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A PENITENTIARY FOR THE STATE OF UTAH

During the last few decades penology has advanced at such a rapid rate that the majority of existing penitentiaries have become obsolete and incapable of fulfilling their proper function. This condition is prevalent in many states including Utah. A design of a small penitentiary which will permit the proper confinement and reformation of criminals is the aim of this thesis program.

The existing state penitentiary of Utah is located in a new residential suburb of Salt Lake City. It fails to properly fulfill its function. These conditions make it advisable to build a new penitentiary, rather than attempt to remodel the present building.

The State of Utah owns sufficient land that practically any size or type of plot is available.

The only requirement of this thesis is that adequate provision be made for 500 prisoners.

It is suggested that possible future expansion be considered in the design.
In 1870 the federal government established a prison on the outskirts of Salt Lake City, Utah. This prison was under the control of the federal government until 1879 due to the fact that Utah was still a territory. In the year 1879 Utah was admitted to the Union. In the same year the prison was turned over to the State under whose jurisdiction it has remained.

The original cell block was built to accommodate about one hundred and twenty prisoners. This old cell block has no modern sanitation, and still falls back on the old "bucket-system." A new cell house was later built. It contains two hundred rooms, each with a toilet and basin. The group is surrounded by a wall, 450 feet long by 200 feet wide, but more of this later.

Concerning the condition of the prison today. I am going to quote a section from the report of the Utah warden, R. E. Davis in his Biennial Report of June 30, 1930.

"On account of old and worn out condition of most of the buildings, it has been necessary to spend considerable money for repairing roofs, plumbing, painting etc. The old fire wall in roof of cell house Number II was torn down and eaves were put in its place." Following this is a long list of necessary repairs, but more valuable for our problem is his recommendation.
"In my last two Biennial Reports I have recommended the removal of the Prison to a large and more suitable location, and that a new modern Prison be erected, large enough to accommodate the increasing prison population for years to come, and so arranged that segregation of inmates would be possible, and means provided so that every inmate could be steadily employed at labor which would be profitable enough to make the Prison self-supporting. I again urgently recommend that this be done.

"For many years, even before I was appointed as Warden, there has been considerable talk of moving the Prison, but so far nothing of a definite nature has been done. With the population steadily increasing, every indication points to the fact that the prison will be over-crowded before another year passes.

"If the prison is not moved, or something definite arranged for its removal in the near future, I sincerely recommend that a new cell house be built with a capacity of two hundred and twenty cells to be used in place of the old Number Two cell house, and that a new and larger dining room be provided therewith. This would provide for a capacity of four hundred and forty (440) inmates, approximately one hundred and seventy (170) more than the present population. In addition to this, I recommend the construction of a dormitory or cell house outside
the prison walls for the use of trustees and farm hands. This would also increase the capacity of the prison, and at the same time do away with the dangerous practice of these men going in and out of the prison several times a day.

"I also recommend that some changes be made in the administration building and the Warden's residence.

"The improvements, I estimate, would cost approximately $3000,000.

"For the past four years, I have rented farms near the Prison on shares and have secured all our hay for feeding livestock; from this source, also, some hay and other products that I have sold. This has saved the state considerable money and also furnished employment for more of the inmates, but on account of these small farms being subdivided and sold for residences, I will be unable to continue to do this, and I recommend that if the Prison is not moved, that a farm be rented on shares, or for cash, in some other locality as near to the Prison as it is possible to secure one."

These conditions which existed in 1930 remain today, and have become much worse with the passing of nearly three years. The Prison population has increased to over three hundred prisoners. The available farm land near the Prison has continued to decrease. The condition of the buildings is rapidly getting worse, and even with the continual
repairs, the need for a new prison has become more acute.

In 1929 a study of American Prisons was made, and the facts and recommendations published in a book called "A Handbook of American Prisons and Reformatories." I feel that it will be helpful to an understanding of the problem to quote the comment and recommendation of the investigating committee.

"The industrial program needs expansion, although the prison is one of the smallest in the country and unemployment at its worst would affect only a relatively small number of men.

"The improvement in the plant (the Utah Prison) under the present warden has been continued but the prison still shows the effect of years of negligence and false economy on the part of the state. Only one of the two cell houses is good; the other is in bad condition and should be abandoned. To repair it will not fit it for occupancy......

"The women prisoners are as well cared for as the quarters over the warden's house permit. It is generally agreed, however, that the women prisoners should not be kept in a prison designed primarily for men. If there is no other place for them in a womens institution the suggestion that they be attached to a state hospital and used in the maintenance work appears an excellent one." In regard
to this problem of women prisoners, statistics show that the average number of women prisoners is about five. The above suggestion seems very logical and due to the small number of women confined to the penitentiary, I am considering the problem of the new prison for men only. The women can adequately be taken care of under present conditions in connection with the State Hospital.

Another very good reason in favor of building a new prison in preference to renovating the present prison is the moderate cost involved. The present prison ground, being located in a new residential section, is valuable, and if sold would furnish a large percentage of the cost of building a new prison. This money, added to the money needed to repair the existing prison would nearly pay for the new structure, but more of this later.

The above brief quotations show the serious condition existing in the Utah Penitentiary. The need for a new prison has existed for many years and the problem becomes more serious every year. It is with this problem in mind that I have chosen this subject for my thesis, and my greatest aim and hope is that this thesis may in some way aid in the improvement of the existing conditions in the State.
Before considering the actual design of the penitentiary, we must consider the more general field of penology. This problem of dealing with criminals is one which has many sides to it, and even more advocated solutions. I have attempted to study the main methods used in prisons, and have tried to formulate a system which will permit the use of all our present knowledge on the subject, and yet be flexible enough to provide for the introduction of new ideas in the future.

Prisons have to do with criminals and crime. Before going further let us stop and consider exactly what is meant by the term crime. "Crime needs to be discriminated from vice on the one hand, and from sin on the other. Vices are injuries done to oneself, through the violation of natural law, which affects others only indirectly, if at all....Sins are offences against God....Crimes are wrongful actions, violations of the rights of other men, injuries done to individuals or to society, against which there is legal prohibition enforced by some appropriate legal penalty." (1) This distinction is satisfactory for our need, but we must remember that any vice or sin becomes a crime when it is made punishable by human law.

In the evolution of criminal law and punishment we find four stages. The first was an era of vengeance; the second, that of repression or retribution; the third, that of attempted reformation and rehabilitation; the fourth, that of individualization. In this consideration we

(1) Note: The list of quotation references follows the thesis.
should perhaps add a fifth step to our social system, namely prevention.

We must realize in this discussion of punishment and reformation that there has been a marked overlapping. Historically, however, each has been made prominent in the order of succession above named.

The primitive man knew nothing of law. Each individual or family was a law unto itself. Out of the family grew the tribe. These primitive people became more social in the tribal group, but still could not make any distinction in their principle of morality, reciprocity. He could not see why, if we return benefits, we should not also return injuries. Hence, we see that the instinct of retaliation is one of the oldest and most firmly rooted instinct in human nature. This instinct has never died and still exists in civilized man. This principle has been very well stated in the Mosaic law: "Thou shalt give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, foot for foot, burning for burning, and wound for wound." We still see a survival of this ancient custom in our laws today which demand that a murderer be killed for his crime.

Gradually this Mosaic code was modified so as to permit an agreement between parties, or an intervention by constituted authority, which would substitute an equivalent damage for the expiation of the injury done.

It is not a very great step from this stage to a control of punishment by the State. Theoretically, any injury to a citizen is an injury to the entire structure
or social order to which the citizen belongs. So with this idea developing we see the creation of courts by the State to punish or at least decide the punishment of individuals acting in opposition to the accepted code.

This leads us to our second stage of the evolution of criminal law, repression by intimidation. The theory that we can prevent crime by making the punishment so horrible as to make persons abide by the law because of their fear of being caught and punished, was formulated early in ancient history. This false idea still exists, and it is my purpose in this portion of my discussion to point out the futility and untruth of such an idea.

To claim that intimidation is no longer necessary in repression of crime, may be an unjustifiable and untameable idea. Authorities are still very divided on this question, and it would be very presumptuous on my part to absolutely claim that we can do away with this idea in its entirety. However I do maintain that we should reduce this form of crime prevention to an absolute minimum. I realize that a great deal of our civilization and perhaps even human nature must change before we can do away with the idea of repression of crime due to fear of punishment. Mere conviction, with its resulting loss of esteem in the eyes of society, and separation from the rest of the world are sufficient punishment to make any value of intimidation effective.

The most ancient method of repression by intimidation was punishment by death. Capital punishment was very common in ancient times, as it still is among savages. It
is the most effective method of getting rid of troublesome or offensive characters; and the feeling of revenge, when unrestrained by considerations which appeal to the intellect and conscience of civilized men, may easily run to extreme limits.

Among the methods of taking human life which are or have been practiced, the following list given by Frederick H. Wines, LL.D is quite interesting. It includes the following: burning, beheading, hanging, drawing and quartering, breaking on the wheel, crucifixion, strangulation, suffocation, drowning, precipitation from a height, stoning, sawing assunder, flaying alive, crushing beneath wheels or the feet of animals, throwing to the wild beasts, compulsory combat in the arena, burying alive, boiling, impaling, pressing, piercing with javelins, shooting, starving, poison, the troughs, melted lead, serpents, blowing from the mouth of a cannon, and electrocution. To this we may add the latest method evolved by civilized man, lethal gas.

In ancient time burning was a very common method of punishment. Moses ordained burning as a penalty for incest. Caesar tells of the Gauls and Britons thrusting captives, in mass, into a wicker image of great stature, then piling wood around, and the burning of the victims and the god. In the early days of England, slaves were burned for theft. The Theodosean code prescribed this punishment for witchcraft. In the Middle Ages, burning was the punishment for sacrilege, parricide, poisoning, and arson. Nero smeared the bodies of the early Christians
with pitch, and, it is said, used them to light the streets of Rome.

Many horrible tales have been told of terrible death punishments in the past generations. European museums still testify to some of the methods and instruments used in inflicting death and torture.

Death as a punishment and also an example to others still exists with us today. However, it has been fortunately reduced and gradually is being looked on as an undesirable practice. This gradual disdain has only come in modern times. To illustrate this fact, it is interesting to note the statistics given in an old prison report, which I came across lately, published in 1835. These statistics show that in England from 1813 to 1833 there were 23,700 condemnations to death. Of these condemnations, however, only 933 were executed. This was one execution to 225,000 population. The report notes this as a great improvement over the period before 1813. Seventy thousand executions took place in England during the reign of Henry VIII. If we compare the approximate average of one execution to 1,200,000 in the United States today, we note a marked reduction in capital punishment. This fact alone would indicate that "legal murder" did not materially lessen crime, if at all. If it had resulted in less crime it is probable that we would still widely use capital punishment in our system of penology.

England "in ye good olde times" punished convicted pickpockets by publicly hanging them. The gibbet was erected in the public square. Notices were posted
announcing this "most interesting" event. People flocked from miles around to witness this "necking party". Upraised head gazed intently on the spectacle. Many pickpockets jostled in the crowd, however their interest was not in the execution, but in the pockets and purses of the spell-stricken crowd. Business was good.

Intimidation by secondary punishments are more widely advocated and used in our modern treatment of criminals. Today this type of punishment is seen in the solitary confinement, in fact all enforced labor and action might be included in this group.

Mutilation was early used as a penalty. The Egyptians cut out the tongues of those who betrayed the secret of the state, they cut off the hands of forgers and counterfeiters. Under Henry VIII the punishment for assault resulting in a loss of blood was the loss of the right hand. In 1570 authors who wrote in a manner not pleasing to the king had their ears removed to atone for their so called crime.

Branding was another widely used method of fitting the punishment to the crime. Different brands were used to designate the crime committed. This type of punishment lasted in the civilized world until the eighteenth century. This certainly did not accomplish any good, but only aggravated the condition by making permanent criminals of all first offenders.

Flogging was another ancient punishment. It was authorized by the Mosaic code. It has continued throughout the ages, and still has many advocates among modern people. We do not have to go very far back in our own United States
history to find flogging in public one of the most widely advocated punishments. The pain and even more effective shame was thought to be a most effective means of preventing future crime. In a few cases this may have been the case, but perhaps in the majority of cases this disgrace forced the individual to commit more crimes.

These few examples will probably bring many more to the mind of the reader so I will not go further along this line.

Many will perhaps place the above discussion under the heading of torture. I have refrained from so doing because the real use of torture was not to punish criminals, but to bring forth a confession of guilt, and to force a disclosure of accomplices. It is true, however, that torture was used as a punishment, and in many cases we do not know the exact purpose of the torture.

Moses forbade it. But in Greece it was practiced. Torture was widely used in the Middle Ages. A form of torture called the "Third Degree" is still used today, although generally it is looked down upon by the public as a practice to be shunned.

In this regard we are all familiar with many of these tortures, among which some of the more famous were: the rack, the "Dungeon of Rats", the "Scavenger's Daughter", thumbscrew, heated pincers, the boot and wedge, the stretchers or "Exeter's Daughter", hanging by the thumbs, etc.

Torture was an ecclesiastical weapon with which to combat heresy, for the glory of God and the welfare of human souls. The mere term, Inquisition, brings shivers
of horror to the present generation. It lasted in varying degrees from about the year 1200 until Emperor Napoleon abolished it in 1808. This terrible period brought the old idea, that crime can be prevented by severe penalties, to its ultimate point. We all know that it failed in its purpose.

"The truth of the adage that "crime thrives upon severe penalties" is demonstrated by the experience of mankind, before the genius of Christianity and of modern science taught the lesson of greater tolerance, so imperfectly learned, that even now rash and ill-informed men often express the opinion that what is needed for repression of crime is severe penalties; as if we could hope ever to rival what has already been tried in this direction." (1)

Plato held that the proper end of punishment is not merely the rendering of just dues to the guilty, but at the same time to make them better.

Edwin H. Sutherland Ph.D. is one of the many authorities who support this idea of Plato's. I am going to quote from his book, "Criminology."

"In the orthodox legal system coercion is one of the elements of law and the method of coercion is threat or application of punishment. A law which does not provide a penalty that will cause suffering is regarded as quite impotent. The law not only assumes that punishment is efficacious, but also that it is the only method that can generally and uniformly be used. But it is evident that there are many individuals whose attitudes and
behavior can be changed much more effectively by other methods than by punishment. There is a distinct tendency, therefore, in juvenile courts and in a small way in criminal courts to use such methods as have been found effective, whether they are coercive or not and whether they produce suffering or not. But such adaptation of methods to individuals can be secured only in so far as the principle of uniformity is not used." (12)

Before continuing with the history of the growth of reformation let us consider this problem from a logical standpoint. Does punishment as such tend to lessen crime? In consideration of this we find that we must view it from the standpoint of the criminal and the general public.

The majority of individuals do not know what goes on in prison, so they have no fear. The fear of getting caught and its subsequent trial is enough to stop the majority of individuals from allowing criminal desires to run unrestricted. The branding of an individual as a criminal by his friends and associates will also furnish any necessary fear. The loss of freedom is perhaps the greatest element in preventing the usual individual from commission of crime.

In regard to the criminal we have a different problem. Many people claim that we must not treat the offender too well because he will be only too glad to come back to jail again. This idea brings us to the question of whether or not the thought of conviction and its subsequent punishment tends in any way to hinder the
evil-doer from the execution of crimes.

We know that thousands of people are killed every year by automobiles. If we think about it we realize that our life is endangered by crossing streets or by driving an automobile. But the fact is that we do not think of the danger, or if we do, we think that for some reason our case is different from that of others.

We see a steel worker balancing on a steel beam. Our immediate reaction is to realize his danger. He may become dizzy; he may slip; a gust of wind may blow him to his death. A shudder passes over us and we vow that we would never consider this kind of a job. But the steel worker does not live in constant fear. The fact is that he seldom thinks of the danger, and if he does he feels sure that his skill or luck will protect him.

This same psychology is true in the case of a criminal or lawbreaker. He knows that many are caught and convicted, in fact he may have served several sentences. But he is too smart, someone else may get caught but not him.

Louis N. Robinson, Ph.D. expresses this idea very well in his book "Penology in the United States." I will conclude this portion of my contention by quoting from this book.

"A strong case can be made out of punishments as a means of preventing crimes, but let us not take punishment for granted. Because they have been used in the past in seeking for protection, or because there is some
logical explanation for them, does not prove that they really do protect, or, at any rate to the extent that has formerly been believed. Mankind has been cursed with various superstitious beliefs, from many of which it has not yet emancipated itself. The remedies which our ancestors have used in the past for our social, as well as bodily ills, have been mostly thrown in the scrap-heap, and some which we are now using will undoubtedly follow.

"The chain of reasoning which has underlain the punishment of criminals is by no means so strong as it appears. 'The proof of the pudding is in the eating,' and one has only to study the statistics of recidivism in all countries to learn that society is by no means shut of the criminal, even after trying many of its punishments on him. Likewise the enormous army of new criminals, which society breeds each year, is a standing proof that the preventive force of example is rather weak. Research in psychology, psychiatry, anthropology and sociology has made clear that this theory of prevention does not take sufficiently into account the nature of man. Executions, like war, brutalize man; the more that take place, the greater the number there is to execute. The man about to die becomes a hero. Society has been finally forced to put its criminals to death in private, though now and then some official thinks he can put down crime by allowing or forcing others to witness the execution. A man, seemingly, incapacitated from committing an act, may perversely turn his whole attention to showing the community that he is still
capable of carrying on that particular line of activity. Besides, the real effect may be to incapacitate him also from living as a law-abiding citizen. This is particularly true of those measures which mark him among his fellows as a man to be avoided, for who will wish to employ him or deal with him in any way? Without friends, set apart, must he not continue as an enemy of society?...

"Every year shows a gain in the importance that is placed on the individual member of society, and to compel certain ones to undergo punishments that others may be saved is on the whole bad ethics. It can be honestly questioned whether they who force the examples are worth saving by this means. Jesus was the Great Example, a sacrifice voluntarily made, and one which showed the exact converse of what we try to teach by punishment; that is, that a good life, not a bad one, may lead to the cross. Imprisonment, if it is not perpetual, may leave a man in a condition unfit to associate once more with his fellows. Most people forget that--with few exceptions--all who go to prison come out again. It certainly can be of little avail to turn loose on society men who are more dangerous to its welfare than they were when they went in. But, surely, the reformation of criminals has been successful!"

The failure of this theory of retribution has been observed for many years and is now generally accepted as an ineffective method of crime prevention. This failure resulted in the desire to reform the criminal and turn him back into society, a good citizen. Before considering
the question concerning the effectiveness of reformation, I will give a brief review of the history of the reformatory movement.

As early as 1825 the first reformatory for juveniles was opened on Randall's Island in New York. Shortly, a similar institution was organized in Boston. These were followed by a state-financed and state-controlled reformatory at Westborough, Massachusetts, in 1847, which started a general movement throughout the United States. These early institutions included some of the essential elements of the modern adult reformatory. They included the classification system so widely advocated today. The inmates were divided into good and bad classes, and their conduct allowed the children to pass from one into the other.

In 1830, Obermaier became governor of the prison at Raiserlautern, Bavaria, where he began his experiments. When he took charge of the prison in Munich, in 1842, he found some six or seven hundred prisoners chained together, weighted down, sullen and insubordinate. Obermaier had the chains removed and soon won the confidence of the prisoners. He was aided in his work by an entirely indeterminate sentence group, and by a system of strict supervision of ex-convicts. He is credited with a permanent reformation of the majority of the prisoners. (3)

"Colnel Manuel Montesinos, Spanish penal reformer, organized the inmates of his prison at Valencia, in 1835, into military companies, with inmates as inferior officers. A great believer in industrial training as a means of
reformation, he set up as many as forty trades which the inmates might learn in his institution. He also created a school with compulsory attendance for inmates under twenty. He conducted the institution with a few old soldiers as guards.

"As in Obermaier's experiment, so in that of Montesinos much depended upon the personality and attitude of the prison administrator. The system of the latter, however, gained a good deal of its strength from the fact that a law existed enabling the inmates to reduce through good behavior their period of incarceration by one-third. With the repeal of this law the system broke down and Montesinos resigned. In spite of this failure Montesinos must be credited with being one of the first practical prison reformers to recognize the all-important need of the "personal touch" in penal administration, as it has since been recognized in other forms of social work."....

Norfolk Island, Australia, furnishes the scene for an interesting experiment in 1840, under the direction of Captain Alexander Maconochie, of the Royal Navy of England. The worst convicts seem to have been transported to this island from England and her Colonies. Punishment was horrible and extreme.

Captain Alexander Maconochie instituted many reforms, of which the most important one was the so-called "mark system." Each prisoner, upon entrance, was debited with a certain grade of marks depending on the gravity of the offence. By good conduct the marks were redeemable until the debt was paid off. Upon the removal of all the mark
the prisoner could be considered for conditional release. This system was also used as a credit system for food and supplies. This use of marks furnished a sort of coinage system.

Maconochie was not permitted to discharge men from the island even though the marks had all been removed. However his system was relatively successful, and it is truthfully said that he "found Norfolk Island a hell, but left it an orderly and well regulated community."

The mark system of Maconochie was taken over by Sir Walter Crofton who became the Chairman of the Directors of Irish Convict Prisons in 1854.

"Sir Walter Crofton has never laid claim to any originality in the conception or development of the system....Sir Walter Crofton is the first and only one who has embodied all the highest principles in a complete system; who has so arranged this system in all its details, as to make it comprehensible to ordinary minds, and to enable it to be easily worked by any persons who are trained to obedience to duty." (5)

The system introduced by Sir Walter included several stages. The first one being solitary imprisonment, for a period of eight or nine months, its precise length depending on the conduct of the offender. The first part of this confinement was on reduced diet, and without any work.
"By the end of three months of the first," said Crofton, "the idlers will generally have learned to associate industry with pleasure". (6)

In the second stage there were four grades; passage
from one to the other was dependent on a system of "mark." When a convict reached the final stage he was given special work, apart from other convicts, and had evening-school instructions and lectures.

The third or "intermediate" stage was the real testing ground. Marks were abolished in this stage and all possible freedom was allowed. The purpose of this training was to acquaint the prisoner with a sense of responsibility. This stage has often been referred to as one of "individualization." The officers or guards were unarmed.

"As we look back on Crofton's system today, its chief weakness seems to have been the failure to provide personal and intimate supervision such as is given in social case work or by specially trained parole officers, of which there are only a few. Instead of this supervision was carried on by the police, who seemed interested largely in getting recidivists promptly re-arrested and reconvicted. This activity of the police was in danger of deteriorating into a "hounding" of ex-prisoners, rather than being a helpful supervision. The men on license were required to report regularly to the police, as is still the practice in a number of Continental countries." (6)

The main contributions made by these three outstanding prison reformers are: (1) the mark system, together with the practice of reducing sentences because of good behavior, and the encouragement to individual effort thus implied; (2) the indeterminate sentence; (3) classification of prisoners on the basis of their conduct in the institution; (4) an approach to the theory and practice
of paying prison wages; (5) military drill, trade-training, and education as means of rehabilitation; (6) the practice of subjecting the offender to progressively more complex and free environments as preparation for ultimate release in a completely unsupervised environment, and (b) as a test of reformation; and (7) release on "ticket of license," the forerunner of parole. (2)

It is interesting to note that Crofton introduced a practice which foreshadowed one of the advantages desirable from the "cottage-system" of prison architecture. In the last stage of imprisonment he subdivided the prisoners into small groups, as agreed upon by the men themselves. This grouping of similar interest thus approximated the social conditions outside the prison.

In the United States the old Pennsylvania prison system was in existence, and had many followers on the Continent. This system advocated solitary confinement by day and night. It emphasized the "value" of solitary reflection. It lacked any semblance of organized industries or recreational facilities. About 1860 the system was being widely attacked in America as ineffective, though even then it still had strong support in Europe.

The Auburn system of isolation at night combined with congregate labour in silence during the day gradually came to be recognized as an improvement over the old system. It adapted itself to large-scale manufacturing methods, and at the same time was less dangerous to the physical and moral deterioration of the prisoner.

"Between 1865 and 1869 Mr. Frank B. Sanborn of
Massachusetts, and Messrs. Wines, Dwight, and Hubbell of the Prison Association of New York, the most imaginative and constructive prison workers that America has produced sang the praises of the Irish System (Sir Walter Crofton) in a series of papers published in the annals of the Massachusetts and New York prison associations. Other prison reformers, including Mr. Zebulon Brockway, who was to be the first superintendent of the first American adult reformatory (Elmira, New York.), were also influenced by reports of the efficiency and common sense of the Irish system and of the experiments on which it was based." (2)

Mr. Brockway advocated an indeterminate sentence as early as 1870. This idea followed an earlier report on the Irish system written by Gaylord B. Hubbell, former warden of Sing Sing prison.

In 1868 the Legislature of the State of New York had before it a bill to organize a new prison, and to designate the new institution a "reformatory." They made the sentences "substantially reformation sentences"; that is they proposed that if the regular sentence was less than five years, the sentence to the Reformatory should be "until reformation, not exceeding five years." This act of 1869 established the "Elmira Prison" which was ready for reception of prisoners in 1876. Mr. Brockway was its first superintendent. He introduced a system similar to the Irish system, and little if anything new was introduced. The aim was to release the prisoner on parole and so trained that he could become a law-abiding citizen.
The fame of the Elmira Reformatory spread like wildfire throughout the country and abroad. Its apparent success coupled with the also apparent success of the industrial schools for juveniles in Massachusetts created the necessary impetus to establish an adult reformatory institution in Massachusetts. It was opened on December 20, 1884. This institution followed the Irish System, although it improved it in many ways. It is regarded as one of the finest institutions in the United States. Special social and spiritual welfare is sought along with the educational training. The individual is carefully studied in regard to his physical and mental condition.

Since this time many states have innovated reformatory methods. Our problem now is to determine, if possible, whether or not this idea of reformation really accomplishes its purpose. Although it has been widely accepted, we still must try to judge it by the results achieved.

In dealing with this problem our greatest difficulty is in the lack of adequate information. We do not know whether or not the reformation has been successful or not. In general however it has been accepted that reformation has been to a high degree successful.

The twenty-eighth annual report of the New York Reformatory at Elmira reported that 86 per cent of the 445 men paroled in the year ending September 1903 were "probably reformed." This estimate was made on the fact that they "served well during their parole and earned
absolute release."

In the New York report for 1910 it is stated that "of the 1,035 paroled, 859, or 81.67 have earned their absolute release, or are reporting and doing well." (7)

The Indiana Reformatory as early as 1897 reported that they had every reason to believe that not less than 757 of those paroled will become useful citizens of the State, "each being an example of the utility of the reformatory and parole system."

James A. Leonard, Superintendent of the Ohio State Reformatory, received many letters from superintendents of many reformatories setting forth their judgment expressed in mathematical terms, as to the proportion of paroled inmates who refrained from recommission of crime, and conducted themselves as good citizens. The highest percentage estimated was 85 per cent, and the lowest was 60 per cent. (9)

The following estimates are from those compiled by Shelden Glueck and published in his book "500 Criminal Careers."

W. W. Clark (Journal of Delinquency, 1921) is alleged to have "found" that an average of 727 of parolers of nineteen institutions are "successes." "Robert H. Gault ingeniously analyzed 'The Parole System, A means of Protection' (Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, Vol. V, March 1915), basing his conclusions on over 38,000 parolers, the information being obtained 'by Mr. B. W. Brown, a graduate student in the Department of Sociology in the University of Chicago.' Mr. Brown
'secured his data by correspondence with state officials and by consulting the most recent State reports.' No wonder he and Gault found that 84 per cent of the men 'made good'; Gault goes further and assures us: 'It seems safe to say, therefore, that 80 per cent of men paroled fulfil the conditions and become law-abiding citizens.' Given on p. 801." (2)

All of the above estimates show a marked lack of definite facts. They are all based on such "flimsy" facts as the return of the paroled man to the institution. They disregard the possibility of his being caught under an assumed name and sentenced to another prison, or perhaps of his committing crimes but not being caught.

J. L. Gellin in a more careful study, but still including some grave errors, concludes that only "one third of them come in contact with the law." (10)

Realizing this lack of satisfactory statistics on the efficiency of reformation, Sheldon Glueck, of Harvard University, and Eleanor T. Glueck undertook a very careful and thorough study of 510 men who left the Massachusetts Reformatory during the years 1911-22. Of these 510 men, ninety per cent of them were traced and identified in 1926 and 1927. The facts were published in their book "500 Criminal Careers." The following is from the foreward of this book written by Dr. Richard C. Cabot.

"The important fact established in this book is that out of 510 men who left the Massachusetts Reformatory during the years 1911-22 eighty per cent were not reformed
five to fifteen years later, but went right on committing crimes after their discharge. This is a damning piece of evidence—not against the Reformatory in particular, which stands high among institutions of its kind, but against the reformatory system in general. Here it does not work. No one knows that it works better elsewhere.

"So far as we know, this is the first time that anyone has made a serious effort to find out whether our reformatories are accomplishing what they are intended to accomplish. No judge who sends men there, no parole board that lets them out, no prison commission which administers the system, no citizen who pays taxes to support it, has apparently ever taken the trouble to find out whether its results are good, bad or indifferent...

"The public has been lulled into a comfortable sense that things are being fairly well done in our penal institutions because statements have been made from time to time in the official reports to the effect that four-fifths of the inmates were reformed. Evidently these optimistic statements rest on insufficient study of the facts....

"It (the Glueck research) shows that the Massachusetts Reformatory (probably one of the best in the country) failed, in eighty per cent of the cases studied, to do what it is meant to do. It did not reform these men, for they continued their criminal careers, though not quite so actively as before....

"There is no considerable individualization in the treatment of the inmates of this Reformatory.
"Not even classification (as an approach to individualization) is seriously attempted. The feeble-minded, the mentally diseased, the many hardened criminals, and the few comparative neophytes in crime are all massed together and treated alike....

"What ought to be done about it?

"I (Dr. Richard C. Cabot) doubt if anyone can intelligently answer that question. Psychologists, physicians, social workers, and criminologists who readily condemn the present methods of treating criminals have themselves usually nothing to suggest but more accurate diagnosis. Character diagnosis is essential and we lack it. But it is not treatment."

Dr. Sheldon S. Glueck did not rely on reports or records of prisons, but with the aid of many assistants contacted each available man, those not found being only ten per cent. Each ex-convict was carefully studied through personal interviews with the individual as well as careful guarded investigations in his surroundings and acquaintances.

A summary of this study reveals many rather outstanding facts. The following are some which seem to me to be the more important ones for our present problem of a State Penitentiary:

1. The families of the majority of the offenders are of a very inferior nature.

2. The early life of many of the offenders shows definite neglect, due to their leaving the family at very early ages or for unusual reasons.

3. A widespread prevalence of various demoralizing
habits and vices existed.

4. The men were poorly educated or at least very retarded in education.

5. Their "career" began at an early age.

6. A large percentage had an abnormal mental make-up.

7. At least 1,014 officially known crimes were committed by the group (about 460 men) during the five-year period following completion of parole.

By far, the most important discovery was that four-fifths of the released men from 1911 to 1922 were not reformed, although the Reformatory was partially successful in that it lessened their criminal career and improved their general condition.

An item of practically as great import is that the Reformatory does not have any harmful results. It does not breed bitterness and resentment among its inmates, as shown by the fact that two-thirds of the men speak well of the institution and of their treatment there. Seventy per cent thought that the Reformatory does not act as a school for crime. Two-thirds felt that the system had done them some good.

"In analysing the 356 cases as to which it was possible to determine the probable influence of the Reformatory, the following findings stand out: The institution had no effect in improving the conduct of 36 per cent of the men. Together with the parole system and perhaps other favourable outside influences, it did have such good effect in another 36 per cent of the cases. In 13 per cent the Reformatory may have had a good influence, but such influence was temporary and might have been due largely
to the parole system rather than to the Reformatory regime. In 15 per cent of the cases outside influences rather than the Reformatory or parole system brought about some improvement in conduct." (2)

The above facts, however discouraging as to the beneficial effects of a reformatory system, do show a marked improvement over the older systems with their resulting effects of returning the criminal to society in a worse condition than when they received him.

Mr. Charles T. Judge, superintendent of the Massachusetts Reformatory, estimates roughly that three-quarters of his group were so thoroughly habituated to criminal practices before being committed as to offer little hope for the success of his efforts. "Reformatory treatment apparently has little effect upon young criminals; it is as if we treated all diseases in the same way." (31)

The failure of this reformation method to cope with the criminal problem leaves one in a quandary as to what can be done. All of this discussion of penology and criminology may seem very far removed from the problem of this thesis, a design for a State Penitentiary, but upon its solution depends the complete solution of the problem. If we should continue the attempt to reform the criminal, a certain type of prison is needed. If we should revert again to an idea of merely locking the men up and let them meditate on their past crimes, a different type of prison should be built. If we intend to consider the evil-doer as a "sick" person and try to cure his ills, still another type of prison is necessary to adequately solve the problem. Because of these conditions, I feel
the necessity of very careful study and inclusion of these questions in my thesis, whose main object is the design of the actual prison.

We now come to the very difficult problem of the best method of treating this question, which for want of a better term I have called individualization. I am, perhaps, presumptuous in calling it the best method, but from my research and contact which I have been privileged to have had with several authorities, I feel justified in claiming, that it is the best system we know of at present. It is still experimental but seemingly very sound.
Perhaps by introducing another step in penology individualization, I have given a false impression that we should condemn the reformatory and start an entirely new system of penology. This is really not the case, because we must recognize the fact that before we conclude that the system of reformation is a failure we must realize that the reformatory or prison begins its task after most of the other social instruments for character-building have failed. Again we must not forget that all studies point to the fact that the present system of reformation does not turn the inmate away a worse criminal, but actually does bring about some improvement in their lives.

The system which I am advocating retains most of the attributes of the reformatory system, but introduces several new ideas which may and probably will, result in an improved condition of the crime situation.

Any system of crime prevention is naturally very complex and involves practically every phase of our civilization. My experience is of such a nature that any attempt on my part to establish a complete system of crime prevention would be very unwise. However, any system of penology naturally includes a place of incarceration, and to be successful this link must adequately fit into the whole chain of crime prevention. Therefore, I will attempt
to briefly present the system which seems to offer the greatest possibility of success. The ultimate design of the penitentiary must be of such a nature that it will provide for the execution of the best known methods and yet be so flexible that it can be adapted to new ideas and procedure as they arise. The method of crime prevention which I suggest will be mainly accepted generalities rather than details of a definite plan.

We all recognize the fact that it is easier to prevent a disease than it is to cure the disease. Crime is a form of disease, and it is as true to say that the best way to prevent crime is to remove the "germs" which grow and cause individuals to perform anti-social acts. Our social agencies are attempting this colossal task but are not getting very far because they know practically nothing of the "crime germ". It is true that they think, and perhaps they are right, they know the cause of crime. But the actual facts supporting their contentions are woefully lacking. Penology is in a state, like the medical profession of "not so many years ago," methods of cure are prescribed without knowledge of the cause. Like the medical profession, we must find the cause before we can expect to provide a cure.

In medicine we study disease as found on an inflicted individual, likewise, in criminology, we should study the "crime germ" as found in the criminal.
Today the prisons stand out as the best point to pursue a research in this field. In prison the study of the criminal may be continued over a relatively long period of time. The prisoner is always available, at least physically. The prisoner is usually willing to cooperate when he is approached in a sympathetic manner. He is more willing to divulge the actual facts after his conviction than before his guilt has been established. This willingness to cooperate on the part of the prisoner is very important to the satisfactory solution.

The study of criminals in prison, however, encounters some difficulties. In the first place prisoners are a selected group of criminals. Only a small percent of criminals are confined to prisons, and these differ from those outside in many respects, such as mentality, economic condition, place of birth, family relations, emotional stability, and other items. However, we do find a few men in prisons from all the various strata of criminology, and the study of all of these will shed some light on the situation. We also find that "organized criminals" are seldom found in prisons, but even these are incarcerated at some time during their life. Because of this situation we must be very careful in our conclusion derived from these studies.

Another difficulty is that in prison the criminal is not in his natural environment. It has
been argued that we can no more understand a criminal in prison than we can understand a tiger in a cage. Although this may be true, but still it must be admitted that a careful study in prisons is of great value.

Professor Edwin H. Sutherland, Ph D. of the University of Chicago has the following comment to make on this subject "Assuming that it is desirable to use the prisons as laboratories in which criminals should be studied, the objectives of the investigations should be to provide information which will be immediately useful for administrative purposes, and which will contribute to a theory of criminal behavior and hence to more general control of the crime problem. Such data are desirable for administrative purposes in several respects. It is important that prisoners be classified, and the classification should be based on the characteristics of the prisoner. Assignments to tasks, to recreation, to school, and to other prison activities should be based on a knowledge of the prisoners, and so should the length of the period of confinement."

"These assignments and dispositions are rather formal and are perhaps relatively unimportant. On the other hand, it is highly important that the prison administration which is concerned with an improvement in the behavior of criminals should be
intimately acquainted with the attitudes of prisoners. The whole prison regime should be based on such knowledge......

"The second objective is to acquire knowledge regarding the processes by which criminality develops, in order that thereby it may be possible to develop experimental projects for preventing crime and for organizing substitutes for imprisonment. In these ways the prison should provide the information which will tend to eliminate the prison. Even though the study of prisoners may in certain respects interfere with the program of the prison, it should be continued because of the prospective value of solving the crime problem:"

"The ideal is to develop knowledge which is useful at the same time for administrative purposes, may seem to have no general significance, and vice versa. From both points of view, however, it is important to understand the criminal; and there seems to be no theoretical reason to believe that the two kinds of knowledge cannot be made to concur."
It is chimerical to suppose that after an individual has been subjected to an artificial condition and each one "put through the same mill", he can be sent forth into an unfriendly world and find a permanent respectability. In fact it is no more fantastic to maintain that every illness should receive the same treatment. However, most of our present prisons do expect satisfactory results by subjecting all criminals to the same cure. Therefore, after a careful individual study has been made, an individual treatment must be followed. To carry such an idea to its ultimate end is naturally impossible in a prison whose facilities are limited by necessary economic conditions. However, every possible effort in this direction should be made.

Such information would not only be valuable in aiding the inmate's condition, but would be very helpful to the courts, in the case of recidivists, parole board, and to social societies attempting to prevent crime before its perpetration.

Our present problem deals primarily with the prison so that the very important phases of penology dealing with crime prevention must be omitted.

When a prisoner is received from the court he should be first examined for physical ailments. Any physical ills should be immediately treated.
He is then carefully studied by a psychiatrist. After he has been thoroughly studied, he is classified. The inmate is then assigned to his quarters and to his work.

At this stage it is necessary to consider the question of segregation. It has been universally agreed that the segregation of different types of prisoners is absolutely essential. The "first offender" must be segregated from the "hardened criminal". Unfortunately, in the past the "first offender" and "hardened criminal" have been so designated by their respective number of convictions. Such a criteria, however, is wrong, because the first offender may be a hardened criminal who has been convicted for the first time. He may be a worse influence than another man who has been convicted several times. Hence, we see the necessity of segregating inmates according to the actual studies made in the prison.
After the inmate's segregation we come to the important problem of the "personal touch". One of the faults of the existing systems is that all too frequently the prisoner has been classified and then forgotten. He has been "promoted" or "demoted" according to the mark system, but little personal attention has been given to him. The "guard" or better called the "staff member" should not be satisfied with watching the inmates, but should be truly a social worker. He should know the history of every one of his charges, and should continually study and influence each man under his control. Such a policy is feasible by assigning two staff members to fifty prisoners. These staff members should be chosen because of the character, training, etc., rather than according to their ability to spy on the inmates.

The same personal influence is to be used in the shops. The development and improvement of the prisoner is of more importance than the goods produced.

A social system as near normal as possible must be included. The inmates should have frequent opportunities to express the opinions, desires, and criticisms. Library facilities should be placed at the disposal of the men, and they should be encouraged to better themselves by reading.
Entertainments should be given at reasonably frequent intervals. In fact, as many of the ordinary social functions as possible should be included in the activities of the prisoner.

To include all of these social functions may seem foreign to a prison, but when we realize that many men become criminals because of their unsocial attitudes, we see the value of such training. If we can instill a "social spirit" in the prisoner, his chances of becoming a good citizen are much better.

Small units should frequently meet with a personal advisor, either a member of the staff or an outside person. In these "bull sessions" many ideas would be exchanged, and a better understanding would result between the prisoner and the adviser. A few of our prisons have tried this idea and have found that the influence has been very good. Prisoners have made friends with normal respectable individuals. These friendships have frequently resulted in an improved condition of the prisoner after his release.

"Assuming that shortly after admission to a prison each person is thoroughly studied from every angle now presenting possibilities of study, a program should be developed for him. (18)
This program should aim to correct defects in health, education, and ability to earn a living. It should set a tentative plan for him while he is in prison, looking forward to a life plan upon his discharge. Social workers connected with the scientific program of a prison should make contacts with family, friends, ministers, and employers with the view of correcting defects in his environment and preparing a hopeful situation for him upon his discharge.

"With such an effort on the part of the scientific division, it will be seen that the real purpose of the prison, namely, the protection of society and the salvage of individuals, will be concentrated upon the work of the scientific department. "At the present time, many of the more beneficial opportunities in the prison are left largely to the initiative of the individual. There should be a drive behind the scientific program sufficient to insure that the position which each man occupies in the prison is dependant upon positive dicta coming from the scientific department, rather than momentary needs of a particular industry. Much that is now done in a perfunctory way by various prison officials should come within the
the control of the scientific department. This should not come through control of personnel by the scientific department, but through its recommendations to the warden."

Education forms a very important part of any system of penology. At the present time the educational work of most of our prisons has been of a very low caliber. It has been closely patterned after public schools for children. However, the educational work in the Utah Penitentiary seems to have been of a higher type than generally found. A school has been conducted during the winter months, offering instruction in common and high school subjects. Last year about one-third of the prisoners attended these classes. Teachers were provided without pay by the University of Utah and the public schools. This practice should be continued.

Many people claim that we should not include an educational system in our prisons because the intelligence of the criminal is so low that any attempt to educate him is doomed to failure. This, however, is not true. Studies have shown that from 10% to 20% are virtually illiterate; 55% to 75% have gone no farther than the sixth grade; 2.5% have never attended school. Dr. Herman Adler made a study in 1924 which showed that 9.3% of the prisoners had superior intelligence, as compared with 13.5% in the army draft; the average
intelligence was 66% in prisons, and 61.5% in the army draft; inferior intelligence in prisons 24.7%, 25% in the draft. Professor Carl Murchism found a small percentage of superiority in favor of the criminal group. These studies readily show that the men confined to prisons have ordinary intelligence. Many of the men whom I interviewed felt that the inmates were of inferior intelligence, but they all felt that they could be benefitted by educational classes.

Of 5850 cases in the Illinois Reformatory for Men, 13.7% were found to have superior intelligence, 72.65% average intelligence, and 13.65% inferior intelligence.

In 1916 a very careful study on this subject was made in the Western Penitentiary of Pennsylvania. The following chart shows their findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imbeciles..........</td>
<td>Illiterates.........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morons.............</td>
<td>1st grade..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Line........</td>
<td>2nd grade..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull Normal........</td>
<td>3rd grade..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal.............</td>
<td>4th grade..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior...........</td>
<td>5th grade..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Superior......</td>
<td>6th grade..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7th grade..........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School........</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From these and other statistics Austin H. Mac Cormick, Asst. Dir. of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, concluded that 58% of the inmates of our prisons have had less education than their mental rating indicated that they could attain; 32% had borderline of higher intelligence, and had inadequate trade training in terms of their intelligence.

All of this shows that the criminal should be educated while in prison. By so doing we provide him with the "tools" which will aid him in becoming a better member of society. Most men become criminals because of their failure to fit into the social system, often due to their inferior training.

Education for prisoners should be individualized. It must be based on individual diagnosis and prescription. However, the educational should stress the normality rather than the abnormality of the prisoner students, and should apply standard educational practices rather than try to develop a special educational technique designed for the criminal.

The prison should not be turned into a high school. "It should be rather a community of employed men, each of whom has the opportunity to devote part of his time to that particular form of education which a skilled diagnosis of his individual case indicates he should follow. His educational program will not be a haphazard affair, but will be as carefully worked out as the careful diagnosis and the prescription."
which precede his medical treatment. The medical staff will lay out a plan of treatment which includes two extractions, four fillings, a tonsillectomy, and a course of venereal treatment. With somewhat less assurance, with greater chance of error, but just as carefully and thoughtfully worked out, the educational staff will lay out a program which includes assignments to the carpenter shop, related instruction on the technique of trade, a course in blue print reading, and a short course in mathematics."

The educational training should include the fundamentals of an academic training. Vocational training, designed to give training for an occupation, is essential to a prisoner. The following must also be given an important place in the educational program: health education, designed to teach the fundamentals of personal and community health; cultural education, in order to give the inmate a well-rounded education, and to instil a desire for intellectual advancement; social education, which includes moral and civic education, and training with reference to proper social life.

We realize that this program can not and should not be applied to every prisoner. Again we must apply individualization. The prison education system can not reform every prisoner. We know that every criminal can not be reformed merely by educating
him and giving him a vocational trade. However, there are many men who having been forced into crime by outside conditions will be able to profit by such training and continue life as a good citizen.
From the more or less theoretical problem of penology we now turn to the actual prison buildings. Such structures have existed in some form or another from time immemorial. They are mentioned in the Old Testament. Joseph was thrust into Potiphar's prison, Samson into that of the Philistines, and Jeremiah was let down into a dungeon by ropes. However, the old prisons of these early days were really only places of confinement in which men were kept waiting the final disposition to be made of them. Frequently, however, these dungeons actually became prisons when individuals were placed there awaiting trial and purposely forgotten.

The dungeons of the Middle Ages were situated either in the cellar, subcellar or in the tower of a castle, fortress, hospital, convent, or palace. They were not separate buildings but apartments in their respective structure. The despots of this time usually covered up their tyranny by the use of euphemisms, they seldom called their ancient prisons by that name, but usually applied other names for their prisons.

The famous Tower of London was originally a fortified palace, erected by William I in the eleventh century. It consists of several separate structures and was early used as an arsenal. Gradually it was turned into a prison, and in this regard has become famous.

"The Bastille was originally one of the city gates of Paris—a fortified gate, flanked by two towers. It was known as the Port Saint Antoine. The fortress which replaced it was erected in the fourteenth century, although the last two towers of the eight of which it was
composed were not completed until the middle of the sixteenth century. Hugh Aubrian was the first superintendent of construction, and he was also its first prisoner. It was made a prison of state in 1417. When the boundaries of Paris were enlarged, to include the Faubourg Saint Antoine, the Bastille ceased to be of further value as a fortress and became purely a prison. It was here that the Man with the Iron Mask was confined. The French kings of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were in the habit of signing letters of "cachet", by which men and women could be sent to prison without trial and there held during the royal pleasure. Many of these letters were signed in blank and distributed to the nobles at their request--a very handy thing to have, if one wished to dispose of a troublesome friend or enemy. The prison witnessed the death of many such, forgotten by all but their nearest friends. It was captured by the mob and destroyed, July 14, 1789. The commander in charge defended it with great bravery, and wished to blow it up rather than surrender, but the Swiss guards would not let him do so. It was taken only after eight canons had been brought to bear upon it. This was the beginning of the French Revolution." (1)

The "apartments" of the Bastille were, mostly, octagonal in form. There were five floors of them, the worst being underground and the next worst at the top. The cells where men were put to be forgotten forever, called oubliettes, had deep pits in them, through which a prisoner fell into mud and starved; or into water and drowned; or upon a wheel set with knives which cut
him to pieces. Louis XI is said to have killed not less than four thousand victims in these oubliettes.

The Conciergerie was another famous prison. It was an appendage of the Palace of Paris, and its name denotes that it was the abode of the concierge or royal porter and doorkeeper, whose was to keep people in as well as to keep them out. It was from one of its cell that Marie Antoinette went to her execution.

"It was well known in revolutionary Paris, and was well known all over the world, that the Conciergerie was the place where the most dangerous of political criminals were jailed. The inscription of a name in its register of admission was tantamount to a death sentence. From Saint Lazare, from the Carmes, from the Abbaye, and from other jails, the inmates sometimes returned into the world of living and free men, but never, or very rarely indeed, from the Conciergerie." (3)

For-l'Évêque was an ecclesiastical prison. It was built about 1161, with dungeons and oubliettes under the towers. In 1674 Louis XIV seized it and converted it into a secular prison. It ceased to be used as a prison in 1780.

The Castle of Spielberg in Austria, the Leads in Venice, the Seven Towers of Constantinople, with its "Well of Blood", are a few of the other famous prisons.

The old Royal Palace of Bridewell in London was, in 1557, turned into a workhouse, partly to offer employment opportunities for the poor, and partly to punish, correct, and reform by labor of a diversified
nature, minor offenders of the class of prostitutes and "sturdy beggars and vagabonds." This institution became a model for houses of correction which were established throughout England.

A famous workhouse for men was established in Amsterdam as early as 1595. Its labor and its educational programs, its administration, its use of rewards and punishments, and the indeterminate sentence, distinguish it as one of the most important influences of modern times. It also played an important part in influencing the ideas of John Howard.

No report on prisons would be complete without reference to John Howard, "whose name shines illustrious on the annals of humanity and blazes like a star upon the roll of saints in heaven." He was born near London, September 2, 1726. He was born in very humble surroundings, and never succeeded in acquiring much education. "He was, in 1773, made Sheriff of Bedford and placed in charge of the jail in which a hundred years before John Bunyan had written the Pilgrim's Progress." (1)

His interest in jails and prisons caused him to visit nearly every known country in search of methods of prison reform.

John Howard and an Italian are perhaps the two greatest men in early history to influence the people to demand better prisons. These two men with aid from others including, Hume, Montesquieu, and Voltaire aroused sympathetic response in the hearts of citizens and lawmakers.
A hint as to prison architecture is seen in the cellular construction of the Hospital of Saint Michael at Rome. However, the first prison to be constructed upon a "definite program of specified requirements was the prison of Ghent, built in 1773 by Vilain XIV, a distinguished burgomaster of that city." (5)

Vilain was called upon to do what he could to aid the intolerable condition of vagabondage and petty crime. At the close of the eighteenth century, Flanders was overrun by an idle and vicious horde of paupers, many of whom were imposters. They invaded the country, devastating the farms, burning the timber, robbing the peasants, and committing many other atrocities. Severe measures were seldom applied to tramps, and if severe measures were adopted, they were seldom enforced. In 1771 the Deputies of the Estates of Flanders prayed Vilain to formulate a plan for relief.

Vilain, the burgomaster of Ghent, not only designed the prison, but formulated a clean-cut program of penology. He has justly been called "the father of modern penitentiary science." He recognized the need of trade instruction, with the view of putting the prisoner in condition to earn an honest living after his discharge. He also realized the importance of selecting industries which would not come into competition with free labor outside the prison. The prisoner was allowed to retain a percentage of their earnings. He went further and designed his building to permit the execution of his system of penology.
VILAIN'S PRISON at GHENT.

Figure 1.
"Vilain's prison (Figure 1) was of the radiating type, so designed for convenience of communication rather than for economy of supervision. It included the cells where the prisoners slept as well as the shops where he worked. The octagonal plan (never completely built) provided a central court with radial wings joined at the ends and forming eight enclosed courts, nine in all. The cells are "inside cells," as we have come to designate them, and this is the first instance on record, I believe, where the prisoner, to better detain him, has been removed from any possible contact with the outside walls."(q)

Vilain provided a resident physician and a resident chaplain. The prisoners were classified. The work-shops were in common, and meals were served at a common table. All of these "modern" practices were innovated at Ghent as early as 1773.

The next important prison plan came into being as a result of a series of letters published in 1787, entitled "Panopticon or the Inspection House." These letters of Jeremy Bentham, as indicated by the title of his letters, advocated a system in which the inspector stationed in the center could see into the cell of every prisoner. The Panopticon (Figure 2) has little, if any, good qualities, but it is important because of its influence on many prisons still in use today.

In 1817, John Haviland designed two prisons in Pennsylvania. The prisons had a central observation
- BENTHAM'S PANOPTICON
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point with cell blocks whose corridors radiated from this center. Haviland's Eastern Penitentiary resulted from a combination of the principles laid down by the Ghent prison and the Panopticon.

The prison at Joliet, Illinois is nearly identical to Bentham's Panopticon. The main difference being that in the state prison at Joliet we find eight panopticons instead of one. This type of prison is extremely bad and can be justly called "bad monkey-cages."

However bad the panopticon may seem to us now, it was a great improvement over many other existing prisons of that time. In this regard I uncovered a very interesting report of the State Prison in Maine, published in 1835. This prison had cells in the form of deep pits. The only entrance to these cells was a small trap-door in the top. It consisted of an open grate of iron, about two feet square and served not only as an entrance door but also as a window. A small crooked orifice, about one and one-half by five inches, served for ventilation. The mode of heating was through a small hole, about one inch in diameter, in the bottom of the cell, intended for the admission of warm air. "The truth is, the cells are neither lighted, aired nor warmed in a manner suitable for a human being, however fallen." Although this prison was still used in 1835, it was widely condemned. One reason of its condemnation was "the inconvience and expense to raise the trap-door, put down a ladder, take
it up again and close the trap-door."

At this time many such prisons existed in Europe and the United States.

A prison accommodating some two thousand inmates was completed in 1898 at Fresnes, a suburb of Paris. It was designed by M. Francisque-Henri Poussin who broke away from the radial plan and evolved the so-called "telegraph-pole" plan. He placed the administration building at one end of a long corridor, the chapel at the other end. The cell blocks were arranged off this corridor between the administration and chapel. This plan sounded the death note of the old radial plan.

This "telegraph-pole" system has many advantages and has been followed in many of the most modern prisons. It connects all the cell blocks by an inspection corridor. This permits good control as well as adequate segregation. My objection to this type of prison is that it is too much a "cage prison". Each cell is for the worst kind of prisoner. It fails in providing conditions which allow normal conditions to prevail. It provides for "institutionalization" and not "individualization." However, it has many followers, although usually in a somewhat changed character.

Alfred Hopkins has designed the latest and to my mind some of the best prisons of this "inspection corridor" type. Figure 3 shows the plans of the Westchester County Penitentiary and the Berks County Prison. I have chosen these two prisons to illustrate the latest development in this direction because they
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are small prisons accommodating approximately the same number of prisoners required in this thesis. And, secondly, because they are the best prisons so far built of this general type. In their description I will quote from Mr. Hopkin's book "Prisons and Prison Building."

"The advantage of the Westchester plan (Figure 3)--I will call it that because it was the first prison designed with the administration building in the center and with inspection corridor parallel and not at right angles to it--the advantage of the Westchester plan over the "telegraph-pole" plan is that it lends itself to a dignified architectural treatment. The location of the administration building in the center of the group is more convenient than to place it at the extreme end of the institution as in the "telegraph-pole" plan. The separated administration building also gives that building better light and ventilation and keeps out of it the institutional odors inevitably engendered in the great structure, every part of which is openly connected with every other part.

"In doing away with the radial plan and substituting for it the inspection corridor, it must not be supposed that actual supervision can be less conveniently maintained. The inspection corridor was designed to afford a better and more constant supervision of the inmate when he is most in need of supervision; that is during his hours of recreation. When the inmate is locked up in his cell for the night, and
the count made, the warden and his deputies may rest content that there will be no need for special vigilance until morning. During recreation periods a better supervision is required and the ideal place for this is the inspection corridor..."

The Westchester and Reading Prisons typify one type of prison, let us call this type Prison "A". This type of prison is used in the Middlesex County Prison at Billerica, Massachusetts. Another widely accepted type, Prison "B" is best designated by the term "Dormitory prisons."

The dormitory type includes sleeping rooms with several beds. A prison composed completely of dormitories would, for ordinary purposes, be unsatisfactory because all prisoners cannot be permitted in such groups. However, in the past few years certain prisons have been built which are of a "limited dormitory" type. "Dormitories are being used to limited extent at the New York Prison at Sing Sing, the Indiana State Prison at Michigan City, the Michigan State Prison at Jackson, the Illinois State Penitentiary at Joliet, Massachusetts State Prison Colony at Norfolk and Prison Farm at Leesburg, New Jersey, District of Columbia and by most of the southern state prisons."

Having been privileged to visit the Norfolk Prison Colony under the direction of its warden, Mr. Howard B. Gill, I will use it as an example of Prison "B". Although this prison has been designed for 1,500
Norfolk Prison Colony
Fig. 4.
inmates, which is much larger than the problem at hand, it is one of the most advanced of this type.

The Norfolk prison, Figure 4 and Plate 1, combines dormitories, open cells, semi-secure cells, and maximum security cells. "At present there are twelve permanent buildings erected--ten inside the wall; one, the Guard House, adjoining the wall on the outside; and one, the Farm Dormitory, outside and a considerable distance from the wall." The Administration Building is located directly back of this entrance through the Guard House. It contains "the administration offices, family welfare, case work, and research divisions, and includes dinning-room, library, photograph and finger print department, quarters for five nurses (who work in the Hospital which adjoins this building) and an exercise roof for the officers of the institution."

The Receiving Building is connected with the Administration Building. It contains outside cells of concrete and steel plates. It is of the strongest possible construction. All men are confined in this building upon their arrival. It is also used for the detention of the more desperate type of criminal.

The Hospital Building balances the Receiving Building and is connected with the Administration.

"The dormitories are built to carry out the principle that prisons should be designed for treatment as well as security. It may be assumed that segregation in prison automatically protects society from the
individual imprisoned for the time being and is in itself punishment for the offences committed, but the ultimate aim of prisons should be to return the individual to society better fitted to meet the normal demands of society."(q)

In this prison at Norfolk, Massachusetts, the minimum security men are placed on the farm, outside the wall or in the minimum security dormitory inside the wall. Most of these men have separate rooms with wooden sash windows, no bars, and being doorless. Having no doors they are open to easy inspection, which takes place once every hour. In this security is also found the dormitories. They are large rooms accommodating several beds. Each bed is separated from its neighbor by a thin partition which does not reach the floor or ceiling. These dormitories have been only partially successful, and Warden Gill suggested they be used only in a very limited sense.

The medium security group differs from the minimum in that they have metal windows with no bars, and heavy wooden doors. These doors have handles on the outside only. At night the guard shuts each door, and thereby locks the prisoner in his room. Each room is equipped with a basin and toilet, not found in the minimum security rooms.

The maximum security group are secured in the Receiving Building. Each cell is of steel construction with the usual bars, toilet, and basin.

All of the buildings are surrounded by a wall.
This wall, equipped with electric wires, searchlights, etc; is the main line of defense. The prisoners are permitted as much freedom within the wall as possible, the wall providing the necessary confinement.

Many of these "dormitory prisons" do not have a wall. The Annandale Reformatory is of this type. This reformatory, however, represents the minimum security type of prison, and therefore is of little aid to us in our present problem. See Plate I-A.

Our problem now is to decide which of these two types of prisons will best solve the present problem and permit the introduction of the advancing methods of penology.

The first requirement of a modern prison is that it must be capable of safely confining the prisoners committed thereto. In this regard I feel that both types of prison are adequate.

The modern prison should provide for good classification. Such classification is possible in Prison "A" or Prison "B".

The Dormitory prison has an important advantage over Prison "A" in that it is cheaper to build. Many of the new steel prisons have cost as much as $5,000 per man. Many of the "dormitory prisons" have cost as little as $1,500 per man.

The modern prison should be equipped to protect society through improvement of the individual character of its inmates. This last consideration is undoubtedly the most important of all. The disadvantage of the "cell type", Prison "A" is that it confines the inmate
to such close quarters that he is constantly reminded that he is a criminal. The steel doors "clank" back and forth on him many times a day. His recreation is even confined to a space clearly marked "prison". He marches to dinner, to work, and to bed. Classes, books and instruction in vocational work are provided, still he lives in an unnatural environment. His prison life does not become part of his natural self, after leaving the confines of the prison, his stay becomes a "sort of a dream." It is easy for him to revert to his old style of living. Frequently the bars and this constant reminder of confinement result in a resentment toward society which leads him to become a more vicious criminal upon his release. On the other hand the Prison "B", dormitory type, permits a more normal life. The majority of the inmates, those in the minimum and medium security, are aroused in the morning, in a clean, ordinary room much like many college dormitories. He has his meals with a small group of men, and reports to work. Naturally he must frequently report and is "checked-up" at various intervals, but with the grim exception of the wall he is seldom reminded of his surroundings.

In such an environment he is living under conditions as nearly normal as possible. Upon his release the prisoner need not radically change his mode of life, and hence the influence toward a good healthy life started in prison has a better chance of continuing.
Another advantage of the Dormitory prison is that it is more adaptable to changes. The existing buildings can be easily adapted to the introduction of new methods which are rapidly changing. The ordinary "cell" type is "hard and fast". It is practically impossible to change or adapt it to changing conditions.

Because of these reasons I favor the "semi-dormitory" system with as few "steel cells" as possible. The Norfolk Prison Colony comes nearer to my idea of a satisfactory prison than any other prison with which I am acquainted. I will deal with the advantages of my design for a prison in the next section.
In my introduction I quoted from an early report of the Utah State Prison because it included the recommendation of the Warden for a new prison. In the report of Warden R. E. Davis dated June 30, 1932, we find the following:

"In the Biennial Report for the years 1925 and 1926, I proposed that a new prison site be purchased and that means be provided for employment, segregation and rehabilitation of inmates.

"Today, after having been in charge of the Prison for more than seven years; after having over 1500 men, boys and women in my care; after having released over 1200 of these unfortunate persons, I again urgently recommend, with all the emphasis of experience, that immediate steps be taken to accomplish these things.

"The cost of crime to the State is enormous. The cost of keeping an inmate here for a year or five years, in many cases, is less expensive than the cost of apprehending and correcting the law violator, and the damage done by the commission of the crime, many times, cannot be reckoned in terms of money. I propose that means be provided so that all able-bodied inmates of this institution shall be employed at labor profitable enough that the taxpayers of this State, at least, shall not be compelled to pay the expense incurred in keeping them here."
During the past two years, with an average population of 315 and at three different times with more than 340 inmates in the prison, and only 288 individual cells available, segregation to any extent has been practically impossible. Under this crowded condition the Prison becomes a school of crime to many of the impressionable young men and boys who must immediately associate with hardened criminals and more degenerates. Add idleness to this situation and even the older individuals, of exceptional strong moral fibre, seldom leave the institution better equipped to go straight than when they entered.

"I recommend that an experienced educator be employed to study the educational needs of each individual inmate, and to broaden and improve the present educational program of the Prison. If the State of Utah would reduce crime, the best time to do it is before the crime is committed. If this is not done and the person is confined in this or some other institution, let us remove the obstacles and supply the means of reformation and rehabilitation. Let us remember the words of the "Great Teacher", when he was asked why he was eating with publicans and sinners, he replied, 'They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick'."

Figure 5 shows arrangement of the existing prison with its 288 separate cells. After reading the Warden's
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report, nothing more need be said concerning the necessity of a new prison.

One of our main problems in the design of a new prison deals with the men who are to be confined therein. Figures 6 and 7 show the population of the Utah Penitentiary since 1897. These charts show a considerable variation, but they indicate that in the last ten years the population has varied between 200 inmates and 340 inmates. Such a variation seems to be fairly uniform because we notice that in January 1923, the population was 200 inmates, and as late as July 1930, it was only 265. During the present depression it has risen to a high point of 340 during February 1932. Because of this gradual increase I have designed my prison to provide for five hundred men. This would take care of any increase for several years, and from a study of the statistics seems to be adequate.

The type of man committed to the prison is essential to a satisfactory solution of the problem. We must realize that the population is continually changing so that any absolute conclusions are impossible. However, by considering the crimes for which they were sentenced we can determine something of their type. The only other available information is their occupation before conviction, their birthplace, and their number of terms. Figure 8 is a chart of the inmate's crimes. We see that by far the majority were sentenced for crimes.
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against property. The number of other crimes has remained quite steady, but the crimes against property fluctuate greatly according to economic conditions. The following list is a detailed one dealing with the crimes for which men were sentenced to the penitentiary from July 1, 1931, to June 30, 1932.

Adultery................................. 5
Arson, second degree....................... 3
Assault with deadly weapon................. 7
Assault with intent to do bodily harm...... 1
Assault with deadly weapon to commit murder. 1
Assault to murder.......................... 3
Assault with intent to commit rape......... 8
Assault with intent to commit robbery...... 1
Attempted Burglary, second degree........ 3
Attempted Burglary, third degree.......... 5
Attempt to assist prisoner escape......... 3
Auto theft.................................. 27
Burglary, second degree.................. 97
Burglary, third degree.................... 29
Carnal Knowledge.......................... 14
Crime Against Nature....................... 2
Checks, insufficient funds.................. 2
Depriving owner of automobile............. 9
Embezzlement.............................. 4
Failure to provide and wilful neglect..... 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fictitious checks</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Larceny</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent assault</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injuring jail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder, first degree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder, second degree</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygamy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of marijuana</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of Narcotics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibition violation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving property by false pretense</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving stolen property</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary manslaughter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The men were occupied in many fields before conviction. The largest group being 140 laborers, the next group being 55 farmers.

The following table shows the ages of the prisoners received from July 1, 1930 to June 30, 1932.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 years of age and under</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 21 and 30 years, inclusive</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 31 and 40 years, inclusive</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Between 41 and 50 years, inclusive.... 32  
Between 51 and 60 years, inclusive.... 18  
Over 61 years of age...................... 12

Of the male inmates 424 were White, 20 Mexican, one Filipino, one Japanese, and nine Colored. The great majority were born in the United States. The exact number of terms in prison and reformatories served by the men is not absolutely known. However the following table shows the known terms served or being served by the prisoners in the Utah prison on June 30, 1932.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Term</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Term</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Term</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Term</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Term</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Term</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Term</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following is a list of the length of sentences being served by all prisoners on hand June 30, 1932.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemned</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirty Years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twenty-five Years..................... 1
Twenty Years............................ 1
Fifteen Years......................... 1
Ten Years............................... 2
Indeterminate......................... 284
TOTAL................................. 308

All of these statistics were obtained from the Biennial Report of the Utah State Prison for the fiscal years 1931 and 1932.

These statistics are very typical of those in past years. In fact they vary so little that we are justified in assuming them as our facts upon which to design a new prison.
From these figures we see that the majority of prisoners are first or second offenders; are under thirty years of age; were convicted for crimes committed against property; and are serving an indeterminate sentence.

All of these facts show that the majority of men committed to the prison are not "hardened criminals." Most of these men do not need maximum security. Considering all of these facts and the fact that all prisoners upon arrival are placed in the maximum security, I have concluded that the prison needs sixty maximum security cells. These cells are 6 feet 2 inches wide by 10 feet long and 8 feet high. All of the cells are outside cells. The toilet and wash basin are placed against a shaft which contains the pipes and also acts as a ventilation shaft. The inside walls are steel reinforced concrete, 4 inches thick. The floor and ceiling are also of reinforced concrete. The outside wall is 16 inches thick constructed with concrete blocks. This type of construction is advantageous because the blocks can be made by the prisoner. They can also be readily reinforced with steel and can be laid to a true enough line in the inside to do away with plastering. The steel bars are built upon the inside of the window. This permits the windows to swing outside the building. This steel
grille is painted white and hence is readily accessible to inspection and cleaning. By being so painted and placed the light in the cell is also much better. Upon the inside of the cell the bars are kept warmer and have been found to be more difficult to cut under such conditions. This placement also protects them from the weather with its resulting rust.

The cell doors are electrically controlled by a switch board in the guards' vestibule. All the doors can be opened at the same time or any door can be opened separately.

The cell corridor is 8 feet wide in order to provide an exercise space. The roof of the cell block is also used for exercise, but in inclement weather the corridors will be substituted.

The cell block "A" is in close conjunction with the administration and hospital. (See Plate 2 for all further references.) This provided for easy supervision and control. It also permits careful physical and psychological studies to be made.

The prisoner is received from the court in a unit connecting the administration "C" with the cell block and hospital. He is registered at the office and his papers are examined. If several prisoners arrive at the same time they remain in a waiting room and are individually conducted through the general procedure. After his papers are found to
be in order he is taken into the Bertillon room, where he is fingerprinted and photographed. This is done before he is bathed and given new clothes because the authorities desire a record of the prisoner as he entered the institution. He is then taken to a disrobing room where his clothes are placed in a sterilizer, and then stored in the basement. After bathing the prisoner is given a thorough physical examination. Clean prison clothes are then provided him. He may then be examined by a psychiatrist, this examination may take place several hours or days after his arrival. He is then assigned to his quarters in the cell block. He remains in the cell block until the authorities can properly place him in the other units.

The two units "E" accommodate the majority of the prisoners. Each unit has room for 160 men. The end sections are devoted to medium security men. Each section has forty rooms, which can also be separated into groups of twenty. These rooms do not have bars at the windows which are steel sash. These windows do not completely open, and it is impossible for a man to pass through one of these windows. Each room is equipped with a wash basin and toilet. The door is a heavy wooden door with a wire glass opening. They have a handle on the outside only, which permits the man to be locked in the room at night. This security with hourly supervision is sufficient. The staff member passes each door
each deer once an hour and inspects each room.

The central portions of Units "E" are for the minimum security group within the wall. This portion has individual rooms and dormitories for several men. The individual rooms have no door which provides for better control. Each floor is equipped with wash basins, toilets and showers. None of the rooms have individual toilet facilities. In appearance these rooms are very much like the ordinary college dormitory room. Each building accommodates eighty men, making a total of 160 men in minimum security.

About one hundred men are assigned to the farm colony outside the wall. These men are really the minimum security group. The entire plot should be approximately 1000 acres. This would permit adequate space to provide sufficient food for state uses. Beside the main farm colony, several small houses should be built. These small houses are for men, who are possible parolees, and their families. Under supervision they are permitted to farm this portion of land. They must be self-supporting. This provision allows certain men to learn to become good citizens. This idea is rather experimental but would provide very fine training for a certain few men. The men must be chosen with great care. These men receive training in farming, and upon parole are aided in obtaining a plot of land on which to live.
By proper direction and inspiration many men can be turned into law abiding farmers. This farm colony is located outside the prison wall, and is not included in the present design.

The remaining twenty accommodations are in the venereal disease ward. From July 1, 1930, to June 30, 1932, the Utah Prison had eighty-two cases of Syphilis and twenty-one cases of Gonorrhea. This seems to be abnormally high, however, because from July 1, 1928 to June 30, 1930 there were forty cases of Syphilis and twelve cases of Gonorrhea. However I have devoted the second floor of the hospital building "B" to the more serious venereal cases. They, like all other venereal cases, have their own special eating room and equipment, separate showers and toilets, and their laundry separately done. The venereal cases not confined to the hospital are segregated in Units "E."

The hospital unit "B" is composed of three floors. The first floor is devoted to incoming prisoners and the ordinary "out patient" equipment. Men needing treatment report to the guard in the central vestibule. They are then sent to the waiting room where they are questioned and sent to their respective destination. The second floor is for venereal cases. The third floor is devoted to the operating room and the various wards. The operat-
ing room is equipped with the ordinary equipment, such as sterilizers, operating slab, etc. I have placed it on the third floor because better light can thus be obtained. It is lighted on all sides and by an overhead skylight. An elevator connects the three floors of the hospital unit, and is the only one used in the prison. The ordinary hospital equipment is included in the design of the hospital unit.

The room on the fourth floor of unit "A-B" is devoted to exercise. The roof is also used for this purpose. Units "E" are so designed that the minimum and each medium security group has an exercise room in connection with the roof. In good weather the majority of men will receive their exercise and physical training on "good old terra firma," but in the winter much of this must take place in the exercise room and on the roof. The hospital cases and men in the maximum security group will have all their physical training in this top unit, on the roof of their building, or in their respective corridors.

The kitchen is located under the auditorium in Unit "G". The supplies for the kitchen are received at the rear of the building. The kitchen is actually located in the sub-basement. The auditorium above is raised five feet above the ground level in order to assure sufficient light and ventilation for the kitchen.
The kitchen is connected to all the dining rooms by a tunnel, which is also used for plumbing and heating pipes, electric wires, etc. I placed it below ground level in order that the access to tunnel would not be too difficult. It is more economical to build it in connection with the auditorium than to construct a separate building for the kitchen.

Authorities differ upon the question of dining halls. Some advocate a main control hall for all the prisoners. Others suggest that separate dining rooms be provided for small groups. I feel that the latter idea is much the better. It allows for better segregation and ease of administration. It has a fault in the fact that more men are required for its proper functioning. However, in a prison there are many men in need of employment who can be put to work effectively in this service. Each small dining room is equipped with a small serving room. This serving pantry has a steam-table similar to those found in chain restaurants. In this way the food is kept in excellent condition. The food is delivered in hand trucks to the various dining rooms, and sent up by means of a dumb-waiter. This equipment may be a little more costly than that required for a general mess hall, but I feel that the advantages are worth the extra cost. The men not only work and talk with their own group but also eat with them. It also provides a more normal environment. Many serious outbreaks and
trouble have started in large mess rooms. This danger is practically eliminated in the small dining rooms. The same kitchen supplies the food for the staff members who also have their private dining rooms. All the dining rooms are designed for cafeteria-type service.

The remaining part of building "G" is devoted to the auditorium, class rooms, and social rooms. This auditorium is large enough to accommodate five hundred persons. It is equipped for religious services, concerts, moving pictures, etc. The class rooms are of the ordinary type. All of the educational classes, except the vocational classes, are taught in these rooms.

The library is located in this unit "G". At the present time the Utah Prison has 2,589 books. The proposed library would provide for 4000 books. These are to be supplemented by borrowed books from the Public Library. This unit also houses such functions as the Prison Newspaper, the barber shop, prison store for cigarettes and other things the men are allowed to buy.

The power and heating unit "F", is located in the rear of the plot. The prison is heated by steam. This unit provides all the heat, hot water, steam for sterilization, electric power, and steam for the laundry. The power house is so designed that in
case the electric current is cut off for any reason, outside power automatically is introduced. In this way there is no possibility of the prison being without electricity.

The two units "H" house the shops and laundry. These shops include carpenter shops, paint shops, etc. A new national law goes into effect in 1934 which prohibits prison goods to compete in an outside market. This law will necessitate a change in the products of the Utah Prison. Because of this new law and my lack of knowledge concerning the machinery and industries which will best fill the needs of the Utah Prison, I will not propose an exact design for the shops. Vocational classes will also be taught in the shops.

All persons entering the prison must pass through the entrance building "D". Within this building is a guard office which is enclosed with bullet-proof glass. This bullet-proof room also houses the prison's arsenal. Persons, entering, state the business and register at this office. The guard, if satisfied that they should be allowed to enter the prison, opens the entrance lock. This lock is composed of two steel doors. The first door must be closed and locked before the second door can be opened. The telephone exchange is also located within this bullet-proof room. This entrance and the truck entrance are the only means of entering
or leaving the prison. Unit "D" is equipped with a dining room for staff members and guards working outside the prison walls. This dining room is also to be used for any prison guests. The second floor of the building is devoted to a dormitory. As a general rule the staff and guards are not housed at the prison, however, in case of riots or impending trouble the guards will remain at the prison and sleep in the dormitory. It may also be used to house special exhibits of prison workmanship. On the third floor is located a staff recreation room. This small room is for guards and staff members. The men employed in the guard towers, the main guard house, and on the surrounding land, are never allowed inside the wall. In this way they do not come, at any time, in contact with the prisoners. This precaution is necessary because history has shown that most prison breaks have been accomplished by dishonest and bribed guards. This procedure necessitates a dining room, dormitory, and recreation room accessible from the outside. The fourth floor is devoted to the guard room which overlooks the two walls, which have an area of 75 feet on both sides in which no one is allowed. Anyone in this area is liable to be shot.

After passing the entrance lock, persons entering
the penitentiary proceed through a corridor into the administration building "C". This building accommodates the Warden's Office, the deputy warden's office, the record office, and waiting room. If an individual comes to visit a prisoner he registers at the office, and then enters the waiting room. Adjoining the waiting room is the visiting room. Prisoners are brought through the guard room in unit "A-B" into the visiting room. Anyone entering the remaining portion of the prison must pass through a locked door, controlled by the office, and through the guard room in unit "A-B".

The second floor of the administration building is devoted to a staff library and reading room, and the staff dining room. These are used by all members working inside the prison walls.

We now come to a consideration of the prison wall. Here again authorities differ. Many advocate a surrounding wall, and others recommend its abolition. I feel that a wall is advisable because it allows much greater freedom inside the prison. It gives society sufficient protection. I have talked to wardens of prisons with and without walls, and both types advocate the use of the wall. Practically every authority with whom I have conferred have advocated the use of a wall. The wall is 18 feet high.
This height is sufficient to prevent a man's vaulting over the wall or being boosted over by other prisoners. Since the prisoner will have to use a rope and hook to get over this wall, an additional 5 to 15 feet will not greatly add to the difficulty of escape. The wall is surmounted by electric wires carrying 2000 volts. The wall consists of piers, erected twenty feet apart, between which are built thinner panels. This method of construction has a few faults, but is more economical to build.

I have chosen a triangular wall to surround the buildings. A triangle, enclosing a given area has a greater perimeter than a square. In this problem I have an area of approximately 17 acres within the wall. The triangular wall is 4000 feet long. A square wall enclosing the same area would be only 3464 feet long. However, the final cost is less, because by using a triangular wall, two guard towers are eliminated. A square plan requires a tower at each corner and entrance tower. The triangular plan requires only three towers. Using the cost of the Norfolk Prison Wall as my basis, I have found that the triangular wall is the cheaper. The Norfolk wall, built with prison labor, cost $19 per foot; each tower cost $9000. The extra wall in the triangular plot would cost $10,184, but the saving on the towers
would amount to $18,000, hence we have an advantage of $7,814 in favor of the triangular plot.

Besides the cost of construction, we have another saving in the guarding of the wall. The elimination of the two towers lessens the vulnerable points and hence makes the wall more efficient. One of the rear towers is equipped with an automobile and truck lock. This is an open lock with two gates which can not be opened at the same time. The truck passes through the first gate, it is then inspected, and then allowed to enter the prison. It must pass through the same procedure upon leaving the prison.

The rear corners of the plot are used for baseball parks, horse-shoe courts, etc. This is also satisfactory because the men are under the supervision of the tower guard.

All of the buildings are built of fire-proof construction. The buildings use concrete blocks, which can easily be made by the prisoners. The blocks are made in different sizes, so that when they are laid by the prisoners they have the appearance of broken ashlar. The floors and outside wall are of poured concrete. In construction, prison labor must be used wherever possible.

The complete cost of the prison is undeterminable because the amount and skill of available labor is unknown. However, this style of prison is much
cheaper to construct than the type with all the cells of maximum security. This type formerly called Type "A", costs about $5000 per man, my proposed prison or Type "B" may cost as little as $1000 per man, certainly not more than an average of $2,500 per inmate.

An important consideration in my design is the problem of future expansion. The units "E" have been placed back far enough to provide space for another maximum cell block. An inspection corridor can be built from the present guard vestibule, with the cell block extending from it. Units "E" have been placed far enough apart to allow two more units to be built between them. In this way the accommodations can be doubled. Extra shops can also be built at the rear of the prison.

The sewage system of the prison includes a main sewer line to the filter beds and sewage treatment plant which are located some distance from the prison.

The prison is to be built on a large plot of land, about 1000 acres, located in a section of country which has a very small population. The water supply is to be obtained from the mountain streams and reservoirs. The land must be good farm land.

Most of the prisoners are sentenced from Salt Lake County. Salt Lake City also offers the best source for supplies, etc. For these reasons the prison should be located within driving distance of
Salt Lake City, Utah. However, it should be far enough away so that the prison will never become part of the city. I would recommend a distance of from ten to twenty miles from Salt Lake City.

In conclusion let us consider the question of the efficiency of the proposed penitentiary. The first requirement of a modern prison is that it should be capable of safely confining the prisoners committed thereto. The proposed prison does this satisfactorily with its strong 18 foot wall, and the maximum security cell for the more dangerous inmates. The location of the prison in the middle of a thousand acre isolated lot also insures the security of the prison. The towers and strongly fortified entrance insures its safety from outside or inside trouble.

The modern prison should provide for the newer principles of classification and individualization. The design of the Utah Prison will take care of these needs in a satisfactory manner. The men can be studied carefully in the hospital and in their respective building. The social center provides for individual education and socialization. I have tried to give the buildings as natural appearance as possible. The design does away, as much as possible, with the "prison character". The majority of inmates are housed in rooms which do not continually remind them of the fact that they are criminals and persons to be avoided.
A good prison design must provide for proper segregation. This design considers this question very carefully, and provides accommodations for segregation into small groups. The maximum security cells allow the men to be completely isolated, grouped into units of twenty men, or grouped into a larger group of sixty men. The medium security allows for the segregation of from ten to fifteen men, or the grouping of the entire unit of forty men. Likewise in the minimum security the men can be separated into groups from ten to eighty men.

The shops and farm will provide employment for the inmates, and also aid materially in the upkeep of the prison. In fact the provisions are sufficient that the prison should be self-supporting. The saving of the taxpayers money is always advisable, and prisons should be self-supporting if possible.

Throughout the design I have considered the economy of construction. I have designed buildings which can be built largely by the prisoners with some outside direction. By so doing the State will save a large sum of money.

I feel that the proposed design will allow the introduction of the system of penology outlined in another section of this thesis, and yet be flexible enough to allow future changes. The possibility of future expansion has also been provided.
Figure 8: "Crimes for Which Persons Were Sentenced in Utah."
In the study of this thesis I have been given many fine suggestions, and very fine cooperation. I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks for the aid given me by the following men:

Dean William Emerson, for his suggestions and letters of introduction.

Albert Warren Stearns, M.D., Dean of Tufts College Medical School; Ex-Commissioner of Correction, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.


Frank Loveland, Jr. Department of Correction, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Sheldon Glueck, Harvard Law School, Author of "500 Criminal Careers."

Albert Morris, Criminology Department, Boston University.

Mr. Ford, Assistant Warden of Middlesex County Prison at Billerica, Massachusetts.

Mr. Morris, Secretary of the Superintendent at the State Prison Colony at Norfolk, Massachusetts.

Francis B. Sayre, Harvard Professor, State Commissioner of Correction, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

M. N. Winslow, Senior Engineer of Norfolk Prison.
NOTES TO REFERENCES

1. "Punishment and Reformation" by Frederick H. Wines LL.D.
3. A good account of Obermaier is in Wines, "Punishment & Reformation."
5. "On Prison Discipline in India" Mary Carpenter.
12. "Criminology" Edwin H. Sutherland
13. "Marie Antoinette" Stefan Zweig
14. "The Historical Background of Our Prisons." Thorsten Sellin, Ph. D.
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