

Texas A&M University-San Antonio

Digital Commons @ Texas A&M University-San Antonio

History Faculty Publications

College of Arts and Sciences

Fall 2022

"A Situation That Has Existed for Generations": Double Age, Race, and American Juvenile Justice

William S. Bush

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.tamusa.edu/hist_faculty



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

‘A Situation That Has Existed for Generations’: Double Age, Race, and American Juvenile Justice

By William S. Bush

William S. Bush, *Texas A&M University-San Antonio*

William Bush, Professor of History at Texas A&M University-San Antonio, is the author of *Who Gets a Childhood?: Race and Juvenile Justice in Twentieth-Century Texas* (Georgia, 2010); *Circuit Riders for Mental Health* (Texas A&M, 2016); and, co-editor of *Ages of Anxiety: Historical and Transnational Perspectives on Juvenile Justice* (NYU, 2018).

A 1939 murder case involving two African American adolescent girls garnered almost no attention outside San Antonio, Texas. The city’s two daily newspapers barely reported on the facts surrounding the crime and they wrote nothing of the personal histories of the assailant or victim. Moreover, local media sometimes misreported the ages of fifteen-year-old Odessa Haywood and eighteen-year-old Carrie Lee Thompson, while conspicuously highlighting their racial identity as “Negro.” Some reports identified Haywood, the assailant, as sixteen; one article described Thompson, the victim, as a “woman,” even though she was a high school student at the time.¹ The only outlet to report in-depth about them was the *San Antonio Register*, the city’s Black-owned newspaper. The *Register* published detailed reports on the two girls, their families, and Haywood’s May 1939 jury trial and conviction in the Bexar County Court. Their coverage of the case prompted the *Register*’s editors to issue a dramatic call to action against “a situation that has existed for generations.”²

The *Register* decried the court’s inability to place Odessa Haywood in an age-appropriate facility, none of which admitted Black girls. The court’s only available placement options were imprisonment in the county jail or unsupervised release, –a recurring dilemma across the Jim

Crow South and to some extent other regions in the United States.³ Neither option was acceptable to local Black leaders, who moved to protect Haywood from adult punishments while mobilizing to demand access for Black girls to juvenile detention facilities and training schools.

More broadly, local Black leaders highlighted the “State’s indifference” and “dereliction” in refusing to extend the ostensibly protective benefits of juvenile justice and child welfare to Black children and youth. The Haywood case revived a dormant campaign to build a statewide juvenile training school for Black girls, who had been largely left out of a wave of juvenile justice reforms that had swept the state during the Progressive Era.

By the time of the Haywood case, official neglect had become the defining experience of Black girls in American juvenile justice, and particularly in Texas, where a combination of law and custom invoked the application of “double age.” The White “child-savers” who founded and administered juvenile justice typically excluded Black children and youth from their vision of protected childhood. Instead, Black children were viewed as too “insensate” to respond to nurture, as being fully formed “hard clay” and less amenable to rehabilitation.⁴ In practice, this thinking produced different results for Black boys and girls under the state’s juvenile delinquency laws. In 1913, Texas adopted a sweeping Juvenile Delinquency Court Act that granted original jurisdiction to the juvenile courts over boys under age seventeen and girls under age eighteen. The law explicitly mandated racial segregation in juvenile justice.⁵

For Black boys from the state’s urban areas, segregation meant heightened incarceration. Black boys were overrepresented in local juvenile detention facilities as well as the state’s sprawling youth prison. They were confined to a racially segregated dormitory that was often overcrowded and poorly maintained. When the youth prison introduced academic and vocational schooling, it excluded Black boys altogether, subjecting them instead to agricultural labor. Texas

abolished convict leasing in its adult prisons in 1912, but it continued for decades in the state's youth prisons. Much like their adult counterparts in the prisons, Black boys toiled on private farms, including some owned by state employees, in addition to farming state-owned land. White officials justified these practices by portraying Black boys as incipient adult criminals, while news reports described Black boys solely in terms of the threat they supposedly posed to public safety.

For Black girls, state-mandated segregation meant they received comparatively little attention from juvenile justice authorities. Black girls charged with status or even criminal offenses typically were released back into their communities with no official supervision. Local governments in major cities such as Houston, Dallas, or Haywood's home city of San Antonio committed few resources in the form of juvenile probation, mental health, or rehabilitation services to at-risk Black girls. Texas officials viewed Black girls as innately aggressive and hypersexual; however, strict racial segregation kept the perceived threat restricted largely to Black communities.⁶ Thus, even in a state willing to spend public dollars on public safety, this particular danger did not warrant any investment. This official neglect forced Black organizations to provide privately-run programs, often with very limited resources, which in turn meant that Black girls were much less likely to receive the preventative or rehabilitative services central to juvenile justice.

In Haywood's case, this pattern of neglect deprived her of interventions that might have forestalled the tragic murder of April 1939, and then denied her access to a publicly-supported rehabilitative facility widely viewed as the standard at that time. These outcomes flowed logically from laws and practices that established legal guardrails around chronological age, but applied them differently according to race and gender. Although the law recognized Odessa

Haywood as an adolescent girl in need of protection, its half-hearted application to her needs throughout her childhood and adolescence powerfully illustrates one worst-case scenario of double age, belying “the supposedly benign universality of chronological age.”⁷

A Double-Aged Childhood

Odessa Haywood’s childhood surfaces in bits and pieces from available records. Born in 1923, she appears to have grown up largely in the working-class sections of San Antonio’s East Side.⁸ A “fair student”⁹ in elementary school, Haywood lived with her mother, Martha Prevost, a housekeeper, in a home belonging to her grandparents, Virgie and Jessie Sorrell. The 1930 census lists Jessie Sorrell’s occupation as massager in a bath house, suggesting that he and his adult daughter supported the household with their combined incomes.¹⁰

Trouble began after 1931 when the eight-year-old Haywood entered Douglass Junior School. Haywood spent six years as a student at Douglass, growing into her early adolescence while accumulating a lengthy disciplinary record. “[V]ery much a problem to some of her teachers” and “extremely high tempered,” Haywood reportedly “refused to accept, or adjust to, the opinions of her schoolmates.” School administrators later pointed to Haywood’s home environment as one source of her problems. “[W]hen she was disciplined, and sent home,” they recounted, “her mother would usually come to the school and want to fight the teachers for the disciplinary action.”¹¹ The school’s staff had few available treatment options. School counseling and children’s mental health services remained scarce even for White children and the local juvenile probation department did not serve Black girls.¹² Perhaps as a result, the staff responded to Haywood’s troubling behavior primarily through disciplinary actions such as detention or suspension.¹³

Interestingly, they did not choose to refer Haywood as either a dependent or delinquent child to the Bexar County (San Antonio) Juvenile Court. Opened in 1907, the Bexar County juvenile court operated intermittently due to a lack of budgetary support. It lacked a separate juvenile detention facility, and relied on unpaid volunteers for juvenile probation services.¹⁴ A decade later, in May 1917, five Bexar County judges began meeting formally as a juvenile board. They oversaw a juvenile justice operation that included three juvenile probation officers and a county training school for boys. The court heard cases of White, Black, and ethnic Mexican juveniles, but devoted the bulk of its meager resources to White youth. Among the board's early concerns were "evil environments ever before the children," such as houses of gambling and prostitution, and "Dance Halls," as well as the use of the county jail to detain juvenile offenders.¹⁵

The board worried greatly about delinquent girls, though they comprised about one third as many delinquency cases as boys.¹⁶ San Antonio's child-savers feared for the moral and sexual innocence of adolescent girls. Irregularly filed, handwritten monthly juvenile probation reports listed offenses such as truancy, curfew violation, "vice," "parents unable to control," or "using vile language" rather than assaultive or violent crimes.¹⁷ Placement options were limited to the Texas State Training School for Girls, which opened in 1916 but was located hundreds of miles away near the state's northern border, other county training schools, or a local Catholic convent. A local facility became an "absolute necessity."¹⁸

Agreeing on the "crying need,"¹⁹ Alexander Joske, a local merchant and philanthropist, donated \$15,000 (the equivalent of about \$250,000) for the construction of a home for delinquent girls between the ages of six and sixteen. State law specified the age range for juvenile court jurisdiction to include girls from seven to eighteen years old. Most likely, the upper limit of

sixteen for the San Antonio girls' home reflected a desire to avoid housing older delinquent girls who were viewed as more difficult and could be housed at the state training school up to age eighteen.²⁰ The "attractive and homelike" Henrietta Joske Memorial Home opened in December 1920 on a sixteen-acre ranch, formerly a "home for diseased women."²¹ By 1935, the training school housed twenty-five girls ranging in age from thirteen to nineteen years old, with academic schooling, Sunday church services, and chaperoned excursions in the city.²²

Odessa Haywood's teachers could not have referred her for these programs in spite of her emerging behavioral issues, as they could for a White girl, because of the "double age" effect of Texas law and practice. Neither the Joske Memorial Home nor the state training school admitted Black girls. Had teachers referred her to juvenile court, Haywood would have languished in a segregated cell block in the county jail, which had set up "temporary detention quarters" for "male colored children and female colored children."²³ Barred from accessing these services, Haywood's problems worsened after she entered Phyllis Wheatley High School in 1937. Now fourteen years old, Haywood found herself "almost constantly in trouble" over a "terrible" period of about eighteen months during which she was "involved in numerous brawls with students and children."²⁴

Two of these incidents involved Haywood and her eventual murder victim. The first, in December 1938, occurred during a Saturday night dance at Lincoln Park, a public park located several blocks east of Haywood's home. Haywood collided on the dance floor with eighteen-year-old Carrie Lee Thompson, a senior at Wheatley High School. As a result, a crystal wristwatch that Haywood had borrowed from a friend fell on the ground and shattered. The two girls then feuded over who should pay for the repairs, an argument that nearly turned physical and was left unresolved.

Over the next four months, Haywood and Thompson had several public confrontations, including a “heated argument” in a local drug store. First-hand accounts of these encounters, published in the *Register*, portrayed Haywood as the aggressor, with Thompson “ignoring invitations to fight,” which seemed to enrage Haywood. “I’ll get you,” Haywood reportedly threatened, “if it’s the last thing I do.”²⁵

News reports suggested this seemingly minor dispute over a broken watch escalated into a deeply felt matter of respect between two girls from very different socioeconomic backgrounds. Haywood grew up in a multi-generational, working-class household with her single mother and her grandparents and changed residences frequently. Thompson, however, came from a comparatively stable, middle-class family. Her father, Leslie, worked as a mason; he and Clara Thompson had been married twenty years earlier and had seven children together.²⁶

Thompson also appears to have been a model student while Haywood had amassed a lengthy disciplinary record. In January 1939, Haywood was expelled from Wheatley and began attending an unnamed “denominational school,” where she earned “a very good rating in her studies” and “gave no trouble” for about two months.²⁷ However, by the end of March, teachers reported Haywood for carrying a knife in school and displaying a “high tempered” and “nasty disposition,” and she had stopped attending school.²⁸

Amid these events, the grudge finally erupted into lethal violence after another Saturday night dance at Lincoln Park on April 15, 1939. A heated confrontation between Haywood and Thompson, and their respective friends, resulted in their expulsion from the park. Accompanied by a friend, Thompson began walking west on Commerce Street, a major thoroughfare, in the direction of her home. followed by Haywood. “Still talking fight,” Haywood shouted insults and

threats for about eight city blocks, before rushing up behind Thompson “brandishing a long-blade knife.”²⁹

Shouting soon gave way to a physical struggle; within seconds, Thompson “sank to the ground, suffering a long, slashing stab wound in the neck”—a “stab wound to the Trachea” that killed her within minutes.³⁰ Haywood threw the knife and fled to her home a few blocks away, where she was arrested without a struggle hours later by police. Haywood told officers that she had acted in self-defense and continued to complain that she had been wronged by Thompson over the watch repair.

Haywood now faced a jury trial in Bexar County Court, on a charge of “juvenile delinquency” rather than homicide. This charge reflected a peculiarity of the 1913 Texas juvenile delinquency law, which placed *all* offenses, including felonies, under the jurisdiction of district and county courts as “juvenile delinquency” offenses. Moreover, the statute only addressed male juveniles and remained silent about girls who committed felonies. Undoubtedly, prevailing ideas about girlhood led state lawmakers (all of whom were men) away from envisioning girls as violent offenders. This oversight meant that Haywood’s age and gender protected her from a felony charge. Nevertheless, Haywood still experienced the trappings of an adult criminal trial, even though she was ostensibly a juvenile. The proceeding itself took place in a county court rather than a juvenile court; moreover, it mirrored a criminal court trial in its inclusion of attorneys, jurors, and audience members.

Legal historians have shown how juvenile court law and practice varied widely between and within states with respect to juvenile homicide, with some cases transferred to adult criminal court and others tried in juvenile court.³¹ In Texas, the juvenile court had original jurisdiction over all criminal offenses involving juveniles, including homicide, but like other states, it varied

in practice. Some courts prosecuted juvenile criminal offenses as “delinquency,” using a training school as a de facto detention facility, then retried the same person for homicide once they reached legal adulthood.

This type of delayed adult sanction tended to fall disproportionately on Black youth.³² For example, in June 1940, a San Antonio judge sentenced 18-year-old Black defendant, Lavernia Manning to two years in prison for a burglary committed as a juvenile, after holding her in county jail until she aged out.³³ In other cases, a juvenile delinquency proceeding might include features of adult criminal court such as a jury, attorneys, and an adversarial search for proof of a crime along with an exploration of root causes for juvenile misbehavior.³⁴ An unspoken but pivotal fact in Haywood’s case was the race of her victim. Had Carrie Lee Thompson been White, it is easy to imagine age-based protections dissolving in the face of public anger. Instead, the public—and particularly the White public—was barely aware of this case as it played out.

The Haywood trial opened with jury selection on the morning of May 11, 1939, in the Bexar County Court. “About 200 negroes crowded into the courtroom” as Judge Charles W. Anderson gaveled the court to order, with an assistant district attorney on hand for the prosecution.³⁵ For perhaps the first time in her young life, Haywood received support, in the form of two attorneys provided by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Youth Council. Formed within the previous year to mobilize against inequality in child welfare and juvenile justice, the Youth Council was one of several chapters in Texas cities.³⁶

Haywood’s legal team found a somewhat sympathetic audience in Judge Anderson. Barely six months into his first term, Anderson instituted sweeping reforms of the county’s

juvenile justice system that included the addition of professional psychiatrists, social workers, and juvenile probation officers, and an investigation of conditions in the county's juvenile training schools.³⁷ "The first jury trial in a juvenile case presided over by Judge Anderson" tested Anderson's reformism.³⁸

Two days of testimony from eyewitnesses and teachers—summarized by a reporter for the *Register* from the courtroom—resulted in a finding of "juvenile delinquency." The court ruled that Haywood was "incorrigible" and "guilty of immoral conduct in public places," specifying the stabbing murder "with malice aforethought." In addition, the court concluded that Haywood "knowingly associates with thieves and idle persons," and "habitually wanders about the streets... in the night time without being on any business or occupation."³⁹

The question confronting Anderson was placement rather than guilt. After the Texas State Training School for Girls refused to admit Haywood, "county officials were perplexed. . . as to what they would do with the negro girl."⁴⁰ Noting that state law did not "specify" any racial exclusion, Anderson urged the state legislature to make some provision for Black girls. The issue was rendered moot when Haywood's attorneys successfully won a new trial on a technicality from the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals. The county court had failed to specify her age, an oversight that would have been unlikely in the case of a White defendant, whose age would have been treated as a mitigating factor reducing her culpability. This conspicuously casual error underscores, again, official neglect as a core feature of the "double aging" of Black girls by the juvenile justice system.

A second trial and conviction in May 1940 led to a war of words between Anderson and state officials, who insisted they could not admit "additional negro inmates" due to "overcrowded conditions"—a thoroughly disingenuous statement given that the training school

never had admitted a single Black girl in its twenty-five-year existence. “There are murderers and burglars running loose on the streets in San Antonio and other parts of the state,” thundered Anderson, invoking racialized fears of crime, “because we have no place to incarcerate them.”⁴¹ The struggle dragged on for two years, even as Haywood remained free on bond.

Finally, in May 1942, Anderson had Haywood (now seventeen years old) placed in the Bexar County School for Girls.⁴² For its part, the *Register* offered a more nuanced critique that placed protected childhood on equal footing alongside public safety:

The very least that can be done for [Haywood] will be to remove her from that environment, those influences that have been conducive to her downfall. Every effort should be made to salvage the girl for a future, law-abiding place in society, to put her on the right road. It may not be done, it may not even be possible, in a training and corrective institution. It certainly cannot be done if she is returned to the same environment which has already been a contributing factor to her delinquency – and reassured that she (and the thought goes for all other wayward children) can do anything she likes – even murder! – and nothing can be done about it! . . . It goes without saying that, from Texas’ million Negroes, there are other untoward girls who might, if they are detected in time, be saved from the torments of a murder trial.⁴³

This passage portrayed Haywood as both a dangerous and sympathetic figure who existed outside the *Register*’s middle-class perspective. For the editors, she symbolized the city’s failure to provide adequate public safety for the Black community, a form of official neglect that implicitly undermined respect for authority among other youth. The passage also noted the state’s failure to provide preventive services during Haywood’s troubled childhood. Thus, the state’s “dereliction,” the “situation that has lasted for generations,” encompassed not only the lack of juvenile detention facilities but also the full scope of child welfare services. The editorial concluded by exhorting its readers to organize for the establishment of a training school for Black delinquent girls. In fact, such a campaign had been ongoing for nearly three decades,

launched by the Texas Federation of Colored Women's Clubs (TFCWC) in 1906 and joined by many other organizations over time, including the NAACP in the mid-1930s.⁴⁴

In 1927, the state legislature had authorized the construction of a state school for Black delinquent girls but appropriated no funds for it. In San Antonio, local groups tried to fill the void; the local TFCWC chapter managed to raise enough funds to purchase a building in the city in 1920 but were unable to renovate it adequately.⁴⁵ In 1945, a church group opened a training school in a converted building formerly owned by the Bellinger family – one of the wealthiest and politically powerful local Black families. Indeed, Valmo Bellinger, publisher of the *Register*, was listed as the school's inaugural president.⁴⁶ The Haywood case helped re-energize the statewide campaign for a training school at the end of World War II. Finally, in 1947, the state of Texas opened its first statewide training school for Black delinquent girls, in a repurposed Nazi prisoner-of-war camp located in the town of Brady, west of Austin.⁴⁷

Odessa Haywood likely benefited little from any of these advances; she disappears from the historical record after 1942. Her NAACP-provided attorneys managed to keep her out of the county jail or state prison; her name does not appear in any inmate records. Her difficult childhood, punctuated by a racialized pattern of neglect from child welfare, educational, and juvenile justice agencies, culminated in the brutal, and preventable, murder of another young person.

But White observers, even somewhat sympathetic ones such as Judge Anderson, appeared to have viewed the case through the intersectional prism of raced and gendered characteristics that cast Black adolescent girls as innately aggressive, defiant, and dangerous—terms attributed to adults, not developing children. These same White publics considered Black girls to be incapable of change, fully formed, and akin to hardened adult criminals. In this view,

the most important lesson of the Haywood case was the lack of a secure facility to protect the public from the threats posed by Black delinquent girls.

The local Black community, frustrated by a “situation that had existed for generations,”⁴⁸ mobilized against this version of Black adolescent girlhood. They insisted that Haywood and other Black girls be treated *as* children and adolescents, commensurate with their chronological age. For them, the Haywood case exposed the state’s malign neglect of Black children. For us, it illustrates the human cost of double age —how White assumptions about race and gender combined to exclude Black girls from the protections extended to White children, exposing them to the very dangers the juvenile justice system was invented to prevent.

1. “Woman is Fatally Stabbed During Row,” *San Antonio Light*, April 16, 1939; “Juvenile’s Trial Continues Today,” *San Antonio Express News*, May 12, 1939. This essay uses “girl” to describe Haywood and Thompson, both of whom were high school students at the time of the murder, and were clearly understood as “girls” in their own community. This usage highlights their chronological age as adolescents deserving some measure of protection by the state, consistent with Progressive-era “child saving” reforms routinely denied to Black girls. See Crystal Webster, “The History of Black Girls and the Field of Black Girlhood Studies: At the Forefront of Academic Scholarship,” *The American Historian*, (March 2020): <https://www.oah.org/tah/issues/2020/the-history-of-girlhood/the-history-of-black-girls-and-the-field-of-black-girlhood-studies-at-the-forefront-of-academic/>.

2. “Now Is The Time to Act!” *San Antonio Register*, May 19, 1939.

3. Susan K. Cahn, *Sexual Reckonings: Southern Girls in a Troubling Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012), 45-46, 68-97; Vernetta D. Young and Rebecca Reviere, “Black

Club Women and the Establishment of Juvenile Justice Institutions for Colored Children: A Black Feminist Approach,” *The Western Journal of Black Studies* 39, no. 2 (Summer 2015): 105.

4. Anthony M. Platt, *The Child Savers: The Invention of Delinquency* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969). On the broader history of racialization of childhood, see Robin Bernstein, *Racial Innocence: Performing American Childhood from Slavery to Civil Rights* (New York: New York University Press, 2011); Crystal Lynn Webster, *Beyond the Boundaries of Childhood: African American Children in the Antebellum North* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2021). Studies exploring the racialization of childhood in juvenile justice include Geoff K. Ward, *The Black Child-Savers: Racial Democracy and Juvenile Justice* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012); Miroslava Chávez-García, *States of Delinquency: Race and Science in the Making of California’s Juvenile Justice System* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2012); Tera Eva Agyepong, *The Criminalization of Black Children: Race, Gender, and Delinquency in Chicago’s Juvenile Justice System, 1899-1945* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2018); Carl Suddler, *Presumed Criminal: Black Youth and the Justice System in Postwar New York* (New York: New York University Press, 2019); and, William S. Bush, *Who Gets a Childhood?: Race and Juvenile Justice in Twentieth-Century Texas* (Athens, University of Georgia Press, 2010). On the concept of protected childhood, see Michael Grossberg, “A ‘protected childhood’: The Emergence of Child Protection in America,” in *American Public Life and the Historical Imagination*, eds. Wendy Gamber, Michael Grossberg, and Hendrik Hartog (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003), 213-39. See also Steven J. Mintz, *Huck’s Raft: A History of American Childhood* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005).

5. Bush, *Who Gets a Childhood*, 15-21.

6. See particularly Young and Reviere, “Black Club Women,” and Agyepong, *The Criminalization of Black Childhood*, 26-35.

7. Corinne T. Field and Nicholas L. Syrett, “Age and the Construction of Gendered and Raced Citizenship in the United States,” Roundtable: “Chronological Age: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis,” eds. Corrine T. Field and Nicholas L. Syrett, *American Historical Review* 125, no. 2 (April 2020): 440.

8. For a historical overview of Black San Antonio in this period, see Kenneth Mason, *African Americans and Race Relations in San Antonio, Texas, 1867-1937* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1998).

9. “Girl, Death Blade Wielder, Convicted,” *San Antonio Register*, May 19, 1939;

10. United States of America, Bureau of the Census. Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930. Washington, D.C.: National Archives and Records Administration, 1930. San Antonio, Bexar, Texas; Page: 11A; Enumeration District: 0122; FHL microfilm: 2342031.

11. “Girl, Death Blade Wielder.”

12. Bush, *Who Gets a Childhood*, 56-58.

13. “Girl, Death Blade Wielder.”

14. “Name Probation Officers,” *San Antonio Light*, March 5, 1908, 3.

15. In 1917, the Texas legislature created juvenile boards for the state’s four largest cities, including San Antonio, comprised of district and county judges. *Vernon’s Texas Civil Statutes*, 1925, Art. 5137; Meeting Minutes, Bexar County Juvenile Board, July 28 and October 13, 1917, and March 23, 1918; and, Bexar County Juvenile Probation Scrapbooks, courtesy of the Bexar County Juvenile Probation Department.

16. This pattern was consistent with national trends in Progressive Era juvenile justice, by which girls comprised a small percentage of overall juvenile court cases, but drew outsized attention from authorities due to widespread anxieties about gender norms and especially female sexuality. For a survey of this vast literature, see William S. Bush, ed., “Revisiting Stephen Schlossman and Stephanie Wallach, ‘The Crime of Precocious Sexuality: Female Juvenile Delinquency in the Progressive Era’ (1978),” *Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth* 2, no. 1 (Winter 2009): 85-126.

17. Meeting Minutes, Bexar County Juvenile Board, March 1, 1919.

18. Meeting Minutes, Bexar County Juvenile Board, June 15, 1918.

19 Letter, Alexander Joske to County Judge J.R. Davis, August 15, 1918; Minutes, Bexar County Commissioner’s Court, August 16, 1918 (Vol. W, 1917-19, pp 382-383).

20. Letter, Alexander Joske to County Judge J.R. Davis; “Resolution on Donation of Alexander Joske of \$15,000.00 for the Construction and Equipping of a Home for Delinquent Girls,” August 16, 1918; Minutes, Bexar County Commissioner’s Court, August 16, 1918 (Vol. W, 1917-19, pp 382-383).

21. “Henrietta Joske Memorial Home is Planned,” *San Antonio Light*, December 1, 1918; Letter, Mayor Sam C. Bell to County Judge James R. Davis, May 29, 1919; Minutes, Bexar County Commissioner’s Court, June 2, 1919 (Vol. W, 1917-19, pp 623-624).

22. Report of Superintendent Elizabeth R. Forrest, Joske Memorial Home for Girls, to the Bexar County Juvenile Board, November 2, 1935. Meeting Minutes, Bexar County Juvenile Board.

23. Meeting Minutes, Bexar County Juvenile Board, June 21, 1934.

24. “Girl, Death Blade Wielder.”

-
25. "Four Month Fuss Ends in Death for Girl," *San Antonio Register*, April 21, 1939.
26. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940* (Population Schedule), Texas, p2930. Courtesy of the Bexar County Spanish Archives.
27. "Girl, Death Blade Wielder."
28. "Girl, Death Blade Wielder."
29. "Girl, Death Blade Wielder."
30. Carrie Lee Thompson death certificate, April 18, 1939. Bureau of Vital Statistics, Texas Department of Health. "Girl Victim of Fifteen-Year-Old Knifer is Buried," *San Antonio Register*, April 19, 1939.
31. David S. Tanenhaus and Steven A. Drizin, "'Owing to the Extreme Youth of the Accused': The Changing Legal Response to Juvenile Homicide," *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 92, no. 3-4 (2002): 641-705.
32. Agyepong, *The Criminalization of Black Children*, 62-69.
33. "Gets Two Years," *San Antonio Register*, June 21, 1940.
34. *The Juvenile Offender and the Texas Law: A Handbook*, rev. ed. ([location]: University of Texas, 1966), 47-51.
35. "Open Trial of Negro Girl, 15," *San Antonio Light*, May 11, 1939.
36. Bush, *Who Gets a Childhood*, 72-73.
37. "Judge Institutes New Plan for Handling Juvenile Cases," *San Antonio Express*, January 22, 1939.
38. "Juvenile's Trial Continues Today," *San Antonio Express*, May 12, 1939.
39. *Haywood v. State of Texas*, 138 Tex. Crim. 413; 136 S.W.2d 866.

-
40. "Where to Confine Delinquent Negro Girl Problem of Court," *San Antonio Express*, May 13, 1939; "Negro Girl Sent to Gainesville School," *San Antonio Light*, May 13, 1939.
41. "Jury Picked in Girl's Death Trial," *San Antonio Light*, May 16, 1940; "Girl, 16, Guilty in Stab Death," *San Antonio Light*, May 17, 1940.
42. "Delinquent Girl Problem Back With County," *San Antonio Express*, March 7, 1942; "Negro Girl Committed to Bexar County Home," *San Antonio Express*, April 1, 1942.
43. "Now Is the Time to Act!" *San Antonio Register*, May 19, 1939.
44. Ruthe Winegarten, *Black Texas Women: 150 Years of Trial and Triumph* (University of Texas, 1995), 195-196; Bush, *Who Gets a Childhood*, 72-78.
45. Winegarten, *Black Texas Women*; "City Federation of Colored Women's Clubs," *San Antonio Register*, July 24, 1936.
46. "Delinquent Girls Home Opens," *San Antonio Register*, February 9, 1945.
47. For the full story of the training school campaign and the school's early struggles, see chapter 3 of Bush, *Who Gets a Childhood*, 71-92.
48. "Now Is the Time to Act!" *San Antonio Register*, May 19, 1939.