THE TRIUMPH OF THE "PENNSYLVANIA SYSTEM" AT THE STATE'S PENITENTIARIES

BY LEROY B. DEPUY*

THE group of reformers which in 1787 organized as the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons, a title subsequently shortened to the Pennsylvania Prison Society, dedicated its energies over a long period to promoting the welfare of convicted criminals. The Society, during its early years, developed in theory and practice the so-called Pennsylvania system under which prisoners labored in solitary confinement. This Pennsylvania system influenced profoundly prison design and administration not alone at Philadelphia but at Pittsburgh, in other states, and also abroad. The story of the organization itself has been ably detailed by Dr. Negley K. Teeters,1 and the activities of the Society in connection with the prison which for long stood on Walnut Street across from Independence Square have been sketched in a previous article.2

Documents recently segregated at Harrisburg, in the Division of Public Records, and at the two older state penitentiaries help to fill out the evidence and demonstrate clearly that after having tried and failed at the Walnut Street Prison, the Society and its allies went on with amazing persistence to promote, and increasingly to dominate, the planning of prisons during the first fifty years of Pennsylvania's membership in the Union. Their domi-
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tion was always benevolent, but never complete and unopposed. They met and overcame dissent as they went on from the failures of the Walnut Street Prison and the later Arch Street Prison to win recognition and success at the two great new prisons which were built during the 1820's, the Western State Penitentiary, at Pittsburgh, and the Eastern State Penitentiary, at Philadelphia. With growing strength and grim dedication to the cause, they succeeded in writing the Pennsylvania system into the statutes of the Commonwealth and imposing it upon the new prisons. They pioneered for prisons an architectural style which was to become much copied, and initiated distinctive methods for the treatment of prison inmates. By 1840 they had pushed the Pennsylvania system into world prominence and had demonstrated to the satisfaction of many a penologist (though by no means to all) that despite certain inherent administrative difficulties, notably high cost, their program for combining prison labor with the strictest of solitary confinement was capable of practical application and promised beneficial results. Even to many outside the original circle, it appeared that there had been found in solitary labor the magic formula which would cause moral regeneration to flourish within prison walls.

At Walnut Street an unsuitable structure and overcrowding caused failure. Only in 1789, when the Prison was some years old as an operating institution, did the Commonwealth join Philadelphia as a partner there. Renovation and enlargement followed shortly, but even with the new construction the Walnut Street Prison remained inadequate for its swelling population. On December 14, 1801, the Prison Society addressed to the Assembly a memorial which read in part:

... Ever since the present establishment of the prisons we have wished to make a fair experiment of Solitude and labor on the Convicts. — Every year's experience has shown us that in the present state of the prison such an attempt, however desirable is impracticable. —

We are therefore induced to request that you will devise such means as may appear to you most adequate to separate the Convicts from all other descriptions of prisoners, in order that a full opportunity of trying the effects of Solitude and labor may be afforded.³

³Quoted in Appendix I of Teeters, op. cit., p. 453.
A later memorial from the Society, under date of January 25, 1803, urged the construction of "another House or set of Buildings" for vagrants, accommodations designed to relieve overcrowding at Walnut Street. The Assembly responded by passing promptly an act to provide at Philadelphia "for the use of said city and county," a new prison which was to take over from Walnut Street "all prisoners for trial, vagrants, runaway or disorderly servants and apprentices, and all such other descriptions of persons (except convicts), as have been heretofore confined in the county prison." Explicitly, the intention was to eliminate the intermingling of county jail and state prison functions which characterized the older prison. Walnut Street was to become exclusively a state penitentiary.

At first the new jail was known as the Bridewell, after the famous London institution, but later, from its location just northwest of the present City Hall, it was called the Arch Street Prison. No complete set of records for this building has survived, and printed materials supplemented by the fragments at the Division of Public Records leave its history still somewhat unclear. There was a delay of years in its construction, although it was urgently needed, and the new prison was not opened until 1817, remaining incomplete at least until 1821. Even then, nobody had a good word for this prison, which appears to have been very badly planned and of inadequate security. Erected at a cost somewhat above $100,000, it remained in use but twenty years.

The history of the Arch Street Prison is a credit to nobody concerned. Legislation dated March 13, 1816, finally authorized its use, but only as a debtor's apartment. When at long last the prison became available, it was far too poor and much too late.

At that period, the western counties were very far from Philadelphia both in geography and in political theory. The great costs incurred annually in transporting heavily guarded prisoners by stagecoach is well documented at the Division of Public Records. Printed reports of the time, and manuscripts also, record the protests of county officials who believed that Philadelphia was wickedly reaping profit from the toil of convicts even while burdening their home counties with bills for their maintenance. Combined

---


*Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania, XVII, 469; 1802-05, P. L. 149.*
with the desperate conditions at Walnut Street, these factors led to the act of 1818 which provided for the erection on the public land adjoining the town of Allegheny, in the county of Allegheny, of a state penitentiary "on the principle of solitary confinement of the convicts as the same now is or hereafter may be established." There was to be a board of five Building Commissioners, and an architect who was to receive not more than five dollars per day. The same act called for action which came only years later, the sale of the Walnut Street Prison and the use of the proceeds to construct a new prison at Philadelphia.

The construction at Pittsburgh is documented chiefly by a manuscript volume preserved at the Western State Penitentiary: "Proceedings of the Commissioners appointed by the Select and Common Councils of the City of Pittsburgh, in pursuance of an act titled, An Act to provide for the erection of a State Penitentiary." These proceedings, taken with the legislation, the printed reports, and the manuscripts preserved at the Division of Public Records combine to tell a clear story. The Commissioners were headed by James Ross, distinguished attorney of Pittsburgh, one-time United States Senator, and three times unsuccessful Federalist candidate for governor. The group first met on May 20, 1818, and the prison was turned over to the newly-organized Board of Inspectors eight years later, on July 1, 1826. On that date, it was reported, "the exterior walls and all the entrances through them are finished," certainly a desirable condition for a prison which was within a few weeks to receive its first inmates.

William Strickland, young, but already a well-known architect of Philadelphia, had planned the building, but his circular design was faulty, and at the Western State Penitentiary there was trouble from the start. Three manuscript volumes of the "Minutes of the Board of Inspectors of the State Penitentiary in the County of Allegheny," covering the period from May, 1826, to October, 1866, reveal much detail regarding the early years. From within

---

their own ranks, the Inspectors chose John Hannen to be the first Warden, or "Principal." The unsuitable building made administration difficult, there were several escapes, and on May 7, 1829, after less than three years as Warden, Hannen resigned.

At the original Western Penitentiary complete enforcement of the Pennsylvania system was impossible, and the act passed April 23, 1829, only two weeks previous, requiring strict application of that system, appears to have forced the decision of a Warden already discouraged by existing conditions. Actually, although convict labor in solitude had been much advocated for a quarter-century, the theory had never been placed completely in operation, and whatever might be possible at Philadelphia, with a plant carefully designed by John Haviland to suit peculiar requirements, at the Western Penitentiary in 1829 the Pennsylvania system could not be maintained. Four years later a legislative committee reported

... the total unfitness of the old building for the purposes of Penitentiary punishment. There being at present more prisoners than cells to confine them in, the Warden is compelled to put two in one cell, and thus violate the Act of Assembly and the sentence of the court by which they were convicted. Nor is this the only inconvenience. The cells in which they are confined being so small, and having no means of ventilation, the air within them, in a few hours, becomes so impure as to prejudice their health, and renders it necessary to open the doors of their apartments, and thus allow a full communication between the prisoners. At the same time the rooms are so small and badly lighted that they are unable to employ themselves at any labor whilst confined in them; the consequence of which has been, and now is, that the Warden, in order to keep them employed, has to resort to the old mode of Penitentiary labor, by employing the mechanics in the workshops of the prison and the laborers in the yard.9

The statute of 1829 was detailed and explicit, however, and it required that prisoners suffer punishment "by separate or solitary confinement at labour," and that they be kept "singly and separately at labour, in the cells or work yards." Only drastic alteration of the building could make such solitary labor possible, and during the spring of 1833, when the prison had been in use something

short of seven years, John Haviland, who meantime had most successfully completed the new prison at Philadelphia, was brought to Pittsburgh to draw new plans and superintend rebuilding. For but half of his time, Haviland was paid $2,000 annually and $300 in traveling expenses, with his travel between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh to be included in working time.

The faith thus put in Haviland's ability proved justified, and the revamped structure met with acclaim. On February 10, 1834, there was reported completion of a new block of

... one hundred and eight commodious cells, all of which are well ventilated, with sufficient light, and an admirable apparatus for observing cleanliness. The cells in the lower tier are necessarily somewhat larger than those in the second story; but in both ranges they are sufficiently capacious to admit of the employment of the convicts at any of the mechanical employments. The cells themselves are built of freestone, in a manner which reflects great credit on the skill and judgment of the architect and workmen.

The second story of the range of cells are roofed in by solid slabs of stone, extending across from one partition wall to the other, and secured down by strong bolts in a manner that would appear to render it utterly impossible for one confined within the cell, by the utmost efforts of ingenuity and perseverance, to effect an escape. This plan, in the opinion of your committee, is much preferable to the arched roof of the Eastern Penitentiary, both as to durability and security.

The development of the Eastern and Western State Penitentiaries during the 1830's became essentially one story, and that story was the installation and initial triumph of the Pennsylvania system in its purest and most extreme form. As a result of unsuitable architecture, the Western Penitentiary, although the first to be built, during early years of fumbling lost its leadership to the Eastern Penitentiary. The Philadelphia prison, authorized three years after the Pittsburgh institution had been provided for, had peculiar
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10 The plans of both Strickland and Haviland for the Western State Penitentiary appear between pages 14 and 15 of the Appendix to Report of William Crawford, Esq., on the Penitentiaries of the United States... by His Majesty's Command... printed 13th March 1835.
11 Ibid., p. 637.
advantages. It was able to profit directly from long experimenta-
tion at the Walnut Street Prison, and was from the beginning
administered by a group trained in meeting the practical problems
involved. Naturally, it was in Philadelphia that the Pennsylvania
system was first put in practice strictly and successfully.

It was in Philadelphia, too, that solitary confinement with labor
was practiced longest and attracted most attention and literary
notice. Being directly under the supervision of an experienced and
determined group, the Eastern State Penitentiary flourished from
the start, and because that group was sternly dedicated to the task
of improving the lot of convicts and stubborn in the belief that the
key to the reformation of prison inmates was labor in solitude,
it was there that the Pennsylvania system longest endured. Located
in a metropolis where visitors, both domestic and foreign, were
numerous, the great prison on Cherry Hill quickly became famous.

The Building Commissioners for the Eastern Penitentiary, meet-
ing first on April 6, 1821, had at their disposal $150,000, two-
thirds of which came directly from the Commonwealth. The other
$50,000 came from Philadelphia County as compensation for the
transfer of all the state's interest in the Arch Street Prison, which
from then until its destruction something less than twenty years
later, served as the local jail. Considering the scope and conspicuous
nature of their task, it is somewhat surprising to discover that, very
early, the Commissioners fell victim to a financial scandal. More
to be anticipated was their prolonged wrangle over the choice of
an architect. Successful as it was to prove, once in operation, the
Eastern State Penitentiary had its beginnings in embezzlement
and controversy.

Regarding the embezzlement, many details have already ap-
peared in print,12 but additional information is contained in the
manuscript records, chiefly in the minutes of the Building Com-
missioners, which survive at the Penitentiary itself,13 and partially
in reports and correspondence preserved at the Division of Public
Records. There is strong indication that the president of the Com-
missioners himself attempted to make away with the first $20,000
sent to the Board. He received a draft from Harrisburg on Sunday,

13 Minutes of the Commissioners for the Erection of a State Penitentiary,
one volume, 1821-25, and loose papers which complete the Minutes through
1828.
and exchanged it for nineteen notes of one thousand dollars each, with two of five hundred dollars each, on Monday. However, on the Tuesday immediately following, which was December 4, 1821, he arrived at the scheduled meeting of the Building Commissioners to report a rent in his pocket and the money gone.

The whole incident is described in terms so naive as to seem incredible—a piece of monumental effrontery. To a special meeting held the very next evening, the president came bearing “a wet paper, having the appearance of a letter opened, containing a number of bank notes, amounting to fifteen thousand dollars.” This, so he said, had been received from a mysterious stranger. Later still, he displayed written messages from one “Tom Find,” who subsequently disgorged under unusual circumstances four more notes, each for one thousand dollars. The last communication received from “Mr. Find,” who never did make himself manifest to anyone except the suspected president, stated with brazen candor:

I take the reward of $500—the other $500 should be enclosed, but I want it—on the honour of a Mason it shall be returned.

Brother T. F.

Masonic “honour” was not sufficiently compelling, however, and the final $1,000 remained absent. On July 7, 1822, the president of the Commissioners died insolvent, and five years later, in 1827, the Commonwealth gave up hope in “Tom Find,” accepted the loss, and adjusted the books. All this was a strange beginning—even for a prison.

Tumultuous as were the debates among the Building Commissioners during the financial scandal, these matched neither in heat nor duration the clashes which came over the choice of a man to design and superintend construction of the new prison. Philadelphia reformers had evolved a radical theory of prison administration which called for labor in strictest solitude, and that new system in turn required structural characteristics not found in any prison then existing. At Walnut Street their theories could be applied but partially; there, even after extensive alteration of the physical plant, they had been thwarted. The Arch Street Prison, never designed to serve as anything more than a local jail, had failed
dismally. The Western State Penitentiary, even then under construction, had yet to demonstrate its own peculiar shortcomings, but apparently these men, experienced in prison administration, suspected the design very early. The Philadelphia group, determined to give their theories every possible advantage in practice, were conscious that they were dealing with a strong new wine for which old bottles would never do.

The enabling act called for "a state penitentiary capable of holding two hundred and fifty prisoners, on the principle of solitary confinement of the convicts, as the same now is or hereafter may be established by law." A later section provided for construction "on the plan of the Penitentiary at Pittsburgh," a phrase equally vague. More explicit was the requirement:

*Provided always, That the principle of solitary confinement of the prisoners be preserved and maintained.*

However, even that could have been stretched to cover congregate work, the Auburn system, and the original plans for the Western State Penitentiary had failed to provide working space within the individual cells. During the early days of the Building Commissioners the adoption of the Pennsylvania system in strict form was by no means assured, and from the fundamental nature of the decisions which were required, debate was inevitable.

The debate came, and the outcome of the project was decided, with the selection of the architect. At that period the rising architect in Philadelphia was William Strickland, a versatile genius who was in process of completing the notable structure on Chestnut Street now known as the Old Custom House. Strickland looms large in the history of the Greek Revival and, somewhat later, was most successful also as an engineer with the then prominent canal companies. He was a brilliant pupil of Benjamin Latrobe, fast gaining fame in his own right. Already he had drawn the plans for the penitentiary at Pittsburgh, and his selection to design the Eastern State Penitentiary was so logical as to appear inevitable.

But a committee visited the Governor at Harrisburg with plans "designed and drawn by John Haviland," and the Governor's letter

---

of August 22, read at the Commissioners' meeting of September 3, accepted the Haviland plan of radiating cell blocks. Finally, at the meeting of September 17, a resolution dismissing Strickland was passed; much later, on April 9, 1823, the Board resolved:

That John Haviland . . . is appointed Architect, for erecting the State Penitentiary near Philadelphia, according to the Plan designed by him, adopted by this Board, and approved by the Governor; and that he be paid at the rate of fifteen hundred dollars per annum for his services, in-

Haviland, an Englishman who had come to America only in 1816, won fame by his work at Cherry Hill and developed as the leading authority on prison design. His plans fully recognized the special needs of the Pennsylvania system and provided large cells suitable for one-man work shops, with a series of high-walled exercise pens alongside where individual prisoners could secure fresh air while yet remaining completely secluded. At the Eastern
State Penitentiary John Haviland and the system of prison labor in strict solitude triumphed together.

Meantime, despite the controversy, construction had been going forward for nearly a year, probably following plans submitted by Strickland prior to his dismissal. The minutes of the Commissioners for April 30, 1822, report that digging for the foundation had started, and accounts show on September 25 a payroll for labor totalling $4,833 for two months. This tempo increased, naturally, once Haviland was clearly in charge, until during the second quarter of 1824 payrolls were running steadily at $1,000 each week. The first prisoner was received late in 1829, several months after the organization of the new Board of Inspectors on May 19. Construction continued, though at a slow pace which again accelerated in 1831. That year, an act signed March 28 authorized the Board of Inspectors to operate as building commissioners and to

... construct and erect within the outer walls of said penitentiary upon such plan as they may deem most expedient, buildings which shall contain at least four hundred cells, suitable for the confinement of convicted criminals, in solitary confinement at labor.

This construction started June 13, 1831, with Haviland again in charge. Between December 1, 1831, and June 15, 1833, the sum of $102,397.78 was spent in building the new cells. The middle 1830's found the new penitentiary at Philadelphia operating with efficiency under the guidance of Warden Samuel R. Wood.

Samuel R. Wood was elected Warden at a salary of $1,500 on June 29, 1829. He was a Quaker engaged in business in and about Philadelphia, but he was also experienced with prison affairs. For many years he had served on the Board of Inspectors for the Walnut Street Prison; he had been a Building Commissioner for the prison which he was called to head; and he had visited prisons abroad. Still preserved at the Eastern State Penitentiary are his journals as Warden and also a neat, complete but unbound series of his monthly reports to the Board. The first of these, dated November 7, 1829, narrates in some detail the coming of the first prisoner on October 25 previous. The reports show the Quaker Warden as a sympathetic and intelligent man intent upon reforming the unfortunates in his charge. They discuss many prob-
lems perennial in prison administration and reflect strongly the theories of the Philadelphia group in which for so long he was a central figure. For Samuel Wood, being warden of a penitentiary was far more than merely holding a job. He was stern because he realized discipline to be essential, he protested against over-free use of the pardoning power because he felt long incarceration was needed to insure regeneration, and with almost holy zeal he strove to prove the uplifting efficacy of labor in solitude.

Since, as a practical man, Wood also aspired to efficient management, he soon became aware of administrative difficulties. Certain necessary tasks could not be accomplished by convicts without violation of the strict rule requiring solitude. When an apothecary was needed, and he found that prisoner No. 62 was a trained physician, the Warden proposed dressing No. 62 in such clothing as would insure that other prisoners would not recognize him as being one of themselves and permitting him to act as apothecary, thus saving a salary of $250. Apparently this suggestion was overruled, for a nurse was hired.

Pardons created administrative problems, also, and within the thrifty Warden humanitarian sympathy at times struggled mightily with practical considerations, as is demonstrated by a letter which he addressed to Governor Wolf while construction was still progressing inside the outer wall of the prison:

My Dear Friend:

About ten days ago George M. Dallas made enquiry of me relative to Thos Wardle a prisoner in my custody, and stated his intention to apply to thee for his pardon—

I have since received a letter from the Secretary of State respecting said prisoner which I answered yesterday. He was one of a gang of horse thieves, three of whom we got — Thee may get correct information respecting them from Schuylkill and Northumberland Counties in both of which they traded — I am inclined to believe that Wardle & Emmerson were the two best— The worst was not taken—

Thomas Biddle has also called on me for information respecting William Davis a young man who robbed his Country house of a pair of candlesticks— Now I can say as much in favour of Davis and Emmerson as I have done for Wardle “Their conduct has been unexceptionable since they have been inmates in the Eastern Penitentiary”
But if this was good & sufficient cause to have them pardoned, a large majority of those under my care would be entitled to this favour— Now the fact is, that we have not three men at this time in the Penitentiary that we could so illy spare — They are all Smiths and better workmen than I have been able to procure for eight dollars per week — Indeed I do not know where I could replace them for ten dollars per week — We have now 354 iron doors to make; & Iron fastnings for the same number of wooden doors: and on these three men I very much depend for the execution of this work— And I would therefore say if any men are to be pardoned for good Conduct, I would much rather let 6 or 8 others who do not earn 20cts per day (but who behave equally as well as these men) rather than these three and some others of like kind — As the good conduct of one prisoner (& consequent pardon) cannot have any influence on another in our establishment; we have never taken nor I hope never will take this ground — I know my views look selfish; and I think it likely I feel so — If however there was any good & sufficient cause shewn, why these men should not serve out their time, I would be willing to say, the State might hire men — But if there is, I do not know it. Do not my dear friend think me too hard on this old subject of pardons— I know the importunities by which thou are beset, and feel for thee, and should be very willing if it were possible to take all the blame and censure of not granting them — I am satisfied the ground we have taken has had a salutary effect and I am very desirous that our list of pardons when presented at the close of the year will look small —

I remain with much regard & sincere friendship thy friend

George Wolf Esq.

The records reflect a sincere and honest man beset with difficulties. Inevitably, however, there was criticism and opposition, and by 1833 there came investigations. Hints of trouble appear in the minutes of the Inspectors as early as November 12, and on December 3 the Warden wrote to his superiors:

... I have been surrounded by spies, who ... have been closely watching for years, all my movements, in order
if possible at their own time to pervert the same to my injury. . . .

At this same period the Warden himself discovered another trouble spot: certain of the overseers, or guards, were Deists, while one was "a strong sectarian who was busy in inculcating among the prisoners his own notions." By February, charges and countercharges were sufficiently hot and numerous to bring about the resignation of the President of the Board of Inspectors, and hearings followed. In closing its inquiry June 7, 1834, the Board acquitted the Warden and declared the charges unsubstantial; but, once thoroughly aroused, the rumors of scandal would not down.

Those rumors reached Harrisburg, and in his message to the Assembly delivered December 3, 1834, Governor Wolf expressed regret that he must communicate to the General Assembly charges of great irregularities in the management of the Eastern Penitentiary.16

Wood interviewed the Governor and other officials at Harrisburg, but he received little solace. A legislative investigation started at once, and for Christmas Day the Warden's Journal reads:

At home all day & a gloomy one. Never knew what trouble was before. The Board of Inspectors met and remained in session until 10 O'clock.

The investigation dragged on for months. In the official findings, the majority of the committee commended the administration of Samuel Wood, but one member differed so sharply that a second report, longer and more critical in tone, appeared.17 Thus the verdict was ambiguous. Despite these sour circumstances, or perhaps because of them, Wood remained as Warden at Cherry Hill for several more years.

During his days of trouble, Samuel Wood must have been comforted by the knowledge that at the Western State Penitentiary...
The Pennsylvania system was making steady progress. No doubt the act of 1829 requiring labor in solitude was primarily responsible for this development, but it is obvious from the records that there grew up at the western prison an admiration for John Haviland and his prison architecture, and for Samuel Wood and his methods of prison administration.

Early in 1833, as has been noted, as Haviland was completing the second phase of construction at Cherry Hill, the Inspectors at Pittsburgh engaged him to reconstruct their Penitentiary. Haviland quickly tore out the faulty cell block and rebuilt the interior in a fashion which permitted the introduction of the Pennsylvania system. During the summer of 1834, the Inspectors dispatched Warden John Patterson east to study methods used in employing prisoners in their cells at Philadelphia, and the minutes of March 5, 1835, refer to “description or Convict Books” secured from Philadelphia. These last were to be completed back from the first occupancy of the Penitentiary and apparently they were set up in imitation of the system used at the Eastern State Penitentiary.

What was happening was the transplanting of the Pennsylvania system. Conceived at the Walnut Street Prison, championed over the long years by the Philadelphia reformers, finally made the law of the Commonwealth by the act of 1829, the system had been effectively administered by Samuel Wood from the day the Eastern State Penitentiary opened, and the officials at Pittsburgh were accepting both the system and its chief exponents, Haviland and Wood.

The culmination of that acceptance, and what must have been the high spot in the professional career of Samuel Wood, came in 1836. In July of that year Armistead Beckham took charge at the Western State Penitentiary, beginning his twenty-two years of service as Warden there. Only two weeks after his appointment, Beckham addressed a letter to his Inspectors “asking permission to invite Mr. Wood to act as Warden for a few days with the view of being able to derive information from the long experience of that Gentleman.” An invitation was forwarded to Philadelphia, and Warden Wood accepted. During the several days which he spent at the Western State Penitentiary he was actually and officially Warden there. Still preserved in the minutes of the Board is the report, with recommendations, which he made at that time.
It is obvious that through Beckham the Pennsylvania system secured in 1836 a firm foothold at the Pittsburgh prison. Thus when in 1840 Samuel Wood resigned as Warden of the Eastern State Penitentiary, the Pennsylvania system was actually in successful operation at both Penitentiaries. It had been adopted in two other states, Rhode Island and New Jersey, and for these states, also, Haviland designed prisons. Three foreign countries, England, Belgium and Sweden, had already installed the system in their prisons; and slightly later other nations were to follow: Hungary, France, Prussia, Denmark, Norway, and Holland. One authority has stated that

... down to the present day the Pennsylvania system dominates the penitentiary system of continental Europe.\(^8\)

In fifty years the seed of radical prison reform which first sprouted at the Walnut Street Prison had developed through heat and storm to become sturdy and self-reliant; by 1840 the Pennsylvania system had triumphed.

\(^8\) H. E. Barnes, *op. cit.*, p. 176.