

COURT OF DOMESTIC RELATIONS

and

JUVENILE COURT

Lucas County

Toledo, Ohio

Attitudes are not changed by platitudes.  
Human conduct is changed by human contact.

ANNUAL REPORT

1950

To The Honorable Reuben Hilty  
Louis H. Sanzenbacher  
Franklin W. Mohn

Commissioners of Lucas County

And to the Honorable John H. Lamneck  
Director of Department of Public Welfare of the State of Ohio

Dear Sirs:

In compliance with Section 1639-13 General Code, as amended June 28, 1945, I submit herewith the Annual Report of the Court of Common Pleas of Lucas County, Ohio, Division of Domestic Relations, which includes the Juvenile Court, covering the calendar year 1950, showing the number and kinds of cases that have come before it, and other data pertaining to the work of the Court of interest to you and the general public.

Respectfully submitted,

  
J u d g e

May 1, 1951

## SIGNS OF OUR TIMES IN LUCAS COUNTY

(Notes from the Director's Notebook)

Experiences of other cities with juvenile drug addicts brought about a serious inquiry into the situation in and around Toledo. With some of our major cities showing an appreciable use of drugs by children, the question was asked - "What about Toledo?" A check with all law enforcing agencies showed no children involved up to the end of 1950. Our last case of narcotic violation involving a juvenile was seven years ago. We are grateful that this practice has not crept into the local picture.

We still worry about some of the unmet needs of children in Lucas County. The perennial question of what to do with the defective delinquent still plagues us. Few people in the community realize that state law excludes defectives from commitment to the Boys' Industrial School or the Girls' Industrial School. The Court, with its hands thus tied, has no alternative but to return the defective child to the community pending his acceptance at the State School for the Feebleminded. With a low quota assigned to Lucas County, it is difficult to secure a placement for all the children who need it. Some of our most serious repeaters are children who fall in this category. It is not a case of not knowing what to do with them, but rather, not being able to do the thing that is needed. What Ohio needs is an institution for the treatment and training of defective delinquents.

One of the real satisfactions we derive from our work with these young people is the frequent social calls paid probation counselors by former probationers. Recently, one of our girl probationers brought her boy friend in to get the approval of her former probation counselor - the wedding bells will soon ring out. Letters from G.I.s (former probationers) bring us greetings from Korea and Japan. One in particular expressed thanks for a training period the Court provided for him at Boys' Republic. We have used Boys' Republic for fourteen years, and this year there were ten boys there.

There is a real need for a boys' training school in Lucas County. One like Luella Cummings Home (for girls) would be just the thing. While we do use various schools in nearby states, we have nothing locally. Frequently, it is undesirable to send a boy a long distance away from home. Then too, we always have to wait our turn. All available schools give first consideration to their local courts. We have to fit in when there is a vacancy. Frequently, boys have to wait at C.S.I. for several weeks pending an opening at the school selected. Perhaps one of these days a public spirited citizen (or group) will follow the lead of Luella Cummings and Lucas County will have its own facility for boys.

Gangs are still an oddity in Lucas County. Prompt and effective police action by the Crime Prevention Bureau and a court policy that quickly breaks up incipient gangs, and scatters the leaders, has been a practice for fourteen years. It costs a little money, but it has saved the community from the depredations of well-organized juvenile gangs for a decade.

This year the court moved into expanded quarters. It has been a welcome relief from the former crowding. With additional private offices available to probation counselors, it is obvious that a better counseling relationship could be established with the children. The better physical quarters have been reflected in the improved working of staff members and can be credited with aiding in the reduction of repeaters from 24.6 percent in 1949 to 20.0 percent in 1950.

Probation counselors, Referees, and psychologists are taking an active part in various civic activities. The following are some of the "extra curricular" activities of staff members during the year: Co-chairman of County Cancer Drive, Chairman of Y.M.C.A. Membership Campaign, President of P.T.A., Team Captain of Cancer, Polio, Red Cross and Community Chest drives; Boy Scout Committeeman (2); team member of TB Fund drive; Big Brother Association (3); Church League basketball official (2); Commander, American Legion Post; President, Frederick Douglass Community Association; Trustee, Toledo Colored Working Girls Home; Council of Churches (3); Mid-Century White House Committee on Health and Welfare (2); Director, Toledo Day Nursery; Y.M.C.A. Building Campaign (3). Recognition of staff members has been recorded in the following publications of national circulation: Who's Who (1); Who's Who in Colored America (1); Who Knows and What (1). One of the Referees of the Court was selected during 1950 as the "Outstanding Young Man of the Year" by the Toledo Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Over one hundred talks were given by staff members to various clubs and organizations describing the problem of delinquency and methods of handling it in Lucas County.

During the past year, there have been several instances where we have been able to place the facilities of the Child Study Institute at the disposal of doctors and psychiatrists who were treating problem children, but needed the benefit of a period of observation such as the Child Study Institute could give. A little prevention work at this stage of the problem has undoubtedly saved the Court and the County time and money.

## SINGLE-SENTENCE SUMMARIES

1. There was a substantial decrease in the number of major cases, from 786 in 1949 to 677 during 1950. Minor cases increased from 1141 to 1153 during the same period.
2. Sex offenses increased from 36 to 69 in 1950.
3. Traffic offenses showed slight change - 344 in 1949, 352 in 1950.
4. The ratio of boys and girls has returned to the approximate ratio which was observed for many years - three boys to one girl in major cases; seven boys to one girl in minor cases.
5. A prediction made several years ago is being sustained again this year. Total number of cases before the court has shown an increase. The increase is noted in the minor cases which went from 1141 in 1949 to 1153. Unless some unusual social condition develops during the coming year, it may be expected that complaints will level off at about the same figure noted for 1950.
6. The median age for boys passing through the court in 1950 was 15 years, 6½ months; the median age for girls was 15 years, 5 months.
7. Collections for the support of minor children reached an all-time high during this year. A total of \$1,207,113.43 was collected. This is an increase of \$85,427.02 over the previous high in 1949.
8. During the year, \$5,913.87 was collected as restitution for damages committed.
9. Repeaters showed a decrease from last year - 20.0% of the total number of cases passing through the court as against 24.3% in 1949.
10. 1712 different children were handled by the court on delinquency complaints. This is the largest number in any single year in the history of the court.
11. Auto thefts showed a large increase - 76 as compared with 25 in 1949; burglary went from 139 in 1949 to 145 in 1950.

## HOT RODS - HOT HEADS

To convince teen-agers that automobiles are not toys and that the city streets are not the place to operate a proving ground for hot rods, is not always easy.

Recent years have seen a tremendous increase in the number of juveniles cited to court for violation of traffic rules and city ordinances controlling traffic. The thing that has been a constant source of amazement to the court is the frequency with which parents provide autos for their children. Many of these cars are broken down wrecks from the bone-yard. Some are respectable cars of recent vintage. Occasionally, there is a flashy model of the latest type. A considerable number of them carry no insurance as their drivers ride blithely through life and the city streets, leaving a trail of blue smoke and dented fenders behind them.

The fact remains that 327 children between the ages of 16 and 18 cited to court in one year for violation of traffic ordinances represents an unusually high percent of the children of that age range who live in the community. Drastic steps to provide better control of driving is indicated. The court cannot be expected to do it all. Parents themselves must accept the responsibility for the driving habits of their children and wherever there is indication that such children are not exercising proper judgment in their driving, restrictive measures should be imposed at home. Certain it is that young people should be taught from the outset that a car is not a toy - that it can be a lethal weapon when improperly used.

In the handling of traffic violations, the court has tried to exert controls that would be effective in impressing these young people with the responsibility which they must assume in driving. Full insurance coverage - personal injury and property damage has been required. Where such insurance is not already in force, it has been the policy to suspend drivers' licenses until proof of insurance is furnished. In some instances, the age of the cars made it impossible to secure insurance and they were disposed of by parents. Other penalties invoked included suspension of license for periods ranging from two weeks for minor cases to a year for more serious violations. Fines have also been assessed, chiefly in those cases where no suspension of license was involved.

Traffic cases in court 1950:

Boys - 345

Girls - 7

## HEARINGS BY REFEREES

Three referees maintain a daily schedule for the hearing of delinquency, dependency, and neglected child cases. Miscellaneous matters involving custody, visitation and companionship are also delegated to these referees. One woman is assigned to girls' cases and two men assigned to boys' cases.

It is the policy of the court to conduct preliminary hearings on all delinquency cases. These hearings are scheduled by investigating police officers and usually set for the day following apprehension.

The purpose of the preliminary hearing is three-fold:

1. To determine the facts. Usually this can be done without difficulty. As a matter of fact, this has usually been done during the course of the investigation. It is rare that the child denies the facts on appearance in court. Frequently, however, it is the first time that the parents have heard the admission of the facts.
2. The second function of the preliminary hearing is to explain to the child and the parent the method of court procedure and the intent of court handling as a treatment process rather than as a punishment process. With this understanding clarified, it has been our experience that both child and parent offer fuller cooperation in working out a solution to the problem and method of treating the individual child.
3. The third objective of the preliminary hearing is to make a tentative evaluation of the case. Since referees are always persons of special training and long experience in the handling of problem children, they are in a position to make pertinent observations during the preliminary hearing, and give direction to the counselor who will undertake the investigation and study to be prepared for the final hearing.

It has been found that the preliminary hearing serves as a sifting process and will select those cases which are minor and those which need to be investigated in more detail and given specialized care or supervision over a period of time.

### Cases heard by referees:

	Boys	Girls
Delinquency - Preliminary	1485	346
Final	212	118
Probation Violation	3	2
Dependency	311	190
Consent to Marry	-	18
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Hearings - Total	2011	674

# FOSTER HOME SERVICE

1 9 5 0

## INVESTIGATION

Applications for boarding home license pending as of January 1951	3
Total number applications received	35
Total number applications re-opened	2

### Disposition of applications:

Withheld	10
Approved	18
Withdrawn	2
Approved - Adoptive	1
Referral to other agency	1
Re-opened	2
Pending	<u>3</u>
Total	37

## SUPERVISION

	Boys	Girls	Total
Placements made	43	15	58
Removals*	<u>32</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>53</u>
Total	75	36	111

### Children in homes (as of December 1950)

Boarding	17	2	19
Wage	1	2	3
Free	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	19	4	23

Total number homes withdrawn	12
Total number homes re-certified	17
Total number homes licensed	10

\* Some of these children were placed in homes prior to 1950 and removed during the year 1950.



# CASE WORK SERVICES

1 9 5 0

Complete social studies made		722
Total cases supervised		1,090
Average daily case load per counselor		68
Average length of detention of children under investigation and study (In days)		24.5
Contacts during year:		14,709
Home Visits		
Investigation	1178	
Supervision	<u>2347</u>	3,525
Community Visits		
Investigation	498	
Supervision	<u>512</u>	1,010
Office Visits		
Investigation	3302	
Supervision	<u>4972</u>	8,274
Agency Contacts		
Investigation	441	
Supervision	<u>431</u>	872
School Contacts		
Investigation	393	
Supervision	<u>635</u>	1,028
Total miles traveled		40,826

# CHILD SUPPORT DEPARTMENT

1950

Motions to Modify Support	239
Motions to Show Cause	244
Motions for Lump Sum Judgment	86
Motions for Custody	14
Bastardy Hearings	110
State Aid	32
Hearings on Non-Support Affidavits	176
Hearings on Contributing	2
Hearings on Stay of Execution	4
Hearings on Proceedings in Aid of Execution	4
Unofficial Hearings involving Support	57
Children involved in hearings	1166
Non-Support Affidavits filed	115
(114 Male - 1 Female)	
State Aid Cases filed	32
Bastardy Affidavits filed	96

Monies paid through Toledo Humane Society on Child Support Cases	\$1,181,014.32
---	----------------

Monies paid through Juvenile Court:

Restitution	\$ 5,013.87
Boarding Homes	21,474.00
State Aid	1,756.55
Support	<u>2,868.56</u>

31,112.98

Total Monies Collected	\$1,212,127.30
------------------------	----------------

Table No. 1

## TRENDS FOR THE PAST SIX YEARS

	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Commitments to Industrial Schools	79	48	53	46	35	39
Commitments to Private Correctional Schools	72	77	26	64	64	86
Commitments to Other Institutions	23	41	29	17	10	1
Delinquents placed in Foster Homes	<u>32</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>58</u>
Total children removed from Community	206	207	133	187	152	184
Number placed on probation	750	560	348	347	303	466

## MAJOR CASES ONLY IN 1946, 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950

Sex offense	82	75	100	74	36	51
Robbery	22	21	6	6	6	11
Burglary	168	181	107	142	94	105
Auto theft	133	112	43	33	20	59
Larceny	256	218	171	146	205	131
Malicious mischief	77	50	19	40	19	18
Truancy	70	49	49	49	44	32
Runaway	104	85	73	90	73	65
Traffic	31	16	10	15	11	15
All other offenses	<u>230</u>	<u>165</u>	<u>137</u>	<u>191</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>190</u>
	1173	972	715	786	667	677

Table No. 2

## DELINQUENCIES BY THE MONTH

(All cases)

	Boys	Girls	Total
January	92	42	134
February	78	19	97
March	91	24	115
April	105	21	126
May	148	28	176
June	148	27	175
July	158	37	195
August	153	35	188
September	131	29	160
October	179	30	209
November	138	39	177
December	<u>64</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>79</u>
	1485	346	1831

Table No. 3

## OFFENSES FOR WHICH BROUGHT INTO COURT

	Major		Minor		Total
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	
Robbery - Hold-up	11	--	1	--	12
Burglary	105	--	40	--	145
Sex	29	22	16	2	69
Auto theft	59	--	17	--	76
Other stealing	105	26	137	46	314
Malicious mischief	15	3	127	8	153
Ungovernable	36	56	4	7	103
Truancy	22	10	32	10	74
Runaway	28	37	62	54	181
Traffic	15	--	330	7	352
Injury to person	9	1	15	1	26
All others	<u>59</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>211</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>326</u>
	493	184	992	162	1831

Table No. 4

## DISPOSITION OF CASES

	Major		Minor		Total
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	
Probation to a court counselor	239	69	54	10	372
Probation to an agency worker	17	11	42	24	94
Probation to individuals	13	3	211	5	232
Committed to Industrial School	30	9	--	--	39
Committed to other Correctional School	50	36	--	--	86
Committed to Ohio State Reformatory	--	--	--	--	--
To other institution Non-correctional	1	--	--	--	1
Fined	5	--	162	2	169
Restitution required	2	--	14	--	16
Placed in foster home	43	15	--	--	58
Other	25	6	149	24	204
Exonerated or dismissed as too trivial	7	9	79	14	109
Adjusted	39	11	269	80	399
Referred to other court	3	--	12	2	17
Pending	19	15	--	1	35
	<u>493</u>	<u>184</u>	<u>992</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>1831</u>

Table No. 5

## REPEATERS

Total number of individual children in Court on delinquency	1712
Number of first offenders	1489
Number of repeaters	342
% of total number who were repeaters	20.0%

Table No. 6

## AGE RANGE OF DELINQUENTS

	Major		Minor		Total
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	
Under 7 years	1	-	6	-	7
7	6	-	11	2	19
8	5	1	23	-	29
9	14	3	18	-	35
10	19	2	29	1	51
11	26	8	43	10	87
12	37	7	59	13	116
13	55	20	78	14	167
14	70	26	88	28	212
15	109	48	133	32	322
16	97	38	212	27	374
17	52	28	275	35	390
18	1	2	3	-	6
Unknown	1	1	14	-	16
	493	184	992	162	1831

Median Age: Boys, 15 years 6½ months  
Girls, 15 years 5 months

Table No. 7

## SCHOOL ATTENDING\*

Macomber HS	115	Maumee HS	5	(Parochial)	
Waite HS	100	Riverside	5		
Woodward HS	78	Shoreland	5	Central Catholic	76
Libbey HS	77	Swanton	5	St. Francis de Sales	20
DeVilbiss HS	71	Washington	5	Good Shepherd	15
Scott HS	68	Westfield	5	Immaculate Conception	14
Robinson Jr. High	52	Westwood	5	Holy Rosary	7
Burnham HS	48	Arlington	4	St. Michael's	7
Jones Jr. High	45	Edgewater	4	St. Stephen's	7
Lagrange	44	Glendale	4	St. Theresa's	7
Oakdale	42	Pickett	4	St. Thomas Aquinas	6
Parkland (not craft)	38	Roosevelt	4	Nativity	5
Chase	32	Clay Elem.	3	St. Vincent de Paul	5
Sherman	25	DeVeaux	3	St. Charles	4
Gunkel	23	Hopewell	3	SS. Peter & Paul	4
Stickney	19	Horace Mann	3	Other Catholic	
Garfield	18	Mount Vernon	3	Institutions	4
Whittier	18	Parkland Craft	3	Marybrook Academy	
Whitmer HS	17	Private Schools	3	Sacred Heart	3
Birmingham	16	Sylvania Elem.	3	St. Hedwig's	3
Marshall	15	Warren	3	St. Mary's	3
Lincoln	13	Wynn	3	Gesu	2
Holland HS	12	Beverly	2	St. Agnes	2
Irving	12	Feilbach	2	St. Anthony's	2
Whitney Voc.	12	Fulton	2	St. Hyacinth's	2
Raymer	11	Irwin	2	Our Lady of Perpetual	
Franklin	10	Jerusalem Twp.	2	Help	1
Navarre	10	Kleis	2	Rosary Cathedral	1
Cherry	9	McKinley	2	St. Ann's	1
Coy	9	Martin	2	St. James	1
Special School	9	Dorr St.	1	St. Louis	1
Longfellow	8	Ft. Miami	1		
Spring	8	Glann	1		1831
Clay HS	7	Harvard	1		
Hamilton	7	Maplewood	1		
Hillview	7	Monclova	1		
Nathan Hale	7	Monroe	1		
Glenwood	6	Point Place	1		
Ottawa Hills	6	Sharples	1		
Walbridge	6	Not attending	185		
Holland Elem.	5	Out of county	146		
		Unknown	49		

\* Schools not listed had no cases in court.

Table No. 8

## BY CENSUS TRACTS

Census Tract No.	Total	Census Tract No.	Total
1	20	36	18
2	18	37	27
3	6	38	40
4	29	39	21
5	2	40	18
6	5	41	55
7	22	42	27
8	13	43	15
9	15	44	10
10	9	45	13
11	16	46	49
12	60	47	78
13	17	48	42
14	20	49	20.
15	19	50	17
16	14	51	54
17	24	52	40
18	12	53	29
19	27	54	19
20	13	55	42
21	11	58	25
22	29	60	2
23	32	61	1
24	24	62	37
25	30	64	1
26	28	65	2
27	15	66	28
28	21	67	9
29	73	68	66
30	50	69	36
31	9	71	14
32	24	72	8
33	36	Out of County	162
34	44	Unknown	15
35			<hr/>
			1831



Table No. 8a

## DISTRICTS

	1950
East Toledo	329
South End	218
Downtown	141
North End	139
Collingwood	125
Pinewood	107
West Toledo	102
Lagrange-Stickney	87
West End	80
Nebraska	55
Point Place	42
Sylvania Township	66
Oregon Township	37
Washington Township	36
Springfield Township	28
Adams Township	25
Waynesfield Township (Maumee)	14
Swanton Township	9
Ottawa Hills	8
Jerusalem Township	2
Spencer Township	2
Monclova Township	1
Richfield Township	1
Out of County	162
Unknown	15
	<hr/>
	1831

Table No. 9

## SOURCE OF REFERRAL

	Major		Minor		Total
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	
Police	418	98	949	132	1597
Parent	18	34	8	14	74
School	31	14	18	13	76
Social Agency	3	16	--	1	20
Probation Counselor	1	--	--	--	1
Other Court	10	6	2	--	18
Other Source	12	16	15	2	45
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	493	184	992	162	1831

Table No. 10

## MARITAL STATUS OF PARENTS

Common Law Marriage	1
Parents married and living together	1082
Parents married but separated	80
Father deceased, mother not remarried	58
Mother deceased, father not remarried	38
Divorced	78
Father widowed and remarried	25
Father divorced and remarried	47
Mother widowed and remarried	38
Mother divorced and remarried	161
Both parents deceased	8
Parents not married	24
Both parents divorced and remarried	43
Unknown	<u>148</u>
	1831

Table No. 11

## BASTARDY CASES

	1947	1948	1949	1950
Official (affidavit filed)	96	100	107	96
Unofficial (affidavit not filed)	8	6	5	--

## DISPOSITION

Compromise	7	12	3	3
Plead guilty at preliminary hearing	32	29	48	41
Alleged father not located	3	1	2	4
Mother and alleged father married	5	4	3	4
Awaiting birth of child or jury trial	37	35	31	36
Found guilty by jury	--	1	2	--
Found not guilty by jury	--	--	--	1
Dismissed	10	10	14	5
Pending	10	14	7	2
Father in military service	--	--	2	--
	<u>104</u>	<u>106</u>	<u>112</u>	<u>96</u>

## MEETING THE NEEDS OF DELINQUENTS

In 1937, the advent of a new Juvenile Court administration heralded in Lucas County a new and untried philosophy which was destined to have a telling effect on the thousands of delinquent children coming to the attention of the court in the years ahead, and to influence the thinking and planning of other courts across the country.

Before that year, the Lucas County Detention Home, as it was then known, felt that it had fully met its responsibility when it fed, clothed, and housed the children who were brought there. Enforced idleness, jail-like atmosphere, regimentation and their attendant evils were common practice. A lack of well-defined standards brought children into detention simply because the "lock-up" system was sure and safe, and no other plan was available. Basic principles of mental hygiene were unheard of, and detained delinquents were subjected to a deadly routine without meaning.

With the coming of a new court administration, it was recognized that a great opportunity was being lost - the opportunity to really know the child as an individual through careful study and observation in a group setting. Those who were charged with detaining the child saw that their basic interest in him had to be proven in ways which had meaning for him; by dealing with his potentialities - not to give emphasis to his failures, but rather to emphasize his assets.

Accordingly, the name, function and philosophy of what had been the Lucas County Detention Home was abandoned, and a child guidance clinic was brought into being. Named the Child Study Institute, it was designed to perform three basic functions:

- 1) To provide accurate information to the court, based on observations and clinical studies of the child's capacities and fundamental needs, as revealed during the period of detention.
- 2) To furnish a constructive program of activities throughout the child's entire day, related closely to the clinical program and taking into account the child's age and level of development; to do away with the enforced idleness which had characterized the old detention home.
- 3) To meet the physical needs of the child in a setting as nearly homelike as possible.

Operation of the Institute had barely begun under this new philosophy until it was found that success in studying the child depended greatly on the social climate within the institution. Enlightened thinking in handling the delinquent child made it imperative that the Institute offer, first of all, the very things which had usually been lacking in the child's daily life - a warm, sympathetic and understanding relationship between the child and adults; a feeling and sense of "belonging" - development of a feeling that those who surrounded him were interested in him as an individual, and wanted to help him; a full recreational and activities program designed to

be constructive and to re-direct the child's energies into socially acceptable releases; a meaningful, remedial school program pointed toward reinforcing the weaknesses in the child's educational background; and a guidance clinic staffed by trained and qualified personnel - people who were equal to the job of uncovering basic problems, and able to take steps to ameliorate them. These elements were found to be fundamental in helping to reveal the child's true nature to the clinic. They also were to serve as the beginning of treatment and therapy, helping the child to regain some socially normal satisfactions.

A number of other factors, it was found, had a direct bearing on the effectiveness of the first few days of detention for the child. The members of the court's probation department played an important part in lightening the crucial first days through prompt and sympathetic remedial action. This was limited at first to a few daily visits. The friendly reassurances of these contacts worked miracles in helping to relieve the anxieties and tensions which had been felt by the child. By careful interpretation, there was a beginning toward a constructive experience with authority, and an opportunity for the youngster to gain better insight and knowledge of himself. It was largely because of the successful application of this principle that there evolved a motto which has frequently and often been used since those early days to remind staff members of its extreme importance in dealing with children: "Attitudes are not changed by platitudes - human conduct is changed by human contact."

Another of the first needs was found to be skilled professional help in getting to the core of the difficulty which had brought the child into custody. A necessary adjunct was the need for observation of the child during the entire 24-hour cycle, in order that staff members might come to know the child as he reacted to living situations - at play, in the schoolroom, at meals, in competitive sports, in preparing for bed, etc.

Members of the Institute staff had to be skilled in redirecting wrong attitudes and actions during the first days of detention without resorting to punishments or denials of participation. They had to learn that it was desirable to be permissive with the child, so long as that permissiveness did not transcend the bounds of what was socially acceptable in the community. But it was found that permissiveness can be carried too far and greater harm than good could be done. Too much permissive behavior causes a child to develop the idea that he can get away with virtually any kind of wrong behavior. It implies an authoritative "stamp of approval" on actions which would perhaps embroil the child in still more trouble when he returned to his home setting, and serves to further confuse certain children who came into detention without sufficient knowledge of what constitutes the acceptable and the taboo in social behavior.

The newly-elected judge and his staff, in those early days of 1937, found an almost total lack of understanding in the handling of juveniles by members of the police department. No attempt had ever been made to unify police and court objectives, and despite the good intentions of police officials, confusion was commonplace and errors in handling juvenile offenders occurred with monotonous regularity. Following several meetings to discuss the problem, a new juvenile bureau called the Crime Prevention Bureau was

created on October 19, 1937. Designed to handle all police cases involving children, the Bureau was placed under the leadership of Anthony Bosch, then a sergeant of police.

A letter outlining basic policies was immediately sent to the new bureau chief by Judge Paul W. Alexander. It quickly established basic policies which have prevailed ever since in the relationship between the Crime Prevention Bureau and the Court. In part, Judge Alexander's letter stated:

"...I am hereby designating you as the person to give the consent required for placing in jail any child or children 14 years of age or over within the jurisdiction of the Toledo Police Department.... In extending to you this blanket authority to exercise your discretion in placing children 14-17 in jail, I am expressing confidence that you will do everything in your power to keep jail detention of children to an absolute minimum - in other words, that you will place no child in jail if there is any possible way to avoid it.

I am also expressing confidence that you will consistently refuse to allow jail detention to be used as a means of punishing a child, or getting even with him, or compelling him to do any certain thing. In cases where you are in some doubt, I hope you will feel free to consult Mr. Hoffman or me.

This authority is extended also with the understanding that no child, regardless of age, is ever to be placed in the jail if the Child Study Institute has room for him and can handle him without too much danger of escape or injury, either physical or moral, to other children. It is expected that the main types of cases in which you will find it necessary to detain a child will be as follows:

1. Runaways

- A. Non-resident children.
- B. Resident children with a history of running away from the city.
- C. Resident children who are virtually certain to run away this time, even though they have no previous history of running away. (This does not include children who might run away for of course any child might run away; it means only cases where the facts indicate beyond doubt the child would abscond).

2. Children needing protection

- A. Children who need protection against adults.
- B. Children who need protection against themselves or other children.
- C. Children who have no place whatsoever to go (safekeeping).

#### 4. Children for questioning

- A. Children having information concerning other offenses of their own.
- B. Children having information concerning offenses committed by other children (gang activities, for example).
- C. Children who, if released, would tip off other delinquents.

Assuring you of our deep appreciation of the splendid cooperation you and your boys have given us in the past, and expressing our desire to cooperate with you in any way we can, I am

Yours faithfully,

Judge Paul W. Alexander"

Thus it was that the proper police handling of children was assured, and a cooperative working relationship between the police and court was established, to develop and grow in the interests of the child in trouble.

The Toledo Police Crime Prevention Bureau, still headed by Anthony Bosch but now advanced to the rank of Inspector, is a model police juvenile bureau today, operating in close cooperation with the court through a small and specialized group of plain-clothes officers who have been selected for their understanding of youngsters.

One of the seemingly insurmountable obstacles which the Court had to face was the building in which the Child Study Institute was housed. Constructed in 1914, the building presented five major deficiencies which handicapped the new function and philosophy of the Institute.

Economy of operation was impossible. During the Institute's 23 years of occupancy, rentals much in excess of the original building's cost has been paid. Both outdoor and indoor space for recreation was totally lacking. Structural insecurity precluded the handling of older, more serious delinquents. It was too easy to escape. Worse still, space limitations made it necessary to place neglected and dependent children in intimate association with delinquents who were too often eager to boast of their exploits. And the finishing touch was provided by space so limited that it was regularly necessary to transfer children 14 years and older to the county jail in order to accomodate younger children being brought in at all hours by police and agency workers.

These lacks seemed impossible to overcome, but with a determination born of necessity, both immediate and long-range objectives were planned to reduce the deficiencies of an outgrown and architecturally unsuited building.

A technique was proposed to overcome the total lack of recreational facilities - a technique which had never before been attempted with delinquent children in a detention setting, but which was entirely in keeping

with the functions and philosophy of the new Institute. Called the Privilege System, the plan provided the opportunity for children at the Child Study Institute to leave the building during the various days of the week, sometimes with and sometimes without adult leaders, to take full advantage of the recreational facilities in the nearby community. It was predicated on the belief that most of the children coming to the Institute, with only a few exceptions, were capable of trust and would respond to such trust if given the opportunity.

The opinions of well-known juvenile court officials in various parts of the nation were sought, in an effort to determine the plan's workability. To a man, these officials decried the plan as utter folly, certain to lead to public outrage over the runaways which would inevitably follow. But a further question followed - had any of these courts ever tried such a plan? Admittedly, they had not - so it was decided to give the plan a trial, for it held promise of performing two important functions for the court and the Institute. First, it would assist the court in better understanding each child, and in testing him out. Secondly, it would serve as a morale builder for the Institute, and if used wisely, would assist in a progressive handling of children.

At this writing, thirteen years of operation under the Privilege System have been completed. During that time, over 55,000 releases for privilege have been made, involving nearly 7,000 children. Less than half of one per cent of these children have violated the trust placed in them!

---

Finally, the culmination of plans to eradicate the serious handicap of an outmoded building came in 1949. The intensive program of public relations which had gone on for twelve years began to produce results. A small nucleus of women civic leaders who were familiar with the Institute and its plant deficiencies banded together to form a new kind of women's club. Called the "Friends of the Child Study Institute," the only qualification for new members was a signed agreement stating their willingness to go out and work house-to-house for the passage of a tax levy for a new building - a building encompassing all of the newest and best in the modern care of delinquent children.

As the time for elections approached, new members joined the movement in ever-growing numbers, and corps of determined women called meetings, addressed community groups, and combed the wards and precincts, offering incontrovertible proof of the desperate need for the county's delinquent children.

Proof of this group's efficiency began to come in with the first returns, and the final count showed that the voting for the new building tax levy had outdistanced all other issues - even the tax levies for local Board of Education funds.

So the year 1950 became a year of promise for the Lucas County Juvenile Court and the Child Study Institute. At last the future was holding forth the opportunity to combine a proven progressive philosophy with a modern plant capable of producing the desired results - results which will take countless children off the detours of delinquent behavior and place them on the high road to good citizenship.

## PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES

Interpretation of the role of the psychologist in the particular setting of the Child Study Institute is of prime importance in obtaining the cooperation of the child in his psychological study. Misconceptions of such a role abound because of the phonetic similarity with psychiatrist and psychoanalyst, the dramatic portrayals of film and story, the quackery practiced under the name of psychology, and the varied fields of psychology itself. The interpretation of our service to the child is frequently done casually, in the group, when the psychologist is on the floor for observation purposes. A child asks, "Are you a psychiatrist?" The response, "No, I am a psychologist," is usually followed by a simple explanation of the difference, such as "A psychiatrist is a medical doctor with special training in helping people who have difficulty in getting along with themselves and with others. A psychologist is interested in studying all kinds of behavior and has special training in giving tests which help in understanding what makes people do things." Then follows an avalanche of comments and questions from the children: "That is what I need to know! What makes me act like I do? Will you psychoanalyze me? Can you read my mind? Are you going to give me any of those tests? I know, you give us those tests to find out if we're crazy." Further clarification of the role can be developed from such questions.

Test results are only a part of the total picture of the child. The psychological study incorporates the findings of other specialists. The Social History, usually obtained by the Probation Counselor, other case workers in various social agencies, or, in some cases, by the psychologist, provides the background of conditions influencing the personality developing from, or even before, birth to the present time. Routine medical examinations given by a staff physician and nurse, as well as selected studies employing specialized techniques, such as electro-encephalography done at Maumee Valley Hospital, point up the physical limitations under which the child must function and suggest corrections to be made. Considerable information concerning the child's mental content, interests, attitudes, and values is obtained in interviews conducted by the psychologist and the psychiatrist.

Tests of various kinds are used at the discretion of the psychologist to tap particular areas of the personality. These include intelligence, achievement, interests and aptitudes, and personality tests, some of which amount to self-evaluations and others which must be interpreted by the experienced psychologist.

In order to obtain a more complete picture of the child, it is necessary to observe his behavior in a group-living situation. In this respect, having the children living together at the Child Study Institute has a distinct advantage over studying them on an out-patient basis. Behavior is observed twenty-four hours a day by Staff Leaders who make written reports to the psychologists. Each of the three psychologists also spends a half day a week with the group, observing and studying the reactions of the children to each other, to the Leader, and to the activities in progress at the time. Sometimes, group discussions are initiated spontaneously by the children on such occasions.



Scheduled weekly discussions led by a psychologist revolve around subjects introduced by sound films, usually borrowed from the Public Library, which deal with individual and group attitudes, problems of adolescence concerning dating, manners, grooming, parent-child relationships, and character development. Many important behavioral clues are obtained from these discussions.

The lack of space and facilities limit the opportunities for observing behavior. In the proposed new building, a room is to be available where selected small groups or individuals may engage in free play or play in a prepared setting and be observed without being aware of it. It is expected that the apparent freedom of the situation will elicit free expression of feelings which will have therapeutic as well as diagnostic value. Finger painting, another excellent technique for diagnosis and treatment of disturbed children will be possible in the new quarters.

Through the methods and procedures described above, motives for the child's behavior are revealed. The frustrated needs which generate these motives frequently are disclosed. It is only through meeting these needs that we can hope to bring about a change in behavior. The recommendations of the psychologists are made with this aim in mind.

Once in awhile, simply the correction of a physical handicap may permit remarkable changes to take place. Take, for example, the child with defective vision who squinted in an effort to see and who suffered headaches from eyestrain. It was little wonder that he was irritable and appeared belligerent. Even when he may have had no hostile feelings, his squinting eyes and tense look were enough to invite derogatory comments and incite a fight. This boy's entire expression was changed when he was properly fitted with glasses. This change, plus guidance and interpretation from an understanding Probation Counselor, led to a remarkable change for the better in his adjustment.

Besides defective vision and other physical needs, a child's limited intellectual ability may warrant a recommendation for special help in school work. Sometimes, the public school "slow learner" classes can provide this. In other cases, because general intelligence is normal, no special help is provided. The public must be helped to recognize that there are other reasons for a child's failure to learn besides a low I. Q. so that the State Educational program can make provisions to help them.

There are not only physical and intellectual needs but also emotional needs to be considered. In some cases, the child's own home may not be able to satisfy these needs because the parents lack understanding or have emotional needs of their own, so great as to prevent them from meeting those of their children. Foster home placement or boarding school placement may be recommended in such cases, according to the specific needs of the child. Regardless of placement, the child may have specific recreational needs or a need for vocational guidance based on interests and aptitudes. In cases where a child's problems arise from conflicts within himself and cannot be solved merely through manipulation of the environment, psychotherapy may be recommended if it is felt that he can profit from it. The Mental Hygiene Center, a Red Feather community agency, is very cooperative in attempting

to meet such a need. Often, the need for interpretation and guidance and counseling is met by the Probation Counselor or caseworker from another social agency, and in a few cases, by the psychologist on an out-patient basis.

Needless to say, to study a child effectively with the aid of available techniques, time is needed. This is particularly important in making use of the observation of his behavior in the group. A child may be very anxious to go home, and so may be on his best behavior for a week or two and only later reveal his real self. Another advantage in time is that a child may view his problem more objectively after he becomes adjusted to the group. A child who clings to his home, vainly seeking affection which he does not get, often finds sufficient satisfaction in group-living at the Child Study Institute to permit him to accept another placement in a group setting. The psychologist utilizes the study of adjustment at the Child Study Institute over a period of time as a means of predicting future behavior. More effective recommendations are made on this basis. However, the present limited facilities of the Institute are not entirely adequate to meet such a program. The new building, with its out-door play area and improved living quarters will provide the opportunity for breaking up the group into several units and will increase the effectiveness of our study program.

---

CHILD

—  
STUDY

—  
INSTITUTE

---

Table A

## NUMBER OF ADMISSIONS\*

	1950				1949			
	White	Negro	Other	Total	White	Negro	Other	Total
Boys	559	75	8	642	536	116	20	672
Per cent	58.66	7.87	0.84	67.37	55.60	12.05	2.07	69.70
Girls	246	64	1	311	231	58	3	292
Per cent	<u>25.82</u>	<u>6.71</u>	<u>0.10</u>	<u>32.63</u>	<u>23.96</u>	<u>6.01</u>	<u>0.31</u>	<u>30.30</u>
Total	805	139	9	953**	767	174	23	964
Per cent	84.48	14.58	0.94	100.00	79.56	18.06	2.38	100.00

\* Includes re-admissions of same child if he was received more than once during the year.

\*\* Per cent of decrease over 1949: 1.14

Table B

## STATUS OF CHILDREN ADMITTED

	1950		1949	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Delinquent	839	88.04	837	86.80
Dependent	102	10.70	114	11.80
For Observation	<u>12</u>	<u>1.26</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>1.40</u>
	953	100.00	964	100.00

Table C  
RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION OF CHILDREN

	1 9 5 0		1 9 4 9	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Catholic	253	26.55	253	26.25
Baptist	93	9.76	137	14.22
Lutheran	82	8.60	74	7.68
Methodist	63	6.61	84	8.72
Church of God	35	3.67	40	4.15
Presbyterian	15	1.57	12	1.24
Episcopalian	16	1.68	11	1.14
Greek Orthodox	1	0.10	1	0.10
Jewish	2	0.21	4	0.41
Protestant -				
No denomination	271	28.45	210	21.78
All Others	56	5.87	68	7.05
No Affiliation	<u>66</u>	<u>6.93</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>7.26</u>
Total	953	100.00	964	100.00

Table D  
AGES OF CHILDREN

	1 9 5 0		1 9 4 9	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
6 and under	21	2.2	26	2.7
7	15	1.6	10	1.0
8	15	1.6	14	1.5
9	16	1.7	26	2.7
10	39	4.1	46	4.8
11	41	4.3	46	4.8
12	82	8.6	87	9.0
13	103	10.8	116	12.0
14	173	18.2	131	13.5
15	190	19.9	201	20.9
16	167	17.5	160	16.7
17	80	8.4	92	9.5
18	10	1.0	8	0.8
19	<u>1</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.1</u>
Total	953	100.0	964	100.0

Median Age (1949): 14 years, 10 months.  
Median Age (1950): 14 years, 10 months

Table E

## PERIOD OF RESIDENCE OF CHILDREN

	1 9 5 0		1 9 4 9	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Less than 10 days	363	38.1	549	57.0
10 days to 1 month	345	36.2	270	28.0
1 month to 2 months	190	19.9	117	12.1
2 months to 3 months	42	4.4	18	1.9
3 months to 4 months	12	1.3	8	0.8
More than 4 months	<u>1</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0.2</u>
Total	953	100.0	964	100.0

Table F

AVERAGE DAILY NUMBER OF CHILDREN  
IN RESIDENCE

	1 9 5 0			1 9 4 9
	Boys	Girls	Total	Total
January	19	17	36	24
February	22	18	40	25
March	20	16	36	21
April	20	9	29	25
May	23	12	35	31
June	17	14	31	24
July	21	11	32	23
August	13	15	28	24
September	21	12	33	22
October	23	16	39	30
November	25	14	39	33
December	21	17	38	30

Daily Average (1950): 35

Daily Average (1949): 26

Table G

## SUMMARY OF MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS

	1 9 5 0	1 9 4 9
Total number of new children examined	307	271
Total number of children re-examined	103	108
Uncompleted medical examinations	10	20
Number of daily treatments in clinic	1815	1790
Nutritional status of children:		
Good	83.8%	78.2%
Fair	12.8%	15.3%
Poor	3.4%	6.5%
General Health		
(when admitted)		
Good	65.3%	50.5%
Fair	33.8%	46.3%
Poor	0.9%	3.2%
Per cent having visual defects	30.6%	33.0%
Per cent having dental defects	25.6%	28.5%
Per cent having positive Wasserman tests	1.4%	1.0%
Number positive Gonorrhea cases	1	0
Per cent positive N - T cultures	0.1%	0.0%
Number of pregnancies	18	10
Number of cases of chronic pelvic inflammatory disease	35	20
Number of cardiac cases	5	3
Clinic cases	25	34
Immunizations (prior to admission)		
Smallpox	47.3%	50.0%
Diphtheria	23.8%	27.8%
Typhoid	27.3%	27.3%
Pertussis	2.8%	0.5%
Number of Impetigo cases	1	1
Number of Chronic Otitis Media	1	3
Number of Parotitis (Mumps) cases	1	1
Number of Varicella (Chickenpox) cases	1	0
Number of Scarlet Fever cases	0	0
Number of Obesity cases	34	22
Number of Malnutrition cases	11	4
Number of Scabies cases	1	3
Number of Hypothyroidism cases	2	2
Number of Hypospadias cases	1	1
Number of Petit Mal cases	2	2
Number of Albuminuria cases	2	0
Number of Chronic Mastitis cases	1	0
Number of Phimosis cases	4	0
Number of Ringworm infection cases	5	0
Number of Psoriasis cases	1	0
Number of Molluscum Contagiosum cases	1	0
Number of Acute Glomerulonephritis cases	1	0
Number of Undescended Testicle cases	1	0
Number of Secondary Anemia cases	1	0
Number of Deaf Mute cases	1	0

Table H

## DISTRIBUTION OF LEVELS OF INTELLIGENCE

1950 Frequency	Classification	1950 Per cent	1949 Per cent
17	Mentally Defective	10.8	7.9
48	Below Average ("Dull-Normal")	30.4	27.7
72	Average	45.5	43.5
18	Above Average ("Bright-Normal")	11.4	12.4
	Superior	<u>1.9</u>	<u>8.5</u>
158		100.0	100.0

Table I

## NUMBER OF REPORTS RENDERED

Type of Report	1950 Frequency	1949 Frequency
Psychological Studies	170	192
Treatment (of probationers, "supervision")	3	2
Psychiatric Interviews	57	60
Social Histories	0	7
Pre-sentence Investigations (Adults)	<u>0</u>	<u>3</u>
	230	264



Table J

## THE PRIVILEGE SYSTEM

	1 9 5 0	1 9 4 9
Number of children granted privileges	579	511
Number of privileges granted	5509	4754
Per cent total population granted privileges	60.7	53.0
Number escapes while on privilege	20	14
Number major violations*	3	2
Number minor violations**	17	12
Per cent non-violated privileges	99.28	99.41

\* e.g., Committing a delinquent act while on privilege.

\*\* e.g., Exceeding time limit, visiting home, smoking, etc.  
while on privilege.

Table K

## ADMISSIONS - NEW CHILDREN AND REPEATERS

	1 9 5 0	1 9 5 0
	New	Repeaters
January	53	33
February	45	19
March	40	31
April	60	27
May	60	24
June	40	21
July	61	32
August	57	24
September	55	32
October	47	38
November	41	31
December	<u>51</u>	<u>31</u>
Total	610	343

## FAMILY IS TREATMENT UNIT

The 1950 White House Conference on Children and Youth pointed out that "the accomplishments of the juvenile courts and their probation staffs have demonstrated that the child's problem is inseparable from his family life; that the family is the treatment unit; and that the courts, when properly led and staffed, are capable of using and marshaling community resources to strengthen family life and to meet the needs of children."

It is good to have this fundamental truth re-emphasized. A housewife who has carefully washed a dish doesn't put it right back with the dirty dishes in the sink. She puts it to one side until she has washed the remaining dishes. Then she puts them away--together. To work with a delinquent child, then put him right back in the very situation that gave rise to his delinquency, is too often like washing a dish then putting it back with the dirty dishes in the sink.

This means that if a delinquent child is to be returned to his family-- and that's what almost always happens sooner or later--plenty must be done about the family. "You can't treat a child in a vacuum."

That's where the coordination of effort of the marriage counselor and probation counselor comes in. It is immaterial whether the case reaches court via the delinquency or divorce route--the imperative need for combination of skills and coordination of effort is obvious.

We constantly hear that the children are the first casualty of divorce. That is not strictly true. What is strictly true is that the children are the first casualty of the marriage failure whether or not the family breaks up, or of the broken family whether or not it ends in divorce. In tens and hundreds of thousands of cases the marriage may be succeeding to all outward appearances, yet may be failing in its ordained functions. That is where the children suffer. Or in perhaps an equal number of cases, the family is broken without divorce, the parents are separated and living apart. There, too, the children are the primary victims.

A popular fallacy is that all the marriage counselor does is to talk separated spouses into going back together again. How useless to send back together two people exactly the same as when their dissatisfactions and disagreements drove them apart! Without discovering and doing something about the underlying casual factors! Without helping them to improve their attitudes toward themselves, each other, their children and their marriage!

Just as the probation counselor helps the child to correct his attitudes toward himself, his family and the situation in which he must live, so the marriage counselor helps the parents to change their basic attitudes. If this results in reuniting the disunited, all to the good. A family is saved; potential delinquency is averted. If not, it has at least helped the parents to go their separate ways with a minimum of injury and has minimized the spiritual and material damage to the children. And again it has averted potential delinquency.

Thus, even before a divorce case comes to court, and while it is pending, and after it is over, the efforts of the marriage counselor and the probation counselor complement and supplement each other. The advantage of the close coordination and cooperation derived from working in an integrated family court operates for the benefit of children, parents, the family, and society.

It may be of interest to note some of the factors which have been observed over the years in divorces brought before the court. Perhaps one of the more important items in this list is the one that shows divorces granted in only slightly more than half of the cases where they were sought. This is quite in contrast to the general impression that practically all divorce applications result in a divorce decree. It may be significant that the ratio of divorces granted to divorces filed has been decreasing.

The figures speak for themselves.

#### DIVORCE STATISTICS

	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Total number of divorces sought	3105	2349	2217	2045	2055
Average duration of marriage before divorce (in years)	8.9	8.4	8.7	9.3	9.4
Average length of separation before divorce (in years)	2.5	2.1	2.04	2.04	2.05
Percent of divorces following "war marriages"	14.1	12.3	11.1	6.8	6.1
Percent of divorces involving veterans	51.0	42.2	40.0	40.0	39.8
Percent of divorces following "child" marriages (girl under 21. Past standard 55%)	69.8	63.1	68.0	67.4	68.2
Average age of wife, first marriage	19.4	19.7	19.5	19.5	19.6
Percent of divorces following "runaway" marriages	38.8	32.2	35.1	31.4	30.8

	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950
Percent of cases heard, marriages under one year's duration (divorce seldom granted)	2.1	3.9	3.9	4.3	3.3
Percent of divorces, marriage under three years' duration		18.3	21.7	22.8	19.2
Percent of divorces involving unfaithful husbands	45.8	47.6	47.8	45.0	47.3
Percent of divorces involving unfaithful wives	23.0	22.1	19.0	15.0	16.3
Percent of recidivist husbands (second or subsequent divorce)	21.3	25.8	29.1	28.8	31.5
Percent of recidivist wives (second or subsequent divorce)	22.5	21.7	31.1	33.8	34.4
Percent of actions commenced by husbands (past standard 25%)	40.2	30.6	28.9	25.9	26.8
Percent of actions involving minor child	39.3	40.9	39.5	40.0	41.4
Ratio of divorces granted to divorces sought		67.0	63.0	52.6	58.6
Divorce rate per thousand of population					3.07