

CONTROVERSIAL QUESTIONS ABOUT THE IDEOLOGICAL ORIGINS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA SYSTEM OF PRISON DISCIPLINE¹

Olena Sokalska,
German Historical Institute Warsaw,
Warsaw, Poland
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8737-0829>
e-mail: co2001@ukr.net

Abstract. The present article delves into the origins and theoretical underpinnings of the carceral model of corrective punishment at Walnut Street Prison and the system of solitary confinement at Eastern State Penitentiary. The central research question to the extent to which the ideology advocated by the Society of Friends served as a formative influence in shaping the Pennsylvania system of prison discipline and its implementation in practice, as frequently acknowledged in historiography. To probe this inquiry, we have resorted to primary source materials and literature addressing the historical trajectory of penal institutions in Pennsylvania.

It has been ascertained that the contention positing the pivotal involvement of the Society of Friends in the reformatory initiative gained traction primarily within the European penitentiary discourse on penology, through accounts of American prisons penned by La Rochefoucauld, Niemcewicz, Beaumont, and Tocqueville. The carceral model at Walnut Street Prison, characterized by distinctive attributes encompassing segregated confinement, hard labor, distinct treatment protocols grave for the most egregious of offenders, and administrative oversight by the Board of Inspectors, largely adhered to the English carceral model of corrective punishment. The conviction in the redemptive potential of seclusion was intrinsic to both religious and materialist penitentiary discourses of the era. Therefore, the ideology of the Society of Friends was not determinative here.

The establishment of the system of separate and solitary confinement during the 1820s was instigated by the challenges encountered within the carceral model of Walnut Street Prison. It was a complex process and cannot be reduced to the realization of one religious group's idea: it took into account the practical experience of prisons in Pennsylvania and other states, the theoretical research, and analyzed statistical data. The reform was predated by active public discourse and scholarly dialogues appraising the merits and limitations inherent in diverse models of prison discipline.

Keywords: Pennsylvania system of prison discipline, Walnut Street Prison, Quakers, penitentiary, solitary confinement.

INTRODUCTION

While historical knowledge predominantly serves the cognitive purpose of pursuing an "objective historical truth," an inherent ideological dimension

¹ The paper was prepared within the framework of the Fellowship «Research Perspective Ukraine» at the German Historical Institute Warsaw

permeates even historical studies of prison. The reference to history and the reevaluation of the origins of penitentiary systems have frequently been linked to paradigm shifts and method changes in the application of incarceration. The International Penal Commission, initiating the historical reviews of the prison systems of the participating countries at the Rome Congress, recommended starting from the era of Howard (*Actes du Congres penitentiaire*, 1888). However, penal scholars from Spain, France, and the Netherlands sought to extend this chronology to underscore their respective nations' contributions. Amidst the globalization of penal systems, the pursuit of identifying national foundations for penal reforms persisted well into the 20th century. German scholars contended that the re-socialization and correction of offenders stemmed from Protestant ethics in the 16th century. Representatives from the Netherlands asserted primacy in introducing workhouses and labor for inmates, perceived as precursors to contemporary penitentiaries.

Concomitant with the evolution and modification of fundamental principles and components within penal systems, there emerged a reevaluation of their historical antecedents, predominantly conducted within the purview of a reformist approach until the mid-20th century. Critiques of the penitentiary model and rehabilitation methods extended to the historical genesis of prison. The revisionist historiography during the 1960s and 1970s reoriented focus towards economic determinants, the strategy of power, and the role of social control as impetuses behind the modern prison. In the early 1980s, a counter-revisionist paradigm emerged, rooted in the precepts of the "new social history". Scholars somewhat transitioned from exploring the origins of the modern prison and reformist rhetoric to probing penal institutions through the lens of inmates' experiences and daily life.

Post-non-classical historiography not only revisited conventional approaches to the periodization of the modern prison but also reanalyzed the motivations underpinning shifts in punitive strategies (Gibson, 2019), including the religious factor's role in shaping corrective penitential punishment (Skotnicki, Throness). However, a recurring pattern emerged akin to the revisionists, manifesting as an exclusive emphasis on the Christian origins of penitential reform while overlooking other influential determinants. Nevertheless, the institutionalization of the modern prison was multifaceted, entailing intricate interactions among diverse components and gradual changes spanning protracted developmental phases (Spierenburg, 2007).

Within the broader context of the ideological foundations of corrective carceral practices, the present article endeavors to hone in on a specific facet: the emergence of the model of corrective punishment at Walnut Street Prison and the system of solitary confinement at Eastern State Penitentiary and their theoretical basis. The central research question is as follows: Did the ideology of the Quakers (Society of Friends) play a decisive role in the evolution of the Pennsylvania system of prison discipline and its practical enactment, as recurrently posited within historiography, and what factors influenced this process?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In pursuit of addressing the central research inquiry, our study engages an array of primary sources that meticulously chronicle the process of

institutionalizing the Pennsylvania carceral model. This engagement extends to scrutinizing the historical milieu and contextual circumstances that provided the backdrop for the formation of this model. Furthermore, a comprehensive analysis of secondary sources is integral to our approach, encompassing firsthand accounts of Walnut Street Prison penned by visitors, as well as relevant works elucidating the historical trajectory of penitentiary establishments in Pennsylvania. Within these secondary sources, the discernible influence of the Quakers and their ideological underpinning on the formulation of the corrective punishment model during the transitional period from the 18th to the 19th century is prominently underscored.

The central methodological tenet of this study is rooted in a deliberate endeavor to circumvent inherent ideological or political biases within pre-existing national-patriotic narratives that illuminate the origins of corrective carceral models. In this vein, a functional approach forms the bedrock of our methodology, with its essence lying in the contextual understanding of the examined primary sources within the trajectory of the tradition that birthed each specific source. Consequently, we subjected the primary sources to the analysis of knowledge systems, the purpose of the analysis was to study the possibilities of dissemination of previously formulated theories and their influence on other knowledge systems. The approach adopted is dialectical, perceiving the subject of investigation as a dynamic field where issues assimilate historical attributes and are grasped by exposing latent contradictions. The historical apprehension of the corrective punishment model rests upon sources that were subjected to dogmatic interpretation, emanating from a critical stance towards the veracity or fallibility of specific substantive content.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In historiography, the question of the origins of the Pennsylvania system of prison discipline remains debatable. Although certain scholars, exemplified by David Rothman and Ashley Rubin, attribute its “genesis” more closely to the Eastern State Penitentiary, it is inherently rooted in the previous experiences with prison reform in Pennsylvania, notably at Walnut Street Prison. Consequently, this study undertakes a comprehensive examination of both carceral models. Advocates aligned with the reformist approach (Harry Barnes, Negley Teeters) asserted the reform movement (both penal and prison systems) was a triumph of Quaker principles. Barnes posits that “the ideas and theories of the reformers were wholly in harmony with Quaker precedents (probably meant the “Great Law of Pennsylvania” of 1683 - auth.), even if they were to some slight degree affected by the contemporary reform currents in Europe”. Solitary confinement was the only element that needed to be added to constitute the Pennsylvania system (Barnes, 1927). However, it is precisely the intimate nexus between solitary confinement and the precepts of the Society of Friends that contemporary researchers, champions of the theological underpinning of the Pennsylvania system, anchor their assertions upon. In their assessment, solitary confinement seamlessly aligned with the core tenets of Quakerism, deeply rooted in the pursuit of Inner Light (Vasilyeva, 2015; Skotnicki, 2000).

Svitlana Vasilyeva discerns within the primary constituents of the Pennsylvania penitentiary model, the theological essence of early Quakerism,

alongside the humanistic ideals of European penology and the legal legacies of the erstwhile colony (Vasilyeva, 2015). But, the precise instantiation of the impact of the “theology of early Quakerism” remains unelaborated. She approaches both the carceral model of Walnut Street Prison and the system of solitary confinement of Cherry Hill State Prison as an integrated Pennsylvania system of solitary confinement, underpinned by religious constructs. Consequently, when she asserts that protestant Quakers proposed and implemented a prison practice where the criminal/sinner had the opportunity for penance and redemption through solitary confinement (Vasilyeva, 2022), the referent – whether it pertains to the penitentiary house of the Walnut Street Prison established in 1790 or the Eastern Penitentiary inaugurated in 1829 – remains ambiguous.

According to Skotnicki, the very principles of the Quakers constituted the impetus that propelled the formulation and execution of the stringent solitary confinement system, with the divergence into two distinctive penitentiary models (Pennsylvania and Auburn) being ostensibly driven by Pennsylvania’s Quaker affiliation and New York’s Calvinist inclinations (Skotnicki, 2000).

The aforementioned approach, in our assessment, exhibits a certain degree of oversimplification and neglects the findings of eminent scholars within the realm of penitentiary studies, including David Rothman, Adam Hirsch, and Michael Meranze, who underscore the secular impulses of reform. Revisionist scholars, as a whole, veered from their predecessors’ convictions regarding the paramount role of evangelical Christianity in shaping prison transformations, instead forging connections between reforms and broader social changes and the exigencies of the post-revolutionary period. The rapidly evolving demographic, industrial, economic, and cultural landscape highlighted the inefficacy of traditional control mechanisms (Rothman, 1990). The escalating incidence of crime engendered substantial apprehensions, catalyzing changes that were propelled not exclusively by humanitarian ideals. As noted by Hirsch, citing the instance of Massachusetts, the establishment of new penitentiaries was not confined solely to states harboring influential philanthropic entities, religious organizations, or reformist advocates (Hirsch, 1982).

Recent inquiries, notably those conducted by Jen Manion, have redirected the focus of penitentiary system investigations toward themes of gender, sexuality, and race. The social crisis at the juncture of the 18th and 19th centuries precipitated a recalibration of perspectives on the concept of freedom, exerting a palpable influence on the evolution of novel penal practices. The penitentiary, though initially designed as an alternative to corporal punishment for the most egregious of offenders, quickly became a repository for those who attempted to lay claim to the new nation’s promise of liberty (Manion, 2015).

Ashley Rubin, a scholar delving into the history of the Pennsylvania system, accentuates that “The role of American Quakers in penal reform more generally has often been overemphasized.” In this context, Rubin cites the authoritative viewpoint of Carl Schneider, who posited that solitude as a rehabilitative technique is not an innovation of the American Quakers, but it was advocated by English Christians of several denominations throughout the eighteenth century (Rubin, 2013; Schneider, 1979).

Undoubtedly, the religious impetus underscoring penitentiary reforms and the formulation of strategies grounded in Christian doctrine to influence criminals are arduous to dismiss (Schmid, 2003; Ignatieff, 1978; Yarmysh et al., 2021). Similarly, the active involvement of representatives from the Society of Friends in reformatory social initiatives is notable. The concept of moral transformation and communal accountability vis-à-vis the prodigal son-criminal occupied a central niche within the annals of the Society of Friends' pioneers, with prison reformers typically embodying fervent Christianity. However, was Quaker ideology the determining or dominating factor in the formation of the Pennsylvania system of prison discipline?

Jennifer Graber contests the notion that the Quakers' affinity for silence and Inner Light provides a comprehensive explanation for their alleged predisposition toward solitary confinement. She deems such an approach overly simplistic, highlighting that penitentiary reformers from diverse religious backgrounds, including Calvinists, also espoused the belief in criminal reformation through systematic labor, introspection, and solitary confinement (Graber, 2008).

A common argument in favor of the notion that the Pennsylvania system was a "product of the Quaker movement" rests on the premise that the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons was established by Quakers, who were also at the forefront of penitentiary reform. The names of the founding fathers of this philanthropic entity are widely recognized. Indeed, some of them were members of the Society of Friends, but the most important was that they were powerful local industrialists, religious and public figures. Notably, among the 340 members of the penitentiary society during the period spanning 1787 to 1830, a mere 136 (40%) were members of the Society of Friends. The leadership of the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons included Bishop William White of the Episcopal Church (1787-1836) and Dr. William Rogers, the pastor of the First Baptist Church, who served as vice president from 1797 to 1824 (Rubin, 2013).

Mark Colvin observes that Quakers did not constitute the predominant religious cohort within the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons. The society boasted participation from major Protestant denominations, underscoring that the notion of Quaker authorship of the Pennsylvania system is, in essence, a myth. Colvin, representing the revisionist stance, underscores that the proactive members of the society, primarily Quaker industrialists advocating capital interests, challenge the notion (Colvin, 1997).

The activities of the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons unfolded in an era marked by religious tolerance. During this period, the Society of Friends experienced a transformative phase wherein radical Quaker principles were reassessed, fostering closer ties with other evangelical denominations (Adamson, 2001). Hence, in contemplating the sway of religious convictions on prison transformations, it becomes imperative to account for the expansive evangelical corrective penitential discourse during the embryonic stage of American disciplinary models. Analogous trends also resonated within the landscape of European penology during the 18th century.

Nonetheless, to what extent did this influence hold sway in the nascent independent state? By examining penitentiary reforms in New York, Graber scrutinizes the endeavors of Protestant evangelicals to enshrine religion as a pivotal facet of the novel philosophy and punitive practices. Her analysis

concludes that amid secularization and broad religious tolerance, these attempts floundered as secular paradigms gained ascendancy (Graber, 2011).

Turning to Pennsylvania, Michael Meranze dispels the notion of Quakers as catalysts of the reform in the punishment system. According to Meranze, the revisitation of criminal statutes was instigated and executed by state judges under the sway of Beccaria's ideals. The forces of patriotism and Enlightenment wielded more influence in shaping punitive measures aligned with the republican order. The structuring of the punitive execution model was profoundly shaped by Howard's ideas and Rush's penological framework (Meranze, 1984).

The principal contentions advanced by proponents advocating the "Quaker origins" of penitentiary reform encompass several facets: that Walnut Street Prison's inception was attributed to Quakers; that they formulated and executed solitary confinement as a conduit for convicts to establish communication with the divine, to repent, and to reform, thereby laying the groundwork for the emergence of a novel institution – the penitentiary house.

It is noteworthy that the endorsement to construct a new gaol, workhouse, and house of correction at the intersection of Sixth and Walnut Street in 1773 was granted by the Pennsylvania General Assembly, propelled by the overcrowding plaguing the existing penal establishment situated on High Street. Upon the inauguration of Walnut Street Prison, its architectural design and operational regimen were scarcely revolutionary or groundbreaking. The architectural configuration of the prison complex adhered to classical conventions, encompassing communal chambers to accommodate several dozen inmates. The predominant objective lay in the provision of improved conditions for housing convicts, debtors, and offenders.

A subsequent phase in the prison's trajectory unfolded after the United States achieved independence and enacted penal reform, marked by the replacement of capital punishment with imprisonment with hard labor (An Act amending the penal laws, 1786). As posited by Rothman, the reformist impetus was more profoundly driven by aversion towards the death penalty than by a conviction in the reformative potential of novel penal institutions (Rothman, 1990). Analogous to contemporaneous developments in Europe, the amelioration of punitive measures was mirrored in the pragmatic utilization of incarcerated individuals' labor, undertaken in seclusion and under surveillance. Convicts had to work not only in prison, but also in repairing and cleaning the streets of the cities or towns, making and amending the public roads, in fortifications, mines, and other hard and laborious works.

Thus, during the formative phase of the restructuring of criminal jurisprudence, the prison assumed a predominantly isolative function, with prime focus directed towards public hard labor. This approach came under criticism in Benjamin Rush's treatise "An Inquiry Into the Effects of Public Punishments upon Criminals and Society". This treatise, coupled with the apparent ineffectiveness of prevailing laws, instigated a critical reassessment of the penal system (Hawke, 1971).

The foremost impetus in driving this evolutionary course was unequivocally attributed to the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons. In January 1788, the Society proffered recommendations to the General Assembly advocating legislative revisions: the introduction of stringent regulations to enforce the separate confinement of diverse prisoner categories,

the cessation of public hard labor, and the instatement of labor arrangements within the penal facility, whether individually or within solitary cells. Additionally, the prohibition of the sale and consumption of alcohol was proposed (Barnes, 1927). Benjamin Franklin, in a missive directed towards legislators, underscored the shortfall of extant criminal statutes and advocated for a transformation of punishment into a vehicle of reformation. He cited «Late experiments in Europe have that those advantages are only to be obtained by temperance solitude of labour» (Minutes of the Supreme Executive Council, 1853).

In 1789, the General Assembly enacted amendments to the law, mandating the separate confinement of distinct groups and transferring debtors to a workhouse. Notably, explicit mention of confinement within solitary cells was omitted. Consequently, the Society persisted in advocating “solitary confinement”, subsequently publishing “Extracts and remarks on the subject of punishment and reformation of criminals” in 1790 to disseminate insights regarding the envisaged prison reforms. This publication encompassed delineations of the penitentiary in Wymondham, England, its operational regulations, and excerpts from John Howard’s works.

David Shapiro’s analysis led to the conclusion that it is improbable the pamphlet’s authors endorsed protracted long solitary confinement. This refuted the prevalent misconception that the Pennsylvania penitentiary model, characterized by the practice of severe solitary confinement in state penitentiaries from the 1830s, was instigated by prison reformers and Society members during the 1790s (Shapiro, 2019). Instead, their emulation centered on John Howard’s counsel, who, notably, did not advocate prolonged strict solitary confinement but merely supported segregation in solitary cells during nocturnal hours. Consequently, the term “solitary confinement” within the pamphlet likely encompassed confinement within solitary cells during nighttime, alongside actual solitary imprisonment. The temporal extent of such confinement, however, remained unspecified (Shapiro, 2019).

Opposition to the prevalent practice of protracted solitary confinement was also articulated by the eminent legal luminary of Pennsylvania, William Bradford. He contended that the redemptive severity of absolute isolation should be reserved for the most dangerous criminals (as an alternative to capital punishment). He further proposed that solitary imprisonment should not be excessively prolonged, suggesting partitioning it into intervals lasting no more than 20 or 30 days. He underscored his stance by referencing Howard: “The intention of solitary confinement, (I mean by day as well as by night), is either to reclaim the most atrocious or daring criminals – to punish the refractory for crimes committed in prison – or to make a strong impression, in a short time, upon thoughtless and irregular apprentices, or the like. It should, therefore, be considered by those who are ready to commit, for a long time, petty offenders to absolute solitude, that such a system is more than human nature can bear, without the hazard of distraction or despair” (Bradford, 1793).

As illuminated by Teeters, the Society’s primary aspiration was to persuade the legislature to implement reforms mirroring those undertaken in Wymondham (Teeters, 1955). The pamphlet of 1790 declared: we must follow this English example and make our prisons penitentiary houses and places of correction, the miseries of the unfortunate prisoner have become subjects of deep investigation in Europe and that by an observance of wholesome rules, gaols may prove the happy means of reformation, and that the criminals

instead of being a burden may be transformed into serviceable members of the community (Barnes, 1927). Thus, it may be inferred that the proposition of prolonged and comprehensive criminal isolation was not a subject of deliberation during this stage of reform.

The terminology “penitentiary house” appears to have been drawn from the title of the account detailing the reformatory institution in Wymondham, namely “An Account of the Origin, Progress, and Regulations with a Description of the newest-established Bridewell, or Penitentiary House, at Wymondham”. About the solitary wing within Walnut Street Prison, this designation was initially introduced by Caleb Lownes in his account of the prison in 1793.

An Act to reform the penal laws of the state of 1790 ordered the erection of a separate building with solitary confinement cells for the incarceration of dangerous criminals. But the term “penitentiary house” was not used in this act. The preamble alluded “whereas the laws heretofore made [...] in some degree failed of success [...] and it is hoped that the addition of unremitted solitude to laborious employment as far as it can be effected will contribute as much to reform as to deter”.

The account of Walnut Street Prison’s operations, compiled by prison inspector Caleb Lownes, bore witness to radical transformations in the institution’s structural configuration, administration, and regimen (Published in Bradford, 1793). Lownes’ affiliation with the Society of Friends, coupled with his role as a presenter of progressive prison discipline to foreign visitors, subsequently contributed to the propagation of the notion of the Philadelphia prison as an exceptional Quaker undertaking in European circles.

Within the prison precincts, a wing featuring individual cells (the penitentiary house) was erected in the northern section to confine dangerous criminals and disciplinary infractions. By 1792, the inspector committee had devised “Rules Orders and Regulations for the Gaol of the City and County of Philadelphia,” alongside “Directions for the Inspectors.” A scrutiny of these provisions suggests that the drafters relied upon English legislative frameworks and reformatory house guidelines as their prototype, both in terms of content and arrangement.

The initial implementation of rigorous solitary confinement within the Philadelphia prison was introduced primarily as a punitive measure, aligned with English penal-reformist conventions and the theoretical principles espoused by John Howard. This approach had already taken shape in the workhouses of Northern Europe during the 17th century. The model of prison discipline, wherein the stark isolation of the offender within a solitary cell formed the bedrock of the reformatory regimen, garnered theoretical substantiation in late 18th-century Europe through the writings of Hayway, Bentham, and Paley, as well as practical realization at the Penitentiary House in Gloucester and the Bridewell in Petworth. In the United States, one of the earliest theoretical expositions advocating for the adoption of stringent solitary confinement was encapsulated in Benjamin Rush’s 1787 pamphlet. This framework was grounded in the norms of Christian ethics as encapsulated in evangelical teachings, the ideals promulgated by European Enlightenment philosophers and prison reformers, and insights gleaned from the domains of medicine, psychology, and psychiatry.

In 1793, Lownes remarked that the newly established regulations, albeit in effect for a mere two years, had demonstrated their efficacy (Bradford,

1793). These positive developments were precisely the ones emphasized by proponents of the movement advocating for the abolition of the death penalty. They rationalized the impracticability of capital punishment while concurrently showcasing the effectiveness and humanity of the emerging penitentiary system. Notably, the description of the successful experiment at Walnut Street Prison was featured in a pamphlet authored by William Bradford, which advocated for the elimination of the death penalty. Bradford, a lawyer, proposed the tested application of solitary confinement as a humane substitute for the death penalty. This alternative punishment not only safeguarded life but also held the potential for a positive impact on the offender while maintaining an appropriate degree of rigor (Bradford, 1793).

The “An Act for the better preventing of crimes, and for abolishing the punishment of death in certain cases” enacted in 1794 rescinded the imposition of the death penalty for most crimes and introduced imprisonment at hard labour and solitary confinement in the gaol and penitentiary house of Philadelphia. A segment of the overall sentence was designated for rigorous solitary confinement within the penitentiary. This solitary period was mandated to not surpass half of the total sentence and not fall below one-twelfth of its duration.

In his analysis of legal archives, Thorsten Sellin deduced that in practice, judges seldom imposed strict solitary confinement or enforced the minimum duration of such isolation (Sellin, 1953). Shapiro, presenting a tabulated record of sentences encompassing the years 1795 to 1800, observed that judges generally exercised clemency, with the duration of solitary confinement frequently approaching the statutory minimum. It was noted that during their sentence, inmates spent even less time in isolation (Shapiro, 2019), presumably contingent upon compliant behavior and demonstrated reformatory efforts. In actuality, the envisaged experiment involving strict solitary confinement within the penitentiary, which possessed a mere 16 solitary cells, was not fully realized. Typically, these cells accommodated disciplinary violators, albeit for only a few days (Rubin, 2013, 2021). The majority of inmates were held within communal cells, albeit segregated based on categories.

The regimen and managerial tenets of Walnut Street Prison exhibited minimal divergence from the English corrective carceral model. These principles were largely adopted from practices within English penitentiaries and the theoretical advancements of European reformist thinkers, aligning with the broader trajectory of penitentiary evolution. The introduction of strict solitary confinement for a portion of the sentence emerged as an experimental practice for individuals convicted of particularly egregious crimes, for which the death penalty had been commuted to imprisonment, partially accompanied by rigorous solitary confinement. While this innovation could be attributed to Pennsylvania, analogous provisions were also present within the regulations of the Gloucester Penitentiary House.

Regarding the potential religious influence as a facet of the corrective regimen within Walnut Street Prison, it is noteworthy that programmatic documents of the Society of Friends, regulatory enactments, external assessments by visitors, and inspector evaluations do not prominently feature a specific focus on the religious impact on inmates. While the Prison Rules did encompass provisions for Sunday services, unrestricted access to preachers from diverse denominations, dissemination of religious literature (even

accessible to inmates subjected to strict solitary confinement), and references to Sunday schools, these characteristics were shared across a majority of correctional institutions on both sides of the Atlantic. The directive mandating mandatory attendance of Sunday religious services by all inmates closely paralleled the stipulations articulated within English legislation.

Amidst the crisis encountered by the disciplinary model of Walnut Street Prison, as indicated by Rev. Louis Dwight's report, there existed no mandatory program for religious education. Instead, individual preachers and members of respective religious societies offered all religious guidance and support on benevolent grounds (First Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society, 1827). In this light, the committee of inspectors, some of whom belonged to the Quaker faith, did not give particular attention to the religious welfare of the inmates. However, it is pertinent to acknowledge the existence of such initiatives in other states.

Walnut Street Prison experienced a period of relative success approximately between 1790 and 1805. Thereafter, challenges emerged in production, overcrowding became a pressing concern, funds allocated for inmate maintenance proved insufficient, and incidents of riots and escapes grew more frequent (DePuy, 1951). By 1826, following a visit to the facility, Rev. Dwight characterized it as the most disreputable prison in the United States. Approximately 400 individuals were confined within 16 communal cells, forming an unruly multitude. Notably, elevated expenses and significant mortality rates among inmates were noted, accompanied by the unsettling trend of robbers and thieves being released only to return to prison. Furthermore, educational efforts for inmates were conspicuously absent (First Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society, 1826).

In light of the crisis that befell the Pennsylvania system of prison discipline in the early 19th century, reform advocates increasingly turned to strict solitary confinement as a potential avenue to realize the goal reformation of criminal. This shift, in our interpretation, was more a response to the shortcomings of the extant prison model rather than being markedly influenced by the ideology of the Quakers or any particular religious group. The inability to segregate prisoners within the confines of a burgeoning inmate population, compounded by the cohabitation of state prisons, gaols, and houses of correction within a single penitentiary complex, culminated in negative influences between inmates.

The architectural plan of the old prison, which had been built for general confinement, was also cited as a problem. In 1818, Bishop White, head of the Society, responded to a query from Stephen Lushington concerning the efficacy of solitary confinement. Bishop White highlighted the challenges faced by reformers in implementing such a practice within the constraints of prison overcrowding. Nevertheless, he expressed optimism that the complete realization of solitary confinement could be attained through a novel architectural undertaking that aligned with its foundational principles (Barnes, 1927).

The subsequent progression of the punitive paradigm within state prisons became intertwined with the endeavor to implement the system of solitary confinement in emerging state penitentiaries. This prompts an inquiry into the innovation of Pennsylvania's reformers in this context, as well as the influences that guided the selection of the penitentiary discipline model.

Addressing the initial question, it is worth highlighting that throughout late 18th-century Europe, the prevailing trend in correctional facility construction involved the incorporation of individual cells, primarily designated for nocturnal confinement. Notably, between 1816 and 1819, the Millbank Penitentiary embraced a regimen of solitary confinement. Brochures disseminated in England encompassed conventional layouts for novel prisons that adhered to the imperative of segregating inmates within discrete cells.

Despite the wealth of empirical insights amassed by American reformists, the early 19th century saw the former metropolis continuing to serve as a source of inspiration, particularly concerning the architectural dimensions of penitentiaries. Architectural pioneers of the nascent penitentiaries, such as Benjamin Latrobe, William Strickland, and John Haviland, drew from European prison architecture innovations. For instance, John Haviland, the architect responsible for the Eastern State Penitentiary where the Pennsylvania system of prison discipline was realized (partially owing to his spatially efficient design), had previously apprenticed under the English architect James Elmes, who had a vested interest in penal matters.

Consequently, the notion of erecting a prison replete with individual cells in the early 19th century was not an entirely groundbreaking departure. The crux of the challenge lay in formulating the regimen for such solitary confinement. The Commissioners Appointed to Superintend the Erection of the Eastern Penitentiary advocated for a system of strict solitary confinement devoid of labor engagement for inmates, as provided for in the acts of 1818 and 1821 establishing penitentiaries.

Within the echelons of state authorities, including the gubernatorial sphere, no explicit endorsement of a distinct prison discipline model was tendered, thereby permitting the adoption of the Auburn system, a proven approach implemented in a neighboring state. The response from reformers in Philadelphia was swift: Roberts Vaux proffered comprehensive observations on enhancing prison discipline in the city, accompanied by a proposal to convene a commission tasked with crafting amendments to the criminal code and managerial regulations for new penitentiary establishments. This proposal aspired to encompass like-minded individuals, including inspectors of Walnut Street Prison and members of the prison society, thus illustrating the strategic hopes of alignment (Vaux, 1826).

In March of 1826, the legislative assembly granted authorization to the governor to institute the Commissioners on the Penal Code. This commission consisted of three legal practitioners, each devoid of affiliation with the Society of Friends: judges Charles Shaler and Edward King, alongside attorney Thomas J. Wharton. Their primary mandate was to formulate and present to the legislative deputies an optimal framework for prison regimen. Over two years, this commission conducted a thorough examination of professional literature about penitentiary matters, deliberated upon theoretical and practical proposals, scrutinized the experiences of Walnut Street Prison, penitentiaries in other states, and analogous establishments in European nations. A considerable array of statistical data was meticulously analyzed. Inputs from the committee of inspectors of the Western Penitentiary and the commission overseeing the establishment of the Eastern Penitentiary were also incorporated. The focal points of discourse encompassed construction and operational costs, the most suitable regimen for incarceration, and the organization of labor within this context.

In response to an inquiry lodged in August of 1826, the Commissioners Appointed to Superintend the Erection of the Eastern Penitentiary articulated an aspiration that the authorized entities would duly comprehend and acknowledge the underlying intent of reformers and legislators in Pennsylvania. It was underscored that no other state had devised a system akin to this, nor had it constructed penitentiary edifices of such expansive proportions and comprehensive design, thereby providing a setting for the testing of solitary confinement intertwined with spiritual influence. The commission expressed optimism that the impending experiment would be anticipated with enthusiasm by every resident of Pennsylvania, and its successful execution would promptly enhance the state's reputation and renown (Journal of the Senate, 1828).

A point of contention arose concerning the subject of inmate labor activities. A notable portion of the members of the Commissioners Appointed to Superintend the Erection of the Eastern Penitentiary advocated for isolating inmates devoid of engaging them in labor. This stance was rationalized by asserting that organizing productive tasks presented considerable challenges, and its pursuit would divert inmates from contemplation and ethical betterment. Consequently, a protracted duration would be requisite to achieve the desired rehabilitative outcomes, and imprisonment devoid of occupation would exert greater demands upon the individual (Letter, Report, and Documents on the Penal Code, 1828).

The inspectors responsible for the Western Penitentiary espoused a somewhat divergent perspective, influenced by their direct involvement in translating the conceptual framework promulgated by their Eastern counterparts into practical application. The early stages of penitentiary operation witnessed challenges in realizing the envisioned strict solitary confinement regimen. The Western Penitentiary's inspectors exhibited a proclivity toward integrating labor activities within communal workshops. This sentiment was succinctly articulated by Alexander Brackenridge, the Secretary of the Western Penitentiary committee, who ardently supported the imposition of obligatory convict labor. Brackenridge contended that maintaining a cohort of offenders solely supported by public funds, who whiled away their time under the pretense of aspiring to re-enter society as reformed individuals, was impracticable (Journal of the Senate, 1828).

After an exhaustive exploration of the most suitable penitentiary discipline model, the 1828 commission submitted a comprehensive report to the Senate. This report meticulously examined three distinct penitentiary discipline models: solitary confinement without labor, solitary confinement with labor in solitude, and solitary confinement at night, alongside labor executed within communal workshops. The authors meticulously scrutinized the core arguments in favor of complete isolation, including the substantial severity of the punishment through the deprivation of all interpersonal bonds, the preclusion of detrimental interactions among convicts, the favorable influence on the psychological and rehabilitative facets of criminals, the truncated duration of solitary confinement relative to alternative forms of incarceration, and the resultant reduction in associated expenses.

Conversely, the commissioners counterposed these points with arguments against the inhumanity of such a system, excessive financial outlays, adverse effects on both physical and mental well-being, erosion of

vocational skills, and degradation of convicts' social standing. Their inclinations toward the congregate system were palpable within these counterarguments. Consequently, the commission's verdict was foreseeable: given the infeasibility of entirely adopting the Auburn system, discrete elements of it should be incorporated. The Western Penitentiary would be adapted to a regimen of communal labor alongside solitary seclusion during nighttime hours. In Eastern Penitentiary, both of the proposed disciplinary models could be applied (Shaler et al., 1828).

The response exhibited by Philadelphia's prison reform advocates toward the released report was notably unfavorable. The report was construed as an act of disloyalty to Pennsylvania, a state that had rightfully established its standing as a trailblazer in the realm of penitentiary reform. The commission affiliated with the Eastern Penitentiary persisted in their endorsement of the system of solitary confinement devoid of labor. Some members of the prison society, however, adopted a conciliatory standpoint, promoting the idea of amalgamating solitary confinement with labor while maintaining a stringent environment of isolation.

During the period spanning 1828 to 1829, a period coinciding with the deliberations within the Senate and the House of Representatives concerning the preferred penitentiary system, the prison society members earnestly undertook educational endeavors to uphold the practice of strict solitary confinement. Their efforts garnered success as they managed to sway the General Assembly to their side, a feat potentially facilitated by the advanced stages of construction of the Western Penitentiary under the system of solitary confinement, coupled with the near completion of the initial phase of the Eastern Penitentiary. Consequently, on April 23, 1829, the legislative enactment titled "An Act to Reform the Penal laws of this Commonwealth" was passed, formalizing the introduction of the system of "separate or solitary confinement at labor". The system of prison discipline outlined within this legislation for both the Western and Eastern Penitentiaries became universally known as the Pennsylvania penitentiary system.

Despite an array of reports, pamphlets emanating from the penitentiary society, publications, correspondences exchanged by participants in the reform movement, and the *Journal of Prison Discipline and Philanthropy*, a periodical inaugurated by the society in 1845, no trace of insinuation about the influence of Quaker ideology or its role in the establishment of penitentiaries, prison reforms, or the formulation of the solitary confinement system is discernible. This absence is noteworthy, even as foreign visitors on occasion acknowledged their involvement. François de La Rochefoucauld, in his prominent and widely disseminated European narrative detailing the Walnut Street Prison, acknowledged the Quakers as initiators of the reformation in the punishment paradigm, attributing the creation and efficacious implementation of the novel punitive approach to their concerted endeavors (La Rochefoucauld, 1796). Similarly, Julian Niemcewicz, an acquaintance of Caleb Lownes, spotlighted the active role undertaken by Quakers as transformative agents within the American prison milieu in his survey of American correctional institutions (Niemcewicz, 1818).

Fundamentally, the proposition attributing an exclusive role to Quakers within the penitentiary reform movement found its initial grounding within the European discourse on penal institutions. This assertion can be traced to

Gustave de Beaumont and Alexis de Tocqueville, who, in their evaluation of American penitentiary systems in 1833, devoted a segment to the “Influence of the Quakers.” Nonetheless, their analysis predominantly revolves around the Quaker impact on the evolution of criminal law reform from the era of William Penn to the eventual abolition of the death penalty in the latter part of the 18th century. Within this context, the authors offer a rather critical appraisal of the Walnut Street Prison experiment, contending that the system failed to garner success anywhere within the United States and did not culminate in the rehabilitation of incarcerated individuals (Beaumont, Tocqueville, 1833).

Within the European domain, the discourse concerning “Quaker” involvement in penitentiary reform gained prominence with the establishment of the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline and the Reformation of Juvenile Offenders. This notable entity was substantially composed of Quakers and wielded considerable influence across various European countries.

However, in the United States, the Pennsylvania system, confined largely to a single state due to the concurrent adoption of the congregate system by other states, encountered sustained criticism over numerous years. Notably, it wasn’t until 1883 that Eastern state newspapers began responding positively to the regimen and framework of the Eastern Penitentiary, employing evocative headlines such as “The Quaker Prison” and “A Penitentiary run on Quaker principles.” Evidently, these headlines reflected the prevailing stereotype that associated Pennsylvania with Quaker principles, thereby offering an explanatory framework for the divergence in penitentiary models across states.

In the annals of American historiography during the early 20th century, particularly within comprehensive treatises, educational materials, and encyclopedic compendia, the narrative concerning prison reform’s historical trajectory assumed a linear configuration. This exposition traced its origins from the pioneering criminal law reform efforts spearheaded by William Penn, which marked the inaugural Quaker undertaking in this domain, progressing methodically through the chronicles of the Walnut Street Prison to culminate at the juncture of the Eastern Penitentiary. This historiographical schema duly accentuated, at each sequential stage, the seminal and instrumental involvement of Quaker proponents, as conscientiously underscored by the expositors. Manifesting the essence of this thematic literature, a paradigmatic exemplar is discernible in the nomenclature of a notable opus: “Pennsylvania Quakers Establish the Modern Prison System” (Handbook of Correctional Institutions, 1949).

In the 1960s, the Federal Bureau of Prisons initiated a change in the penal paradigm, in particular, the introduction of a rehabilitative model, ostensibly grounded upon precedents entrenched within historical archetypes. It is pertinent to note, however, that the evolution of the carceral establishment, as an institutional apparatus, was oftentimes presented within a conspicuously oversimplified and schematic framework. According to this didactic rendition, the inception of the prison enterprise can be attributed to the Quaker constituency during the latter half of the 18th century. Emanating from this Quaker ethos was the proposition that the efficacious reform of the delinquent could be best achieved through their sequestering within a solitude-laden cell, thereby fostering an environment conducive to contrition to be elicited via introspective contemplation, scriptural study, and devotional supplication. This institution, envisaged as a vessel for fostering penitence, was duly denominated

as a penitentiary (Alexander, 1966; District of Columbia Appropriations for Fiscal Year, 1967). Notwithstanding the foregoing limitations, it is noteworthy that this particular narrative template continues to endure in contemporary erudition, persisting both within educational tracts encompassing penological studies and scholarly treatises dedicated to the history of penitentiary systems.

CONCLUSIONS

Notably, neither the reports and reviews of the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons nor the discourses of Pennsylvania's prison reform figures, prominently underscored the pivotal involvement of Quakers in this reformative endeavor. Contrarily, in the European penitentiary discourse, commencing with La Rochefoucauld's 1796 account of the American prison experience, Quakers were recurrently referenced both as proponents of humanizing penal practices (from William Penn's 1682 legislation to the restriction of capital punishment in 1794) and as principal actors of prison reform. Conspicuously, these narratives often converged, presenting a coherent and progressive Quaker movement, despite the temporal chasm spanning 150 years between these occurrences. It has not been taken into consideration that the directions of the Great Law of 1682 for the establishment of prisons and workhouses were not realized and the act was revised in the early 18th century.

Within the European gaze, Pennsylvania was conceived as a state founded by Quakers, although its population was not mono-denominational by the close of the 18th century. Pivotal to this transformation were members of affluent, established families within Philadelphia's industrial milieu, who actively engaged in philanthropic initiatives, including prison amelioration and penal regimen transformation. This collective impetus led to the formation of the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons, with a noteworthy portion of its active constituents – predominantly adherents of the Society of Friends – assuming pivotal roles within the inspectorate committee of Walnut Street Prison. Consequently, this cohort emerged as emissaries of the reformative impetus in Europe, received visitors, correspondence with British counterparts, and analogous endeavors. This orchestration engendered the perception of Quakers as the architects of the nascent penitentiary paradigm. However, it is imperative to recognize that by the latter 18th century, Pennsylvania's identity was progressively defined by religious pluralism rather than an overt Quaker hegemony. Confidingly, the religious influence on inmates in Philadelphia, during this era, did not markedly surpass that evident within other American or European penal institutions.

The late 19th century in the United States witnessed a prevailing skepticism towards the Pennsylvania system of prison discipline. Nonetheless, the early 20th century saw the germination of research inquiries into its origins, significantly facilitated by the proactive involvement of the Pennsylvania Prison Society, which instigated historical explorations. The works of Barnes and Teeters were published precisely in the initial half of the 20th century. In these scholarly contributions, the historical narrative surrounding the evolution of modern correctional establishments was articulated as a progressive movement instigated by religiously motivated philanthropists, driven by the aspiration to transform inmates into pious Christians and civic-

minded individuals. Subsequently, these doctrinal expositions permeated educational textbooks and reference compendia. During the period of change in the concept of penal execution and implementation of the rehabilitation model in the 1960s, these narratives found strategic utility in the advocacy of reform by leaders within the Federal Bureau of Prisons, eventually achieving the status of the sanctioned historical account.

Within contemporary historiography, scholars of the modernist disposition, focusing on the religious substratum underpinning prison reforms, epitomized by the scholarship of Andrew Skotnicki and Svetlana Vasilyeva, have been discernible. In European penological literature (we are not talking about professional historical studies) the narrative of the Quaker establishment of penitentiary systems is also quite persistent.

In contrast, revisionist authors have critically evaluated the benevolent motivations of philanthropists as the sole impetus for penal transformations. These scholars attribute greater significance to shifts in social dynamics, demographic transitions, economic determinants, and the metamorphosis of institutions of power. Prison reforms were not only realized in Quaker or Calvinist states. But even in these, attempts by evangelical Protestants to make religion the centerpiece of a new philosophy and practice of punishment failed, and secular paradigms prevailed.

On the front of ideological foundations, the belief in the reformatory potential of isolation was not unique to Quakerism but resonated across diverse Christian doctrines. Correspondingly, advocates of materialistic rehabilitative carceral discourse endeavored to better inmates, viewing them as subjects necessitating tailored “treatment” methodologies, including quarantine (isolation), discipline, physical and mental hygiene, moral influence, and analogous mechanisms. It is within Benjamin Rush’s synthesized rehabilitative framework that these convergent impulses found theoretical mooring, thus furnishing the conceptual groundwork for the penitentiary reforms in Pennsylvania.

However, the shaping of the Walnut Street Prison’s paradigm of prison discipline was profoundly influenced by English practices of corrective punishment and associated theoretical literature. This corpus of experience exerted a paramount impact that the members of the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons deemed worthy of emulation. The initial introduction of solitary confinement, akin to its instantiation within European houses of correction, was initially imbued with disciplinary intent. Subsequently, when the exigency arose for an alternative to capital punishment, the paradigm of incarceration marked by stringent isolation and devoid of labor engagement found its inception within the precincts of the Walnut Street Prison. This development can be construed as an evolutionary permutation of preceding modes of disciplinary solitary confinement. While innovative, this approach was not bereft of parallels, as comparable methodologies were partially operationalized within British bridewells and penitentiary houses. However, within the confines of the Walnut Street Prison, this trajectory retained the semblance of an experimental venture rather than an institutionally crystallized praxis. Acknowledged by the very protagonists of reform, the rigorous regimen of solitary confinement encountered substantial practical challenges, precipitated by overpopulation, the cohabitation of disparate categories of confinements – state prison, gaol, and houses of

correction – within a singular complex, alongside architectural inadequacies that plagued the prison.

The formulation of the emergent penitential paradigm, designated as “separate or solitary confinement at labour,” was motivated by the critical juncture encountered by the Walnut Street Prison, coupled with the adverse experiences encountered by the reformists. This developmental trajectory constituted a multifaceted process that resists reduction to the assimilation of specific religious precepts. Informed by both local experiences incorporating the Walnut Street Prison and the Western State Penitentiary and extraterritorial correctional institutions, most notably in New York, the formulation of this model was a nuanced synthesis. This synthesis was enriched by an assimilation of insights from penological theoreticians, empirical analysis of statistical data, and a comprehensive assessment of the merits and demerits intrinsic to assorted modalities of confinement. This assessment encompassed their psychological repercussions upon inmates, economic efficiency, the potency for maintaining discipline, and the provisions for surveillance and control. Crucially, these deliberations extended to transcontinental discourse, wherein interaction with British counterparts assumed significance. Importantly, the doctrine of solitary confinement did not reign as the exclusive and incontrovertible preference; proponents of the Auburn system, previously implemented, also made a compelling presence. For the first time, prison administrators entered the discussion and voiced their views on the appropriateness of a particular system grounded in pragmatic realities rather than strictly theoretical perspectives.

REFERENCES

- Actes du Congrès pénitentiaire international de Rome*. (1888). Publiés par les soins du Comité exécutif. T. I. Rome.
- Adamson, C. (2001). Evangelical Quakerism and the Early American Penitentiary Revisited: The Contributions of Thomas Eddy, Roberts Vaux, John Griscom, Stephen Grellet, Elisha Bates, and Isaac Hopper. *Quaker History*, 90 (2), 35-58.
- Alexander, M. E. (1966). Changing Concepts in Corrections. *Proceedings of Fifth Annual Conference “Mental Health Career Development”*. Phoenix Arizona. US Department of Health Education and Welfare, 26-29.
- An Act amending the penal laws of this state (1786). *Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania 1682 to 1801*. Vol. XII. Harrisburg: State Printer of Pennsylvania, 1896, 280-290.
- An Act to reform the Penal Laws of the State. Ch. MCXVI (1790). *Statutes at Large of Pennsylvania 1682 to 1801*. Vol. XIII. Harrisburg: State Printer of Pennsylvania, 1896, 511-528.
- Barnes, H. E. (1927). *The evolution of penology in Pennsylvania: a study in American social history*. Indianapolis.
- Bradford, W. (1793). *An enquiry how far the punishment of death is necessary in Pennsylvania. To which is added, an Account of the gaol and penitentiary house of Philadelphia*. By Caleb Lownes. Philadelphia.
- Colvin, M. (1997). *Penitentiaries, reformatories, and chain gangs: social theory and the history of punishment in nineteenth-century America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- De Beaumont, G., De Tocqueville, A. (1833). *On the Penitentiary System in the United States*. Philadelphia, Carey, Lea & Blanchard.
- DePuy, L. B. (1951). The Walnut Street Prison: Pennsylvania's first penitentiary. *Pennsylvania History: A Journal of Mid-Atlantic Studies*, 18(2), 130-144.
- First Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Prison Discipline Society, Boston June, 1826*. (1827). Boston.
- Gibson, M. (2019). *Italian Prisons in the Age of Positivism, 1861-1914*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Graber, J. (2008). “When Friends Had the Management It Was Entirely Different”: Quakers and Calvinists in the Making of New York Prison Discipline. *Quaker History*, 97(2), 19-40.

- Graber, J. (2011). *The Furnace of Affliction: Prisons & Religion in Antebellum America*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Handbook of Correctional Institution Design and Construction*. (1949). United States Bureau of Prisons.
- Hawke, D. F. (1971). *Benjamin Rush; Revolutionary Gadfly*. The Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- Hirsch, J. A. (1982). From Pillory to Penitentiary: The Rise of Criminal Incarceration in Early Massachusetts. *Michigan Law Review*, 80, 1179–1269.
- Ignatieff, M. (1978). *A Just Measure of Pain : The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution, 1750-1850*. New York : Pantheon Books.
- Interview with Myrl E. Alexander. What Life Is Like in Today's Federal Prisons. From the US News & World Report. July 11, 1966. In: *District of Columbia Appropriations for Fiscal Year (1967)*. Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations United States Senate Eighty Ninth Congress Second Session. Washington.
- Journal of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1827-1828*. (1828). Harrisburgh.
- La Rochefoucauld, F.-A.-F. (1796). *Des prisons de Philadelphie*. Paris.
- Letter, Report and Documents on the Penal Code, from the President and Commissioners Appointed to Superintend the Erection of the Eastern Penitentiary*. (1828).
- Manion, J. (2015). *Liberty's Prisoners: Carceral Culture in Early America*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Meranze, M. (1984). The Penitential Ideal in Late Eighteenth-Century Philadelphia. *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 108(4), 419-450.
- Minutes of the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania*. (1853). V. 15. Harrisburg.
- Niemcewicz, J. U. (1818). *O więzieniach publicznych, czyli Domach Pokuty rzecz krótka*, Warszawa-Krzemieniec.
- Rothman, D. J. (1990). *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Rubin, A. T. (2013). *Institutionalizing the Pennsylvania System: Organizational Exceptionalism, Administrative Support, and Eastern State Penitentiary, 1829-1875*. [A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. University of California, Berkeley].
- Rubin, A. T. (2021). *The Deviant Prison: Philadelphia's Eastern State Penitentiary and the Origins of America's Modern Penal System, 1829-1913*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108754095>
- Schmid, M. (2003). "The Eye of God": Religious Beliefs and Punishment in Early Nineteenth-Century Prison Reform. *Theology Today*, 59(4), 546-558. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/004057360305900403>
- Schneider, C. E. (1979). The Rise of Prisons and the Origins of the Rehabilitative Ideal. *Michigan Law Review*, 77(3), 707-746.
- Sellin, T. (1953). Philadelphia Prisons of the Eighteenth Century. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 43 (1), 326-331.
- Shaler, C., King, E., & Wharton, T. I. (1828) *Report of the Commissioners on the Penal Code*. Harrisburg.
- Shapiro, D. M. (2019). Solitary confinement in the young republic. *Harvard Law Review*, 133(2), 544-598.
- Skotnicki, A. (2000). *Religion and the development of the American penal system*. Lanham, University Press of America.
- Spierenburg, P. (2007). *The Prison Experience: Disciplinary Institutions and Their Inmates in Early Modern Europe*. Amsterdam University Press.
- Synopsis of the Visits to Prisoners. *The Journal of Prison Discipline and Philanthropy*, 1884, 1.
- Teeters, N. K. (1955). *The Cradle of the Penitentiary: The Walnut Street Jail at Philadelphia, 1773-1835*. Pennsylvania Prison Society.
- Vasilyeva, S. (2015). Quakers' Ideology and the Formation of the Philadelphia Prison System. *The Bulletin of Ryazan State University named for S. A. Yesenin*, 4 (49), 64-74.
- Vassilyeva, S. *Genesis and evolution of the doctrine of penitentiary in the Anglo-American socio-cultural space (late 17th - early 19th centuries)*. [Doctoral dissertation, The Academy of Law Management of the Federal Penitentiary Service of Russia].
- Vaux, R. (1826). *Notices of the Original, and Successive Efforts, to Improve the Discipline of the Prison at Philadelphia, and to Reform the Criminal Code of Pennsylvania*. Pennsylvania.
- Yarmysh, O., Sokalska, O., & Kyrchenko, V. (2021). Genesis of the concept of correctional punishment: from antiquity to modern times. *Journal of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine*, 28(3), 162-175. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.37635/jnalsu.28\(3\).2021.162-17](https://doi.org/10.37635/jnalsu.28(3).2021.162-17)