


1956

Juvenile Offender in Norway, The

C. Terence Pihlblad

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

C. Terence Pihlblad, Juvenile Offender in Norway, The, 46 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 500 (1955-1956)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

THE JUVENILE OFFENDER IN NORWAY

C. TERENCE PIHLBLAD

The author has been Associate Professor and Professor of Sociology in the University of Missouri since 1945. His major fields of interest have been in criminology and delinquency and in problems of population. He held a Fulbright Fellowship in Norway at the University of Oslo in 1953-1954. There he studied internal migration as affected by the development of heavy industry.

Professor Pihlblad's publications are in the *American Sociological Review*, *American Journal of Sociology*, *Social Forces*, and other Sociological and Educational journals.—
EDITOR.

At approximately the same time as the Juvenile Court movement had its inception in the United States, there grew up in the Scandinavian countries a somewhat different type of agency for dealing with the child offender. This was the Child Welfare Council first established in Norway and later imitated in all the Scandinavian countries. The councils were organized in Norway to carry out the provisions of a law of 1896 which provided that the term "neglected child" should be extended to cover not only children who because of the parents' or foster parents' depravity or negligence are found to be neglected, ill treated or morally depraved, deprived of educational opportunity or otherwise neglected, but also should include children who "have committed any punishable act showing depravation of morals or neglect."¹ By this act the delinquent child was entirely removed from the jurisdiction of the criminal courts, where he had been treated as a law breaker, and placed under the guardianship of the Child Welfare Council to be protected, reared and educated as might seem best in light of his own interest and those of the community.

This was essentially the same philosophy which motivated the establishment of the juvenile court in the United States. In the Scandinavian countries, however, the care and protection of the delinquent was entirely removed from the courts and made an administrative function, divested completely of the judicial punitive legalistic point of view which still permeates the operation of many juvenile courts in the United States.

The law provided for the establishment in each municipality or commune of at least one Council, although more than one may be provided for in larger communities such as Oslo, where there are four. In 1950 there were 744 Councils in the country, 680 in rural municipalities and 64 in towns and cities. As constituted prior to July 1, 1954, each Council consisted of seven members. Two of these, a local judge and the parish clergyman, served ex officio; the other five members were elected by the Commune Council (municipal legislative body) with the provision also that at least one member must be a physician and at least one must be a woman. Terms of service were for two years and service was regarded as a public duty which could not be

¹ HANNE-MARIE TJENSVOLL, *The Treatment in Norway of Neglected and Refractory Children and Young Offenders*. Norwegian Joint Committee on International Social Policy, Ministry of Social Affairs, Oslo, 1950.

refused and which was not compensated. In lieu of the local judge, the Government could appoint a permanent chairman with the qualifications of a judge who would serve as permanent administrative officer. This was commonly done in larger municipalities, such as Oslo, where the Council occupies permanent quarters and has the services of a trained probation staff and a corps of clerical workers. In smaller communes, with much less business, investigation and supervision is done by the members of the Council itself or with the assistance of volunteer workers.

In 1947-1953 the Child Welfare Council system has gone through the first radical overhauling since the adoption of the plan at the turn of the century.² The new law provides for the abolishment of the Child Welfare Councils, and the establishment in their place of Child Welfare Committees to exercise considerably wider functions. The Committees are to have extended functions in the protection of all classes of children in need of special care. Jurisdiction extends to age 18. These will include, not only delinquent and neglected children but those who present health problems, assistance cases, handicapped children and other categories for which other agencies have hitherto had responsibility. The following classes are mentioned specifically in the law as wards of the Committee:

- 1) children who are so treated or live under such conditions that their health (mental or physical) is likely to be impaired;
- 2) those who, thru breaking the law or other conduct, exhibit such lack of adjustment to their environment that special measures seem necessary;
- 3) children who have no one to support them or whose parents are unable to support them properly, and who are not otherwise properly cared for;
- 4) children who are sick or physically, mentally or otherwise handicapped and which do not have the care and treatment which they need.

The new Child Welfare Committees are to consist of five members, both men and women, chosen by the Communal authority, from among persons with a special understanding and interest in child welfare. Persons chosen are under obligation to serve unless over 60 years of age, or have already served one term of office. In all cases involving custody, withdrawal of parental power and like matters the district-court or town judge shall sit *ex officio* as member of the Committee. Provision is also made for a local official in each County responsible for child welfare matters. The new law provides also that local administration of the Child Welfare law shall be supervised by the Ministry of Social Affairs. A State Child Welfare Council, of not less than five members, is to be appointed by the King to advise the Ministry in such affairs. Regulations and rules governing the placement of children, the inspection and supervision of children's institutions, supervision of foster homes are spelled out in the law. Jurisdiction over children who violate the law is essentially the same as that formerly enjoyed by the Child Welfare Councils.

As in most American juvenile courts, procedure is entirely informal and private. Members of the Council or Committee, under the guidance of the Chairman, question witnesses or direct queries to members of the probation staff familiar with the case.

² *Instilling fra Barnevernkomiteen, I, Lov Om Barnevern, Oslo, 1951* (Report of Child Welfare Committee, Law Relative to Child Care) Act of 17th July, 1953, respecting Child Welfare. Trans. by United Nations.

The child or his parents may be present, as the Council thinks wise. Parents have the legal right to appear, before the Council. Often the hearing takes the form of a sort of family council (as observed by the writer) with the parents seated on one side of the table, the child standing behind them, and the members of the Council seated on the other side. Parents are encouraged to ask questions both with respect to their assessment of the problem as well as to the decision and proposed plan. The family may retain counsel if they wish but there is little function for him to perform, since the hearing is in no sense a trial. The Council has powers of subpoena and may compel the attendance of witnesses. Under certain circumstances, parents or other relatives may be excused from giving evidence which might appear to be self incriminating.³

Records of the Council must be adequately kept and provision made for the collection of social, psychological and psychiatric data. Decisions of the Council must be preceded by the opinion on which they are based. If decision is made to remove the child from the home notice in writing must be served on the parents who may also express their opinion, either orally or in writing. Appeals from the decision of the Council may be had to the Ministry but not to the courts.

Problems of delinquency or neglect may come to the Council in a variety of ways. The police must refer all children under age 14 who come into their hands to the Council. If he believes it in the public interest the Prosecutor may waive prosecution of any person under 18, a practice which is almost universal between 14 and 16, and common up to age 18. Children may also be referred to the Council by the schools, the Public Health Councils, Public Assistance Boards, by employers, neighbors and, most often, by parents themselves, who come to the Council for aid. The schools may refer refractory or unmanageable children who are a threat to the safety or welfare of other pupils or who seriously disturb the orderly school routine. Jurisdiction, once taken, extends to age 21 unless surrendered to some other child welfare or educational agency.

After a case is referred, investigative procedures are started. In the larger city Councils this function is performed by probation officers, both men and women, who visit the home and school, relatives, neighbors or others in a position to provide information. Complete physical examination is provided as a matter of routine. If the case warrants the child may be referred for either or both psychological or psychiatric observation. These professional services may be obtained from the school psychologists or psychiatrists or from the clinics supported by the Commune or the State as a part of the public health service. During the period while investigation is under way the child may be left in his own home, if this seems wise, placed in a boarding home or temporarily committed to the local "Observation School", or even left in the Psychiatric Division of the National Hospital. No disposition of the case is made until investigation is complete. It should be noted, of course, that complete examinations and investigations tend to be achieved only in those areas where

³ This is consistent with the principle in Norwegian law that no defendant nor an accomplice is allowed to give evidence under oath, nor is any child under 15 allowed to take an oath. The same rule applies to any witness whose weak intellect or retarded development might make clear understanding of the nature of the oath doubtful.

facilities are available. In rural districts, and in the more isolated regions, members of the Councils do much of their own social investigation and must rely on local medical resources for the physical examinations. Where psychiatric service is patently necessary, cases may be referred to Oslo or to other urban centers for specialized study. Since the major share of the population resides in the south third of the country, which contains almost all the larger urban centers, most of the children who need specialized service get it.

In dealing with the children several courses are open to the Council. The simplest, and the most common, is a warning to the child and to the parents. The warning generally takes the form of an oral admonition to the child and parents given by the Chairman of the Council in the presence of other members. The Chairman points out to the parents and the child the dangers of the course being followed and the penalties and consequences ultimately likely to flow from it. Promises of closer supervision from parents, and improvement in conduct from the child are commonly forthcoming and the case is closed unless reopened by future misconduct. One gets the impression that these "warnings" are primarily in the nature of a lecture with little done positively to make it possible for parents to carry out promises or children to keep out of mischief. The Chairman of the Oslo Council, however, reports that less than ten percent of the cases to whom warnings are administered ever again come to the attention of the Council. In a substantial number of cases no action is taken.

Where the nature of the offense calls for something more than a warning, or where the home and family situation warrant, the child may be placed on probation and left in his own home. In this event periodic home visits, counseling by the probation officer with the parents in seeking a solution for the child's problems, enlisting the aid of other agencies, securing public assistance when necessary, consultation with school authorities and other steps may be taken. Probation may continue as long as the Council feels necessary or up to age 21.

It is in connection with investigation and, especially with respect to supervision, that the Councils feel themselves handicapped. As in the United States, funds are often lacking to permit the employment of sufficient staff to maintain adequate supervision. Case loads are often too heavy and "follow up" is neglected. Another difficulty is the scarcity of trained social workers and probation officers even if the funds for paying them were forthcoming. The latter difficulty is gradually being corrected as social work becomes established as a profession and as graduates of the State School of Social Work become available to fill the positions. In the rural areas, however, a great deal of the work of investigation and supervision falls on the members of the local Councils themselves or on the volunteers whom they can enlist as aides.

In many cases, however, the child cannot safely be left in his own home. This may grow out of the inadequacy and incompetence of the parents in dealing with the child or because the home itself imposes serious moral risks. In these cases probation is often accompanied with placement in either a foster home or in boarding homes. Such homes are selected only after careful investigation and approval by the Council. Homes of relatives, if suitable, are preferred and often used. Maintenance of family

unity and responsibility is regarded as of supreme importance and use of the homes of grandparents or other relatives is believed to further this end. Where necessary small subventions, in homes where means are limited, are often granted by the Council to foster parents. Most normal children, who present no serious behavior problems, are provided for in this way. Later, if and when conditions warrant, the child may be returned to his own home. In Oslo, often the children who come to the Councils, are youngsters of parents who have recently moved into the city from surrounding rural regions. In many cases grandparents, residing in the home communities, provide a resource for the care and protection of children whose parents are having a hard "go" of it in the City. Serious housing shortage and almost incredible overcrowding in the cities, both during and since the German occupation, have imposed great strains on the family.

Another interesting contrast with American attitudes and practices may be noted with respect to the use of public funds for securing home or institutional care for wards of the Councils. It seems to be taken for granted that Council funds should be used for boarding homes or for payments to foster parents, or even for payments to private institutions such as children's and youth "pensions", or children's homes. The Council may make payments to foster parents, to relatives such as grandparents, or even to parents, in cases where economic need makes necessary employment of mothers outside the home, and where such employment might be inconsistent with the child's best interest.

In the event that home placement is not feasible resort must be had to institutional care. There are two kinds of institutions available to the Council, the coercive school and the school home. Placement in the institution is provided for in the Child Welfare Councils Act when the child "is so morally depraved that it would submit other children to harmful influence if it attended the ordinary school".⁴

The coercive school is designed for those children who present particularly difficult behavior problems. There are three of these institutions, two of them in Oslo, and one in Bergen. One in Stavanger has not been rebuilt since it was destroyed by fire in 1948. Originally conceived as disciplinary institutions, these schools are now developing into study centers where children may be placed for extended periods for careful study and observation as the basis for treatment. In Oslo the school for boys is now called Observation School. The number of boys has been reduced from 40 to 25. All are accepted entirely on the basis that they need expert study. The Superintendent of the institution is a specialist in behavior problems, thoroughly familiar with the literature in this field as evidenced by the extensive library with which his study was equipped, and quite conversant with trends in child welfare in the United States, England as well as other countries. A psychologist, nurses, teachers and matrons make up the staff which also has medical and psychiatric service from the Royal Hospital. The physical resources of the institution are not impressive; buildings are old, and the plant inadequate but there was a family atmosphere in the informal relations which prevailed between staff and the children which seemed to more than compensate for the lack of modern play ground or school and workshop. The role of Father, in the Superintendent's relation to the boys, was illustrated in the interrup-

⁴ TJENSVOLL, H. M.—*op.-cit.* p. 1.

tion of our conference by a breathless and tousle-headed ten year old who had an immediate problem on which he needed advice and counsel from the Superintendent. Great emphasis is placed on keeping the school small, in creating as far as possible a family atmosphere, the avoidance of formal rules and resort to coercion only in the form which it would normally take in a family situation. In striking contrast with the situation in American institutions, was the calm way in which the runaway was dealt with. The only concern seemed to be to see to it that the lad should come to no harm, to secure his early return, and to diagnose the difficulties which were behind the running away. Children are committed to these institutions up to the age of 15, the folk school leaving age, but ordinarily do not remain for more than a year. The observation schools are operated and administered by the local Councils.

The school homes are designed for children without serious behavior problems but for whom special treatment and education is desirable. Many of them are backward children who seem to show more aptitude for acquiring manual and vocational skills than they do for the more literary type of training in the traditional school curriculum. Emphasis is placed on such subjects as agriculture, dairying, market gardening, carpentry, metal work and seamanship. The ordinary school curriculum is also included and, in cases where it seems desirable, the children may attend neighborhood schools. Learning proceeds at a more leisurely pace than in the ordinary schools and, since the school leaving age has been extended to 21, trade training can more readily be combined with the traditional school curriculum.

The school homes are administered and supervised by the Directorate of School Homes in the Ministry of Education and Ecclesiastical Affairs. In the 1953-54 session of the Parliament, however, a proposal to place control of these institutions in the Directorate of Special Schools was adapted. This will combine their administration with that for the schools for deaf, blind, feeble-minded and otherwise handicapped children.

Some of the School Homes are operated by the State, one by a County; two by municipalities and one under private auspices. All are subject to inspection by the State Authority to see that standards are maintained. Since 1950 there has been a tendency to reduce the number of children cared for in these institutions and to divert the facilities toward other purposes. One of the two private school homes for boys has been closed as has one of the State Schools, and the total accommodations have been reduced from nearly six hundred to 420, 250 places for boys and 170 for girls. The tendency also has been to reduce the number of pupils in each institution in keeping with a policy of creating a home rather than an institutional atmosphere. It should be noted that once a child is committed to a School Home the Council surrenders jurisdiction which passes to the Directorate of School Homes.

Finally, it is possible to place the child in a children's home. These institutions are designed, primarily, to care for normal children who have been neglected in their own homes, where homes have been broken by death or separation of parents, or where other conditions preclude care in the child's home or, temporarily while awaiting placement in a foster home. Between fifteen and twenty of these homes are supported by the Oslo Commune and nearly forty are managed under various auspices; by the Red Cross, The Norwegian Women's Public Health Association, by various

religious denominations and by private individuals. All receive some support from public sources. The number of children per home varies from less than 10 to 80, although most of them have less than 30 children. Ages range from infancy to 21, with some homes caring only for very young children, others receiving youngsters of all ages. In many of the smaller homes it is the deliberate policy to take children of widely varying age to create a normal home situation in so far as possible. The homes are commonly operated by a middle aged couple who play the role of parents. Children attend neighborhood schools, the older ones help with household tasks, caring for younger children and contributing to a common enterprise. While less commonly used for the care of delinquent children, in cases where the child shows no serious behavior problems, is unlikely to disturb the routine of the home and seems likely to profit by its program, it may be placed in a home of this type. These homes are operated by the Child Welfare Agency of the Commune or receive partial support and are subject to its inspection.

No current data are available to reveal the present operations of the Child Welfare Councils. A 1950 report, prepared for the Norwegian Joint Committee on International Social Policy, supplies some information for 1947.⁵ About 70 percent of the 1244 cases dealt with by the Councils for that year were referred for misconduct while 519 were referred as neglected. While it is impossible to separate the delinquent from the neglected children with respect to their treatment, about 140 or approximately 20 percent of the delinquents, were committed to observation schools or school homes. More than two thirds appear to have been dealt with simply by warnings and admonitions.

A better picture of the operations of the Councils, as well as the outcome of various treatment policies have been presented in a number of studies.⁶ The latest and most elaborate of these studies reports the results of a follow-up study of 1863 children, 668 girls and 1195 boys who were dealt with by the Councils in the five year period 1929 to 1933.⁷ These children were followed to Dec. 1, 1948 with respect to later conduct as well as status in 1948. Records from the Child Welfare Council, the Folk-register, records of the Department of Justice, the records of fines from the Oslo Police Department and the Social Register of persons receiving any form of public aid, were utilized. It should be kept in mind that the study shows a pre war and pre depression record with respect to the measures adopted by the Councils and would not be representative of current policies.

The cases were almost evenly divided into two groups; a delinquent group and a neglected group. About one fourth of the delinquent group were removed from their homes of which the major share were committed to institutions, one fourth were left to the schools to deal with, and in about one third no more serious measures than a warning were followed. A considerably larger proportion of the neglected

⁵ Ibid pp. 12-18.

⁶ SIGNY ARCTANDER AND SIGURD DAHLSTROM: *How Do the Council Children Fare* (Hvordan går det våre verjerådsbarn?) Oslo 1932. SIGNY ARCTANDER: *Child Welfare Council Measures and their Results* (Verjeradsbehandlingen og dens resultater) STATSÖKONOMISK TIDSKRIFT 1936 (S.97-294).

⁷ MAX PETERSEN AND EGIL NILSEN: *Results of Child Welfare Council Measures with Special Reference to Children's Environmental Background* (Verjeradsbehandlingens resultater I Forhold Til Barnas Miljøbakgrund) Oslo Commune, 1950.

than the delinquent were removed from their own homes and a larger proportion of those removed were placed in foster homes rather than institutions.

The results of the follow-up study are not essentially different from the results of similar investigations in the United States⁸ and give no great support for the notion that the Councils have solved the delinquency problem. In 1947-1948, the young adults who had been the wards of the Councils in 1929 to 1933, as compared with comparable sex and age groups of the City of Oslo were disproportionately concentrated in unskilled labor, were less frequently married, more frequently divorced, had been more frequently fined and imprisoned and were more frequently recipients of public assistance. Of the delinquent group two thirds approximately, had been fined, imprisoned or received public assistance. Of the neglected group the corresponding percentage was forty. The institutionalized children showed a far higher proportion of persons committed to penal or correctional institutions than was true for the ones who had been left in their own homes. Whether or not the large proportion of the subjects with "negative criteria of adjustment" (to use the author's phrase) was due to the selective influence of institutional commitment or to the results of the separation from home and family is not revealed.

The authors conclude their study with the suggestion that the creation of a single child welfare authority, with responsibility for all kinds of child welfare problems, could better serve the needs of children and be more completely removed from the punitive connotations which still, in the public mind, surround the Child Welfare Council. As mentioned above such an authority has now been created in the Child Welfare Committee which on July 1, 1954 took over all responsibility for the care and protection of children who are the special concern of the community.

In addition to attendance at meetings of the Council the author also had the opportunity for extended conferences with the Chairman and a number of members of the probation staff. He also was given permission for extended study of the case records of the Council. From the material so gathered the following brief account of a group of six related cases may illustrate more concretely than statistical studies can do, both the kinds of problems with which the Council (now the Committee) deals as well as the methods resorted to and the community resources upon which it can rely.

THE RUSELKEN GANG

All the boys are involved as a group in a series of thefts covering a two year period. They vary in age from 8 to 13. A definite gang relationship with strong loyalty ties, group stealing, considerable skill and technique, division of the spoils, leader and follower relationships are reminiscent of delinquent behavior probably more common in American than in Scandinavian cities. The boys have been engaged for more than two years in stealing candy and cigarettes from kiosks, purses from women's bags in shopping centers and at sales. Pleasure boats lying in the harbor often have provided rich loot as have lockers in the public baths where wrist watches, purses and other goods have been stolen. The valuables have been sold or pawned and the

⁸ See studies by SHELDON AND ELEANOR GLUECK, WM. HEALY AND AUGUSTA BROONER, BELLE BOONE BEARD.

money used for movies, cigarettes, rides in the amusement park and other childish pleasures. The boys have been referred to the Council by the police. The youngsters all attend the same public school and are all residents of the same neighborhood, an old and rather deteriorated section of the City in the harbor district, probably the poorest section of the City although hardly a slum area by American standards.

Case No. 1. The first boy, Leif S., is 12 years old. He lives with his Mother, an older sister and her three children, an older brother and two younger children in an incredibly over crowded four room apartment. The Father is employed outside the City and is seldom at home. The Mother has a job as a washer woman on board ships in the harbor and is away from home a great deal.

The boy is described as small for his age, infantile in physical development and emotionality. He is easily led by other boys. The boy has had rheumatic fever and has spent some time in a "fresh air school". The Mother suggests that he be placed with relatives at Vardal but the Council feels that he needs the systematic care and ordered regimen which can be provided at an "approved school" and orders him to be placed in the Orkeröd School for Boys.

At the institution the boy has made a good adjustment. He is very fond of his Mother and writes to her often. He has visited at home several times. In the meantime his own home situation has considerably improved as the married sister has found quarters for her own family. Mother and other children are eager for Leif to return home. Decision of the council is to return the boy to his home, place him in a public school in a different part of the City, see to it that he receives special assistance in school in correcting deficiencies in arithmetic, and keep him under medical supervision. If protected he should do well.

Case No. 2. The second boy is Erland S., also 12 years old. His offenses are essentially the same as those of the others; snatching purses in the underground station, rifling women's handbags, shop lifting, etc.

The parents are separated and the boy lives with his Mother in a small apartment. The father is a carpenter but works only sporadically. He is a chronic alcoholic and has been arrested numerous times for drunkenness, and peace disturbance. A psychiatrist reports no psychosis although mental illness feigned to escape prosecution; emotional instability. Mother vacillates in attitude toward the boy between indifference and extreme overprotection with a belittling of the boy's offenses as mere mischief. She wishes the boy placed with relatives who reside in a nearby suburban community.

The school reports the boy as aggressive and brutal toward other children, very poor student, not stupid but completely indifferent to his studies. The boy smokes habitually, is often truant from school, stays out late, absents himself for long week end which he spends with grandparents. He is further described in the school report as; "crafty, sly and a mischief maker". The Mother works outside the home and is gone much of the time. She has failed to report for conference with school authorities when requested to do so and seems indifferent to the welfare of her son.

The critical nature of the case and lack of any home resources forced a decision to commit the boy immediately to the Geitmyra Observation School for study and treatment. At the Observation School the boy does well in making social adjustment

although his limited intelligence (I.Q. 86) handicaps him in his school work. While often exhibiting aggressive tendencies, contact with him is quite easily established. The roots of his trouble seem to lie in the conflict between loyalties. He defends his drunken father against the mother's criticism. He responds well to friendship, accepts discipline when he feels himself at fault but protests vociferously if he feels unfairly treated. The Superintendent recommends that he should be allowed to return home and resume his studies at the local school.

During the year conditions in the home have greatly improved. The Father has discontinued drinking and works steadily as does the Mother. The apartment is clean and well kept. The boy has visited at home on a number of occasions. He has rejected advances from his old associates. The Council, however, feels that return home may be premature and, at the Mother's suggestion, decides to place the boy with maternal grandparents in a rural village on the outskirts of Oslo. The grandparents live on a small "gaard" (farm). They appear devoted to the boy who has often visited with them and are willing to accept responsibility for his care. A contract with the Council is drawn, the Grandfather is appointed foster father, an agreed payment established, and the boy is moved to the home. Here he does well for a time, especially in connection with the activities of the farm, the care of animals and other farm chores. School adjustment, however, is a different matter; progress is slow and painful and the boy is unhappy, the traditional curriculum is unsuited to a boy with limited intelligence and the upshot of the matter is a request from the boy himself to be transferred back to the Observation School, a step which is ordered by the Council. Here the record leaves him.

Case No. 3. The third boy is Olaf N. also 13 years old. He lives with his father and step mother in a neatly furnished apartment in a middle class neighborhood. The Father is occupied as a legal counselor, income is adequate to provide a stable economic foundation for the family; family relationships appear to be congenial. The boy is described as tall, overgrown and lanky; lazy in disposition, easily led by other boys. He is a failure in school where he is also reported as a nuisance.

The sources of the boy's difficulty are not clear. Some years earlier the Father had been involved in some kind of shady deal which had resulted in a conviction and three year suspended prison sentence. It is not known to what extent this circumstance may have influenced the boy. School failure seems related to low intelligence, lack of interest in "literary" subjects and arithmetic and revolt against the monotony and routine of the school.

After consultation there is agreement with the parents to place the boy on a nearby farm home. An interest in farm animals and liking for the country seems to have been the principal reason for placement. The foster parents are middle aged people with a boy of their own of approximately the same age as Olaf. At last report (about a year after referral) the boy seems to be doing well in so far as home adjustment goes. He is liked by the foster parents, assumes responsibility for tasks about the farm and is, himself, satisfied. In school work, however, he is deficient and backward. The teacher recommends placement in a "help class" but such facilities are lacking in the village school.

Case No. 4. Gustaf A. is 10 years old. He has been stealing from boats in the harbor

with the other boys. The family consists of Father, Mother and two sisters, aged 11 and 13. The father works steadily as a machinist and makes a good living. He is a stern disciplinarian, completely disgusted with the boy and quite willing that he be punished. The Mother appears to be a cowed and weak character, is extremely protective of the boy against his father, belittles the boy's offenses and blames associates for his behavior.

In school Gustaf is described as "the worst boy in his class"; insolent, disobedient, cruel to other children and completely beyond control. School authorities request his removal.

There is sentiment in the Council for placement in the Observation School, but the Mother's pleas are allowed to prevail and the boy is finally placed in a "fresh air school" in the environs of the City. No adequate explanation is made for the decision. Rather scanty records indicate reasonably satisfactory progress.

Case No. 5. Svein E., boy No. 5, is only 9 years of age. Delinquencies are the same as those of the others. School authorities report him as a most difficult case. He is backward in his studies, a disturbing element in the school, group leader in all sorts of mischief, steals from other children, failure in all subjects. Removal is recommended.

The family situation is most unfavorable. Both parents have been arrested for drunkenness. At the time of referral the parents are separated as they have done numerous times in the past. The child has shifted about between parents and relatives, although at the time of report he is living in one room with the Mother who is employed. Psychological and psychiatric examination report low normal intelligence but emotionally unstable. Projective tests show much insecurity, fear and hostility, lively fantasy life, poor powers of abstraction. Worry over Father's imprisonment has contributed to boy's insecurity. Mother and relatives reluctantly agree to temporary placement in children's home.

Three months later parents propose a new plan. Father and Mother have been reconciled and will rent a small apartment. Father promises to discontinue drinking, and has obtained steady employment as a waiter in a first class restaurant. Mother will discontinue outside employment and make a home for the boy. The boy himself is overjoyed at the prospects, especially in light of the bicycle he has been promised. Reluctantly the Council agrees to go along with the plan although the child welfare worker fears it has been specially concocted to get the boy out of the Home. In spite of misgivings, however, the plan works out well. A report three months after the move reports the boy doing well, the Father has worked steadily and has had only one drink with his pals at Easter time. The boy is back in his own school. His teacher reports a complete transformation which is attributed to improvement in conditions at home. No further difficulties, either at home or at school, appear in the case record.

Case No. 6. The last case is Jan K., 13 years of age. Jan presents the most difficult problem of all. He appears to have been the leader of the gang and seems to present even more serious difficulties than those apparent in the other cases. Immediate placement in the Observation School, pending study and investigation of both boy and home situation, is the first step.

The Father is, at present, at sea. He presents a whole train of problems; alcoholism,

stomach ulcers, emotional instability. He leaves home for prolonged periods, has tried numerous jobs and failed at all, is off to sea with each family crisis. Life is just too much to cope with. The Mother is a serious and conscientious person, deeply religious and greatly concerned over the boy who is just too much for her. She has held a series of unskilled jobs and at time of report was employed as scrubwoman in one of the large banks of the City. The family moved into Oslo from a rural district about ten years ago. Beside Jan, there are two older brothers, neither of whom has ever been in any trouble.

Jan is described as hostile, defiant, boasts of his misdeeds, proclaims his intention to run away from any school where he may be placed. Psychological tests show an I.Q. of 76 and mental age of 9.7. Personality described as impulsive, defiant and aggressive.

In his reaction to placement Jan has fulfilled his threats. He ran away from the Observation School the same day he was first placed there. Tried out in the Fresh Air School he created so much disturbance that his removal was requested. His next placement was in a Home for boys (Children's Pension) privately operated. From this institution he has run away several times. He does poor work in his class, is jealous toward other children, an attitude which he has exhibited toward his brothers in his own home. Parents of other children at the home fear his influence over their children and have asked his transfer. While at this institution he is under care of a psychiatrist whom he sees each week. The last entry reports transfer to an Approved School. No progress. Prognosis poor.

The cases described above give us some insight into the kinds of behavior problems with which the Council is faced and the institutions and agencies on which it relies for care and guidance in the treatment program. Probably those chosen represent more difficult problems than the average case would present. They do illustrate the relatively non punitive atmosphere in which the Child Welfare Council operates, the flexibility with which it may experiment with various kinds of treatment programs, the wide use of psychological psychiatric service, and medical services, and the different types of institutions available for temporary as well as permanent care.