fact that both the accused were sons of wealthy parents. It was suggested that the defence were thus enabled to employ eminent alienists, and that had the lads been poor they would have been hanged without demur or delay. But this argument can be used in the opposite direction. That they were the sons of wealthy men increased the popular fury against the accused. It is quite possible that had so strange a crime been committed by two poor men, the prosecution would have accepted the facts as indicating some mental abnormality, and would have agreed to a life sentence. In this connection the fact that an election was pending in America, and that certain legal offices are elective, must not be overlooked. "Different law for rich and poor" may be no bad slogan.

The judge took some days to consider his sentence. He pronounced it on September 10. He sentenced each of the prisoners to imprisonment for life, adding the technical sentence of 99 years for the kidnapping charge. He stated that, in rejecting the death penalty, he was chiefly influenced by the lads' youth. But he added that he was obliged to dwell upon the mass of data produced as to the physical, mental and moral condition of the two. They had been shown to be abnormal in essential respects. Had they been normal they would not, he said, have committed the crime. He recognized that the careful study and analysis which had been made was of extreme interest, and would be a valuable contribution to criminology. Similar analyses made of other accused persons

would reveal similar or different abnormalities. The value of such tests lay in their applicability to criminals in general. These matters were deserving of legislative consideration. In this last remark he may have been hinting at the desirability of establishing an institution for the study of these difficult cases. It is probable that most of our readers will agree as to this.

We have, in the main, contented ourselves with presenting a summary of this remarkable case. It would not be fitting for us to comment at any length upon a case in which we were not personally concerned, and of which some of the reported details were faulty. We have mentioned the necessity for joint action by the perpetrators of an offence of this kind. Setting aside the abstract question as to whether the commission of a serious crime is, in itself, evidence of abnormal mentality, we feel that the two offenders in this case cannot be regarded as other than abnormal. It may be true that a psychopathic personality is only an exaggeration of the normal, and that we all have, to some extent, split personalities. But we feel that the psychopathic conditions in this case pass beyond the limits of normal variation, although it may not be possible to label them with text-book names.

Finally, we must not be taken as expressing any opinion upon the general question of capital punishment when we claim that, in the interests of science, it is fortunate that these two lads are not to be executed. There will be opportunities (which we may hope will not be lost) for further study of their cases, apart from the excitement and notoriety of the trial. Time will show if either develops a psychosis.

REFERENCES.

- (1) Healy, W.—*The Individual Delinquent*, 1915, p. 704.
- (2) McConnell, R. M.—*Criminal Responsibility and Social Constraint*, 1912.
- (3) Healy, W.—*Op. cit.*, pp. 575-77, and Rosanoff, A. J., *Manual of Psychiatry*, 1920.
- (4) *Idem.*—*Op. cit.*, p. 708; Sighele, *Le Crime à Deux*, 1910.