

1955

Pioneers in Criminology V--John Haviland (1792-1852)

Norman B. Johnston

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

Norman B. Johnston, Pioneers in Criminology V--John Haviland (1792-1852), 45 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 509 (1954-1955)

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 Journal of
CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY, AND POLICE SCIENCE

VOL. 45

January-February 1955

NO. 5

PIONEERS IN CRIMINOLOGY

V. John Haviland (1792-1852)

NORMAN B. JOHNSTON

The author is a member of the Department of Sociology in the University of Pennsylvania. Prior to 1951 he was with the Illinois Penitentiary system and has visited extensively European and Central American prisons. For the past two years he has been engaged in research on prison architecture, particularly of the 19th century. In this article, Mr. Johnston presents some little-known facts about this most influential of all prison architects, evaluates his achievements, and speculates on the implications of Haviland's work for modern day penology.

The original engraving from which the picture below has been made is in the *Pennsylvania Journal of Prison Discipline*, Vol. VII, No. 3, (July, 1852)—EDITOR.

In a cherry orchard on the northern outskirts of Philadelphia construction was begun in 1821 on John Haviland's Eastern State Penitentiary. It was to be the first large-scale experiment ever attempted with the newly-emerging Pennsylvania System of solitary confinement day and night with work in the cells. Even before it was half completed, the Eastern Penitentiary became a *cause célèbre* among reformers and the object of world-wide interest and investigation. For the remainder of the 19th century this prison along with others designed by the same architect, became the model for Almost all the newly-developing centralized prison systems



JOHN HAVILAND

in Europe and South America, and later in Asia. Much has been written about the Pennsylvania System, which had a brief and stormy career in America but has enjoyed more prestige on the Continent. However, almost nothing is known about the architect of this system, a man who must be ranked as the most important architect of any period in prison building. It is the object therefore, to bring together in this paper some of the previously unavailable information on Haviland's personal life, the historical antecedents of his influential plans, their progressive development out of his early associations with the Philadelphia reformers, and his effect upon penology, particularly during the 19th century.

Haviland was born on December 15, 1792, in Somersetshire, in the southwest of England. After showing some aptitude for mathematics and art, he was sent by his family to London to study under the well-known architect, James Elmes. Although neither Haviland nor Elmes apparently ever was responsible for prisons in England, Elmes published a small pamphlet on prison planning in 1817 in which he revealed a careful reading of John Howard's works and a general interest in prison reform, which he may have passed on to his pupil. Following the pattern of many talented young men of that period, Haviland left England in 1815 to visit St. Petersburg and the court of Alexander I. He had originally intended to enter the Imperial Engineers and had made the trip at the invitation of the Minister of Marine, Count Morduinoff, who was also an uncle by marriage. It is not clear just what made Haviland decide not to remain in Russia. However while at the court he met Sir George von Sonntag, a former Philadelphian, who was currently both an admiral and a general in the Czar's military establishment, and it may have been he who urged the young architect to embark for the United States. At any rate Haviland arrived in Philadelphia in 1816, armed with letters of introduction to President Monroe and others, written by von Sonntag and John Quincy Adams, then United States Minister to Russia.

Haviland immediately opened a school of architectural drawing and began to get commissions for churches, public buildings and private residences. In 1818 he submitted designs for a proposed Western Penitentiary to be built near Pittsburgh, but his plans were passed over in favor of a circular type of prison designed by another young Britisher, William Strickland. In 1821 the Legislature of Pennsylvania authorized the Eastern Penitentiary, and this time Haviland's plans won the competition. However there was considerable dissension among the Building Commissioners for the new prison and it wasn't until 1823 that he was appointed official architect and his entire plan approved. He continued to supervise construction of the prison which went on intermittently until 1836.

The Eastern Penitentiary, which came to be known as Cherry Hill, became famous and controversial even as it was being erected, and lifted Haviland from relative obscurity to international renown. During the 1830's he became a veritable commuting architect-contractor. Busy with the large-scale construction at Cherry Hill as well as with many important public and private buildings in the Philadelphia area and a new naval asylum at what is now Portsmouth, Virginia, Haviland soon found himself traveling to Pittsburgh, Trenton and New York City as well. Almost from the beginning, the unusual ring of cells which composed the Western Penitentiary at Pittsburgh had proved unworkable, and in the early 1830's, Haviland was engaged to tear down the interior of this prison and reconstruct it along the lines of his Eastern

Penitentiary. He was at the same time superintending the construction of a court building and detention center in New York City, which later came to be known as the "Tombs" because of its heavy Egyptian style—the name persisting even in subsequent structures. On his trips to New York Haviland would stop at Trenton where he was building a new state prison. During the same decade Haviland designed state penitentiaries in Rhode Island and Missouri and a county jail and court house in Newark, New Jersey. He also submitted plans for the District of Columbia prison and state prisons for Arkansas and Louisiana but these designs were never used.

By 1839 Haviland had no important projects to occupy him, and among his papers we find letters to officials in England, France and Mexico offering his services for various prison building projects. His dissatisfaction with his adopted homeland seen in these letters was undoubtedly short lived. By the following year he again found himself busy building prisons. Certain counties in Pennsylvania had been authorized by law to construct their own prisons, and following the lead of Philadelphia County, one after another of the more populous and wealthy counties decided to replace unsafe jails with new county penitentiaries. In 1840 the county prison at Harrisburg was begun under Haviland, in 1846 the one at Reading, and his last prison was begun in 1849 at Lancaster and completed just before his death.

Not much is known concerning Haviland's family life. Shortly after his arrival in Philadelphia he had married a sister of General von Sonntag. There were three children, a daughter, Mary, and two sons, John, Jr., and Edward. John studied law and later emigrated to England. Edward, also, was admitted to the bar but later turned to architecture, designing several county prisons in the style made famous by his father.¹

On March 28, 1852 Haviland died suddenly of apoplexy at his home in Philadelphia, and was buried in the family vault at St. Andrew's Church in that city.

HAVILAND'S TASK

This bare recital of the facts of Haviland's life contributes little to an understanding of the reasons for his influence and fame during this period. For this we must turn back to a more detailed consideration of the circumstances surrounding the building of the Eastern Penitentiary and the influence it had on subsequent prison construction.

Beginning with the advanced Quaker penal code instituted by William Penn in 1682 which declared the reform of the offender to be more important than his punishment, the colony of Pennsylvania had always shown an interest in the problem of the law breaker. Although Penn's code was repealed after his death, humanitarian thought and advanced European ideas combined to make Philadelphia in Revolutionary times the center of prison reform agitation. Imprisonment became the penalty for more and more offenses instead of death or mutilation. In 1790 the famous Walnut Street Jail came under joint county and state control and a decade of advanced penal

¹ This similarity has led to considerable confusion and the two prisons completed in 1855 by Edward for York and Cumberland counties have variously been credited to his father and to a brother of John Haviland living in America: A description of these prisons as well as a letter written by the architect in which he discusses his debt to his father, can be found in *PA. JOURNAL OF PRISON DISCIPLINE*, Vol. X, No. 2 (April, 1855), pp. 57-93.

administration was launched. A "Penitentiary House" was constructed in the yard of the prison to house 16 prisoners in solitary confinement, presumably the worst offenders among the prisoners. The Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons, as well as many prominent citizens such as Benjamin Rush and Benjamin Franklin, constantly urged the State Legislature to relieve the overcrowding at Walnut Street by the construction of state penitentiaries. As the result of these efforts and complaints from the western counties who had to bear the expense of transporting prisoners to Philadelphia, the Western Penitentiary was authorized and in 1818 near Pittsburgh construction began on a prison to provide solitary confinement day and night. In March of 1821 Cherry Hill was authorized by the Legislature for the eastern half of the state.

What sort of prison did the reformers want to be built in Philadelphia? As the result of experience at Walnut Street and early trials at Pittsburgh, the religious beliefs of the Quakers, and the new humanitarian philosophy so much in the air in Europe and America, the idea of reformation was coming to be regarded as more important than punishment. Men and women, convicts and detainees had been separated at Walnut Street. But for the new prisons each man was to have a separate cell. Every effort was to be made to avoid contacts with fellow prisoners because the Quaker reformers were well aware of the ill effects of contacts among prisoners and their continuing friendships once released. For the criminal already imprisoned, isolation from his fellow men was to prevent harmful corruption, protect his good resolutions, and give him ample opportunity to ponder on his mistakes and make his peace with God. If this were not effective, once the man was released the memory of this complete and awful isolation would be sufficiently terrifying to deter him from further crimes. Likewise the prospect of solitary confinement plus the grim and forbidding appearance of the prison itself would serve as a powerful deterrent to the potential offender. Solitary confinement day and night became, then, the Quaker solution to the problem of rehabilitation as well as the deterrence of potential law breakers.

Whether or not the prisoners should be compelled or allowed to work during their confinement was still a disputed point when the first Western Penitentiary was opened, and prisoners were not provided work. But increasing difficulties with inmates who became physically and mentally ill, as well as the high costs of maintenance which resulted from complete solitary confinement without work, eventually forced a change of policy. By the time the first prisoners were admitted to the Eastern Penitentiary in 1829 legislation had provided that prisoners must work in their cells. The Pennsylvania System as it came to be known, was becoming fully articulated at this point.

The Eastern Penitentiary act of 1821 authorized construction of a prison to house 250 in solitary confinement. (Later supplementary legislation provided for more cells, more than doubling this initial capacity.) It was to be constructed on the Pittsburgh plan "subject to such alterations and improvements as the said commissioners . . . with the approbation of the Governor, approve and direct, *provided always, that the principle of the solitary confinement of the prisoners be preserved and maintained.*"²

The new state prison at Pittsburgh had been operating too short a time to provide

² THOMAS B. McELWEE, *A CONCISE HISTORY OF THE EASTERN PENITENTIARY*, Phila.: Neall & Massey, 1835, Vol. I, p. 283.

any valuable experience upon which Haviland could draw when he designed Cherry Hill. As an architect his task therefore was to plan a building for the first large scale experiment in a new kind of penal treatment. Some of the problems could be anticipated with ease, others could not. The main job was to create cell-blocks where prisoners could be kept completely isolated from one another in surroundings which would not be injurious to their health but would prove secure from escape, the whole of which would be easily accessible to constant inspection by guards.

Haviland chose a peculiar radial type of layout for the prison consisting of a central hub with seven wings converging on it and connected to the center building by covered passage ways. It is this most obvious and perhaps spectacular aspect of Haviland's plan, easily recognizable in later prisons modeled after Cherry Hill, which is usually regarded as his great and original contribution to prison construction. That is not quite accurate, as we shall see in the following sections.

EVOLUTION OF THE RADIAL PLAN

Within the space limits of this paper it is not possible to trace the gradual development of the radial plan on the Continent prior to its introduction into the United States by Haviland. However, a few observations must be made in the interests of perspective. The latter half of the 18th century in Europe, particularly in England, saw a great amount of local prison construction, particularly for detention after trial for petty offenders. At first these local jails were simply strong buildings with a series of large rooms, but the writings of John Howard and others forced a reexamination of the whole process of penal treatment which included a greater interest in the design of the institutions themselves. The great preoccupation on the part of the reformers with the whole matter of proper surveillance of prisoners by guards led to the development of two more or less distinct types of prison layout—the circular and the radial or star shaped.

The circular, appearing somewhat earlier in a few mental hospitals and factories, was first systematically set forth by the great English criminal law reformer, Jeremy Bentham, when he published in 1790 his proposals for a "Panopticon House". This vast circular structure of cast iron and glass was never erected but the idea was partially carried out in a much altered form in the Edinburgh House of Correction, and in "Panopticons" in Holland, Spain and Germany. Later in the United States Bentham's ideas influenced the designs of the first Virginia Penitentiary, the first Western Penitentiary at Pittsburgh, and, many years later, the new Illinois State Penitentiary at Stateville.

Far more common than the circular plan however, and the layout generally approved by the various prison societies, was the radial plan. While structures appeared here and there in Europe which had been designed to allow some kind of inspection from a central vantage point, the first truly radial prisons were designed by an English architect William Blackburn in the early 1790's. These and the prisons which followed them generally consisted of a keeper's house in the center with four detached cellblocks radiating from it.³ Mental hospitals also engaged in a vast build-

³ An idea of the layouts of these early English prisons can be got from several sources: the richest in plans and diagrams is a pamphlet issued by the London Society for Improvement of Prison Discipline in 1826, entitled *REMARKS ON THE FORM AND CONSTRUCTION OF PRISONS WITH APPROPRIATE*

ing program during this period, and some of these also were built along radial lines, with the wings often joined to the center building. A proposed "Lunatic Asylum" plan, published in London in 1814 when Haviland was in that city studying architecture, clearly indicates that the radial plan was almost fully developed at that time. Model prison plans published the following several years show the same six or seven wing radiating pattern although usually the wings were separate from the center building. This center structure was used to house cells, service facilities, or more usually, a combination of warden's quarters and a chapel.

HAVILAND BUILDS A PRISON

In Haviland's originally submitted designs, the arrangement of the prison then was largely an adaptation of the most approved type of plans which were being publicized by the prison reform groups in his native country during his architectural novitiate. His original plans for the Eastern Penitentiary called for an elaborate front building to house administrative offices and quarters for the staff. This structure was designed in a heavy Gothic style complete with iron portcullis and an 80 foot bell tower. Originally the central rotunda was to house cells, a laundry, bake house, and below these a series of dungeons each with a private entrance from the floor above and a fireplace.⁴ Fortunately, by the time construction was begun, the architect decided to make an open inspection hall of this center building, a nerve center for the prison from which vantage point guards could view all the corridors of the prison. The first three cellblocks constructed were single story, each containing about 40 large cells. Entry to the cells was not from the cellhouse corridor but from the outside of the buildings, through the 20 foot long exercise yards which were attached to each cell. Every cell contained a flush toilet, water tap, a bunk on chains against the wall, and equipment for the prisoner's work activities. The remaining 4 cellblocks of Haviland's design were two stories in height and access to cells was by means of double doors opening into the corridors, the previous arrangement having soon been found too inconvenient.

Haviland, probably more than any of the prison architects who preceded him, expended much thought and ingenuity on the design of his prison, and seemed to be more aware of some of the everyday problems of prison life than many of his colleagues. For example, to minimize escapes he placed a tower atop the central rotunda from which a guard had an unobstructed view of all the roofs, exercise yards and open spaces of the prison. Only one gate was provided in the outer wall to minimize the risk of escapes. The stones which made up the floors of the cells were joined only beneath the thick stone partition walls so such joints would not be exposed to digging efforts on the part of prisoners. Light for the cells was provided by narrow skylights in the ceilings too narrow for a man to slip through. Haviland also gave much atten-

DESIGNS, London, J. & A. Arch. This work unfortunately is not easily available but good prose descriptions are contained in JAMES NEILD'S STATE OF THE PRISONS IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND & WALES, published in London in 1812 by John Nichols & Son. The first cited work gives considerable evidence, bearing out data from other sources, to indicate the distinctive role of the little-known Blackburn in developing radial prisons. See especially p. 17.

⁴ HAVILAND PAPERS, mss., Univ. of Pa. Library. This early description appears in a Journal Book kept by the architect (labeled no. 1 in the collection) under an entry dated July 2, 1821.

tion to the problem of communication among prisoners. He provided the first large scale use of flush toilets in this country to obviate the contacts which would otherwise have resulted from convicts emptying toilet buckets or being escorted to central privies. The problem of communication through the heating system proved more difficult. After considerable experimentation with hot air ducts and various arrangements of hot water pipes, Haviland was satisfied before he had completed Cherry Hill that this problem had been reduced to a minimum.

THE IMITATORS

What were the consequences of Haviland's prisons? This question must be answered separately with reference to North America and to the rest of the world. From the beginning, Cherry Hill had become the tangible symbol of the emergent Pennsylvania System of solitary confinement. This highly controversial method of treatment was inextricably linked with the physical structure which Haviland had created. In the few prisons which Haviland designed outside Pennsylvania brief attempts were made to carry out the system of continual solitary treatment but these experiments were abandoned within a few years. Only in its parent state was the Pennsylvania System retained for any number of years in the United States. It was its arch rival, the Auburn System, consisting of solitary at night and congregate work in silence during the day, which was to be adopted almost universally in North America. And with it, the Auburn cell-block was widely copied—inside cells, back to back on tiers, and only large enough to house a bunk and toilet bucket. It is this lengthy rectangular type of cell-block which has become standard in most U.S. prison plants. In a few institutions Auburn-type blocks radiate from a central rotunda, as exemplified in the old reformatories of Michigan, Indiana and New Jersey, and in the more recently constructed U.S. Disciplinary Barracks at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, built in the 1930's.

Although Haviland's prisons never were a direct major influence on American prison architecture, it is one of those strange tricks of history and cultural diffusion that the radial plan, originally developed in English and Continental prisons, was not widely recognized or accepted for large scale prisons until it had first been transplanted to America by Haviland and then reintroduced to European reformers by the many observers and commissioners sent here by their various governments. Soon after the first three cell-blocks were finished at the Eastern Penitentiary, the governments of Great Britain, France, Prussia, Russia, Belgium and several other nations sent representatives to evaluate the rival American experiments, and particularly Cherry Hill. Almost without exception their reports favored the latter, and it seems safe to assume that the high quality of the architecture which Haviland linked with the system was one of the more important factors in its widespread acceptance throughout the rest of the world.

On designs submitted by Haviland, which were substantially those of his New Jersey Penitentiary at Trenton, Britain built the famous Pentonville Prison in the 1840's. One authority has estimated that in the six years following its construction, 54 new prisons with 11,000 cells were built after its general design in Britain alone.⁵

⁵ JOHN R. THOMAS, *Prison Architecture*, PROC. ANNUAL CONGRESS OF NATIONAL PRISON ASS'N. 1891, p. 151.

These prisons, which form the bulk of Britain's present plant, faithfully adhered to details of cell and cell-house construction found at Trenton and the Eastern Penitentiary, even when departing from the strictly radial plan itself.

This story could be repeated in most other European countries. Some of the prisons, built usually in the remaining decades of the 19th century, bore a very striking resemblance to Cherry Hill, particularly the famous Moabit prison in Berlin, the prison of the *Rue de la Santé* in Paris, and St. Gilles in Belgium. Generally by the end of this century most prison construction in Europe had ceased and new forms, the so-called "telephone-pole" plan developed at Fresnes and small farm colonies, were superseding the radial. In spite of this, Haviland's designs continue to inspire the builders of prisons; for example, during the past several years the Spanish government has been building a huge provincial prison in Madrid, consisting of seven cell-houses arranged about a central rotunda in a radial fashion.⁶

The development of prison architecture in South America has followed a course similar to that of Europe. Most of the national penitentiaries in the capital cities show "the definite and unmistakable concepts of John Haviland. . . . The central rotunda with emanating cell-blocks is present in all, and practically all cells are of outside construction." These "Panópticos" have generally been taken from European models which were in turn patterned after Haviland's designs. Prison reform came later to the Orient and it was not until 1912 that the Peking Model Prison received its first prisoners.⁸ This first of the Chinese radial prisons was built after intensive study of European prisons.

HAVILAND'S CONTRIBUTIONS

This brief review of prison building before and after Cherry Hill brings out two important facts: first, we must conclude that Haviland, often regarded as the innovator of radial prison design, brought with him from his home country the most recent experiences and ideas for this type of prison arrangement which had been developing in Europe since at least 1780; secondly, that in spite of its origins, it was not until the construction of Cherry Hill, that the radial plan received widespread and articulate approval and adoption in large scale prison construction. What then has been Haviland's contribution?

Perhaps Haviland more than any other prison architect before or after him was aware of what functions the prison building was expected to serve and how these could best be accomplished architecturally. Up to that time any architect who had designed successful theaters or state houses was felt competent to design a successful prison as well. (Such an attitude unfortunately has not completely disappeared in the ensuing years.) The dismal failures of some of these efforts and Haviland's notable successes did much to change these notions. We have already seen the precautions

⁶ MEMORIA, *Ministerio de Justicia (Spain)*, *Dirección General de Prisiones*, Madrid, 1952, pp. 153, 163 ff.

⁷ NEGLEY K. TEETERS, *PENOLOGY FROM PANAMA TO CAPE HORN*, Philadelphia: Univ. of Pa. Press for Temple Univ., 1946, p. 8.

⁸ SIDNEY D. GAMBLE and J. S. BURGESS, *PEKING: A SOCIAL SURVEY*, New York: Geo. H. Doran, Co., 1921. A photo of this prison appears opposite p. 311.

he took to make the prison secure from escape, and as a result his prison was remarkably secure in comparison with contemporary structures, and in fact after over 130 years the original buildings, unaltered except for additions, are still used to house maximum security prisoners in Pennsylvania.

Because the success of the Pennsylvania System relied more heavily than others on the construction and design of the cell itself due to the fact the prisoner spent his entire sentence there, Haviland gave considerable attention to preventing communication among prisoners, as well as to providing adequate light, warmth and ventilation, and sufficient space for exercise and work. Some important innovations in design were made also to facilitate communication among the prison staff as well as to improve their surveillance of prisoners. This was particularly true of his use of the central rotunda, apparently for the first time, as a sort of communications hub and nerve center of the prison, an idea which has been carried out in many prisons in the United States as well as in Europe, regardless of their plan.

In Cherry Hill the architect had succeeded in incorporating and combining many technical developments, and in so doing, set standards of space, plumbing and ventilation which were seldom equalled in prisons during the ensuing 75 years. Compared with the penitentiaries of their day, the prisons of Haviland were overwhelmingly superior, both technically and stylistically. Because of the widespread imitation of the Eastern and New Jersey penitentiaries, particularly in Europe, Haviland's great service to penology would seem to be not in publicizing the radial plan, which might or might not have caught on otherwise, but in establishing high standards of construction, standards which were to have an influence on almost all of the European prison construction during the entire 19th century and even down to the present time in some instances.

A word should be said concerning the style of Haviland's prisons because some modern criminologists have heaped abuse on Cherry Hill and other penitentiaries of that period for establishing the "fortress school" of prison architecture, which is suggested by the heavy and forbidding Gothic which accents security and the punitive nature of imprisonment. It should be kept in mind however that far from being oblivious to the effects of such a style, Haviland and his contemporaries found it admirably suited to the atmosphere which the reformers sought to create. Haviland's teacher, James Elmes, in commenting on the design of the newly-built Newgate prison in London, wrote "without doubt the most appropriate and correct design in the metropolis or perhaps in Europe; for no one viewing this edifice can possibly mistake it for anything but a gaol, the openings as small as convenient, and the whole external aspect made as gloomy and melancholy as possible."⁹ And the Building Commissioners of Cherry Hill went on record as saying "the exterior of a solitary prison should exhibit as much as possible great strength and convey to the mind a cheerless blank indicative of the misery which awaits the unhappy being who enters within its walls."¹⁰

⁹ JAMES ELMES, *HINTS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF PRISONS*, London: W. Bulmer & Co., 1817, pp. 14-15.

¹⁰ *BOOK OF MINUTES OF THE BUILDING COMMISSIONERS*, bound ms. volume in archives of Eastern Penitentiary, Philadelphia, p. 115.

In the context of such a philosophy then, Haviland's choice of the heavy and gloomy Gothic and Egyptian styles used at Philadelphia and at Trenton seem to have been entirely appropriate. Such choices cannot be criticized in light of a changed, enlightened point of view concerning rehabilitative treatment which developed many years later.

THE PRISON STRUCTURE AND REHABILITATION

Even with this cursory view of early prison construction, particularly John Haviland's, it must be evident that the prison structure admirably fitted the penal philosophy of that day. What kind of building would have been better suited to keep men away from their fellow men during their entire sentence? What style could have been better calculated to deter the potential law breaker by its forbidding external appearance and make the prisoner think twice before committing new crimes once released? What sort of cell layout would have been better suited to the degree of maximum surveillance of men continually locked in their cells?

Modern penal philosophy rejects some (but not all) of these early Quaker theories of crime control as being naïve, oversimplified and certainly not in keeping with our present knowledge of human nature contributed by the various behavior sciences. What about our current prison structures? How closely do they reflect modern penal philosophy? With a few notable exceptions most present day institutions show little basic deviation from the early patterns of prison construction established at Philadelphia and Auburn 130 years ago. This is partly because some of the prison structures were built during an early period and for economic reasons must continue to be used.¹¹ But it is true also that the traditional cell-block and prison layout with minor variations has dominated prison construction right down to the present day, with the exception of the building programs of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and those of a few of the more progressive states. The great gulf between modern penal philosophy on the one hand and our prison buildings on the other, a condition which seems not to have been present in the prison building of the earth 19th century, can only partly be explained in terms of the inertia of tradition. Certain significant factors then operative no longer are. In the first half of the 19th century, particularly in Pennsylvania, New York and Massachusetts, prison reform was a problem which drew to it the keenest intellects, the most influential leaders of the community. Prison reform was in the air. No effort—financial, legislative or philanthropic—was too great to apply towards a solution of the newly—"discovered" problem of the criminal and his reformation. Today prison reform finds itself in the backwaters of society's problems, receiving little attention from community leaders except for brief periods following riots or scandals.

In addition, the formula of treatment in the 1800's was simple: keep men completely secluded so they can repent their sins and avoid contamination from fellow prisoners; teach them industry by compelling them to work and virtue by supplying them with religious instruction, and make the whole thing so unpleasant that, should all else fail, they will be deterred from further crime out of sheer hedonism. Such a

¹¹ James V. Bennett states that only 12 of the 152 state penal establishments are less than 50 years old. See *ANNALS AM. ACAD. OF POL. AND SOC. SCI.*, Vol. 293 (May, 1954) p. 13.

philosophy busy civic leaders, state legislators and practical architects could understand and translate into their own areas of action without much difficulty. But modern penal philosophy is characterized by inconsistencies of an Alice-in-Wonderland magnitude, tortuous by-ways of psychoanalytic theory and sociological statistics, and a tremendous complexity made necessary by our ever-increasing body of knowledge about human behavior. This has reached the point where all but the highly-specialized "expert" find the field almost inaccessible.

If modern prisons are ill-adapted to modern penal philosophy, does it really make any difference? How important is the physical structure anyway in limiting or encouraging the type of program which can be carried out inside its walls? This is a difficult question to answer with empirical evidence. Many prison administrators feel that bars, walls and other maximum security trappings definitely structure the spirit and determine the attitudes of both guards and inmates. It is obvious that the conventional prison allows little opportunity for classification, graded release (using degrees of security) special treatment for certain classes of offenders, education, industrial activities and other measures deemed essential by modern penologists. Above all the great size of the average American prison, of no great moment under earlier penal philosophies, makes present-day programs of differentiated treatment almost impossible. There is no doubt that progressive and intelligent leadership can do much to offset the harmful effects of an outmoded prison plant, and it is certainly true that a well-designed structure is no guarantee of the presence of the more intangible elements of rehabilitation. But it seems safe to assume that a prison system whose architecture is based upon a careful thinking through of the aims of modern correction can do much to keep these aims alive and effective. Perhaps it is not too much to ask that modern day architects make as great an effort as did John Haviland to build prison structures in harmony with a prison philosophy. One can only hope they will approach his success.