

New Europe College
Ștefan Odobleja Program
Yearbook 2009-2010



RAFAEL-DORIAN G. CHELARU
ATTILA KIM
PUIU LĂȚEA
ANDREI MURARU
ALINA SILIAN
ANDREI FLORIN SORA
ÁRON ZSOLT TELEGDI-CSETRI
AURELIA VASILE

Editor: Irina Vainovski-Mihai

Copyright – New Europe College
ISSN 1584-0298

New Europe College
Str. Plantelor 21
023971 Bucharest
Romania

www.nec.ro; e-mail: nec@nec.ro
Tel. (+4) 021.307.99.10, Fax (+4) 021. 327.07.74



ATTILA KIM

Born in 1977, in Târgu Mureș

DLA Candidate, Moholy-Nagy University of Art and Design, Budapest
Dissertation: *Functional and Architectural Rehabilitation of the Penitentiary: Typological Analysis of Penitentiaries Designed on Functional and Architectural Schemes of the 19th Century in Central and Eastern Europe. Conceptual and Functional Redefinition of Penitentiaries*

Architect, designing for *Studio Kim Buçsa Diaconu* and *LUNDI et DEMI*
architecture and design offices

Hungarian Government Doctoral Scholarship, Moholy-Nagy University of
Art and Design, Budapest (2005-2008)

TEMPUS Scholarship, Technical University of Eindhoven (1999)

CETP Scholarship, Study trip in the USA (1998)

Participation to several exhibitions, projects and conferences in
Romania and Austria

Numerous research papers published in Romania and Hungary

FUNCTION AND FORM IN THE ARCHITECTURAL DEVELOPMENT OF PENITENCIARIES

The social restructuring, the spontaneous series of decisions following them and the ideological changes characteristic to the beginning of the nineteenth century are those elements that influenced the development of prisons. The change of the forms of punishments and the change of their relation with the society resulted in many compromises in the early history of this institution. Regarding architecture, we cannot follow the autonomous evolution of prisons that the managing of the *newly* introduced *function*, loss of freedom as a general form of punishment, would have required. Although a new institution was born, power restricted itself to adapting the architecturally already existing though functionally only similar architectural programs. We can state that the short historical development of prisons can be studied only to a small extent as far as the pure history of architecture is concerned.

Prisons as building types evolved from the 17th and 18th century workhouses, lock-ups, approved schools, barracks and hospitals. The original function of these groundings and in many cases the existing buildings that were renamed prisons had not been intended to exclusively serve locking-up or detention purposes. Indeed, detention was part of their function, but it was only interpreted as a secondary, concomitant function of their operation. These building types were the different citadels of surveillance, which became specialized in keeping human body under restraint, pressing it, torturing it, keeping it under discipline and isolating it, whereas the new function, the prison tried to influence the intellect, the spirit. It does not use physical punishment as its predecessors did, but tries to give a social (re-)education to those breaking the laws. As far as its aims and instruments are viewed, prison cannot be compared to the

centuries old institutions of physical punishment. Their operation though was restricted to the same architectural spaces, except a few examples.

The structure of the architectural form housing the new institution has not much changed since the beginning of the 19th century until nowadays as far as the interior space structure and its connection to the immediate environment is concerned. Studying both elements that are decisive from architectural point of view – functional structuring and the form interlocking it – makes us feel the tension that has developed for more than two centuries. The contradictory relationships between *function* and *form*, the users and the building, the building and its environment have determined the slow development of prisons until nowadays. The only requirement that the building has successfully solved may be the impediment of violent escapes. But is it really an architectural issue? What has architecture contributed to the development of the institution with? What is the connection between the changes of ideologies regarding the execution of punishments and the *architectural form*? What alternatives has architecture offered in the course of history in order to solve the specific problems of prisons? Answering these questions is extremely important as during the last two centuries, the primary symbol of loss of freedom as a modern form of punishment has become the building providing room for it. The deficient architectural development of prisons raises the following questions: have architects not succeeded in finding the *form* matching the *function*? Or: is it possible that *architecture* has not been given the chance to develop an appropriate *form*?

The guiding principle of this study is the critical analysis of the history of prison-buildings. Our aim is to determine the connections between *architectural forms* and *functions* while taking into consideration the social forces having an impact on them. We hope that the cause and effect connections that we can discover will give an explanation to the inflexible social image associated to the almost two hundred years old institution, the operational issues existing within the building, and the unsuccessfulness of the architectural form.

Prison buildings can be interpreted from more points of view considering their architectural form. First and foremost, the questions still waiting for an answer are linked to the translation of loss of freedom, locking-up and the functional constraints accompanying them to the “language of stone”. To what extent do we need to make one conscious of the continuous presence of the social and political power by the

spatial organization of the building? What kinds of spatial and functional connections determined by the physical space can be used in order to reform the individual? What does the right to intimacy mean and where are its architectural limits? All these questions are strongly related to the convicted individual and the ever changing punishment ideologies influencing them. The formal development of prisons is strongly related to the continuously changing forms of punishment, the restrictions of their functional and technical execution, and the symbolic role of the institution in society. The operation of the disciplinary mechanism, the form of the prison building and its construction primary depend on the philosophy regarding systematic and organized execution of punishment of a given period, on the system of ideas which determines the administration of punishment – loss of freedom, or penal labor connected to it –, the relationship between society and criminals, and the re-education of convicts. (Snarr & Willford, 1985)

The architectural form of prisons besides the responsibility towards those “inside” them is given a symbolic role and carries a message for the society and its environment. From formal point of view the prison building has always been aligned with a socially well-defined role. The form of the prison building is not originating from the expectations arising from its locking-up – guarding function only, but it is scenery at the same time. The basically unique institution typology regarding the execution of punishment, which has been defined in many different ways in the course of history, is a punctiform building similar to the Middle Ages castles, apparently turning its back to the world. Regarding its architectural concept and formal symbolism, the traditional prison is actually against the world, warns us to lead a law-abiding life and wishes to deter us from committing crime. The result of this hundred-years-old concept is – as it is well-known – that society keeps itself aloof of prisons, thus making the work of the institution, the achievement of its objectives more difficult.

The study and analysis of prisons, the institution giving place to this social function and execution of punishment has become an important social research topic based on different considerations since the mid 1970s. Prisons, according to modern definition, are those institutions that are the scenes of execution of punishments that accompany loss of freedom. Their almost 250 years old history is strongly related to the approaches to legislation of the given age as well as to the shaping powers existing within western society. The standard works dealing with the appearance and development of prisons, recognized as classics today,

are due to the political, social and economic conjuncture of the 1970s. It is characteristic to these works that the reform aspirations formulated at the end of the eighteenth century and beginning of nineteenth century and the contemporary discussions linked to them are central in their approach. As an introduction, let's review the most important researches published on this field.

The face of power: total institutions

I wish to mention three researches connected to the basic works on history of institutions regarding prisons: *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic* written by David Rothman (1971)¹, *Surveiller et punir* by Michel Foucault (1975)² and *A Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution* by Michael Ignatieff (1978),³ the latter being a research dealing with the history of Pentonville penitentiary in Great Britain.

The works mentioned above have common standpoints and assumptions. All three of them agreed that the ideology of the enlightenment served as a basis for punishment with imprisonment and loss of freedom. All three works examine the process of imprisonment becoming a general punishment, the social acceptance of loss of freedom as a fair punishment, as well as the disappointments lying in the regenerating power of reforming detention, and they all agree that it is moving far from the original Quaker intention, moreover against it, imprisonment coarsening to institutional violence. The appearance of prisons, according to these studies, was part of a wider social strategy, which regarded detention as a means of diminution of delinquency, partial elimination of poverty and unemployment; on individual level it realized the spread of state power interference. From this point of view, the originally more human punishing intentions and wishes to deter from crime mentioned in connection with the birth of prisons had become insignificant in comparison with the reasons that had a more important role in serving the revelation, the possible experience and visibility of state power, and started to fight disobedience, indiscipline and lack of respect prevailing on social level.

Rothman studies the appearance and development of all the institutions in the same group that on a given level, in the name of the society keep the individual under restraint, control his life and influence his free will. He includes prisons, mental hospitals, orphanages, community homes

and poorhouses here. He says that all the historians who declare the birth of the above mentioned institutions as a reform only because their novelty and new function, and appreciate their appearance as a progress of mankind, are considerably wrong. Similarly, those who led and protected these institutions were not necessarily reformers having a human way of thinking. None of the above enumerated institutions could have been established out of good will and social necessity since all of them have become without exception a disgrace to society. Rothman traces the rise of total institutions in the United States back, Ignatieff traces the appearance of prisons in Great Britain (especially the opening of the first, pioneer institution of Pentonville) back, Foucault traces the French developments back to the views becoming popular in the eighteenth century according to which criminals, poor people, orphans, the elderly and the insane should be locked-up in specially conceived buildings, representing social power, order, discipline and stability. This is the meeting point between the standpoints of Foucault and Rothman, the first completing the list determined by Rothman with colleges, boarding-schools, barracks, manufacture, and later with factories. Preceding Foucault, Goffman had already included military facilities, leper colonies, boarding-schools and monasteries among total institutions⁴. Goffman defined the concept of total institutions in 1961 as follows:

a total institution may be defined as a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time together lead an enclosed formally administered round of life.⁵

Another important characteristic of these institutions according to Goffman is that there has evolved a communication gap between the individuals cut off from society and the individuals living in society who keep them in detention.⁶

Rothman continues his researches, just like Foucault and Ignatieff later, from the point of view of social history. Rothman asks the question: "Why in the decades after 1820 did (Americans) all at once erect penitentiaries for the criminal, asylums for the insane, almshouses for the poor, orphan asylums for homeless children, and reformatories for delinquents?",⁷ and tries to find an answer to the "revolution in the practices toward the insane".⁸ The total institutions of the 19th century became the first concentration camps of poverty, crime, sickness and social outcast. Social

and moral cohesion are the roots of the process in Rothman's vision, that have tried to find a solution in developing social balance during the birth of the new republic. When seeking for stability and social cohesion, locking-up individuals who caused tension within society was meant to calm to a certain extent the general anxiety arising from the unknown social system. At this level they had only helped to survive the already existing, centuries-long used, but not excessively refined separation mechanisms.

In 1961 Foucault mentioned the continuity of these lock-up mechanisms that can be observed in the course of history, giving as an example the leper colonies that had been liquidated towards the end of the Middle Ages.⁹ The epidemic had come to an end in Europe, camps had been shut down, but the structure itself survived. The place of the leprosy was soon taken over by criminals, tramps and the insane. "With an altogether new meaning and in a very different culture, the form would remain – essentially that major form of a rigorous division which is social exclusion but spiritual reintegration."¹⁰ In 1656 we can find the total institutions defined by Goffman under one roof at the contemporary *Hospital General* in Paris during the reign of Louis XIV. An old barracks had been transformed so that to serve new functions: residence for veterans and the poor, hospital for the sick, but the unemployed, the homeless, the orphans, the insane and criminals were also locked-up here.¹¹

"But the art of 'enclosure' is neither constant, nor indispensable, nor sufficient in disciplinary machinery. This machinery works space in a much more flexible and detailed way."¹² – writes Foucault in *Discipline and Punishment* – where he specially stresses discipline that divides individuals in space, sometimes demanding imprisonment, "marking the self-contained space, different from the rest".¹³ However systematic classification should continue within these institutions, in-house. "Disciplinary space tends to be divided into as many sections as there are bodies or elements to be distributed ... Discipline organizes an analytical space."¹⁴

This is the point when Foucault refers to the church prototype, the cells of monasteries, which were autonomous, organically existing disciplinary unit-spaces influencing both body and soul. The corresponding elements to cells as basic elements can be found with any total institution: isolation cells of prisons, hospital beds isolated by curtains, closed rooms at the mental hospital, the beds of barracks and boarding schools, the worker's table, etc. In all the above cases the individual becomes controllable, appreciable and comparable by power.

The conceptions basically indicate two directions. The first group from chronological point of view, whose main representatives are the already quoted and mentioned Goffman, Rothman, Foucault and Ignatieff link the appearance of the institutions of power with the social changes of the enlightenment, then with the age of industrialization. The other group, the critical historians build up their views based on the ideology of the Frankfurt School, mainly on the works of Rusche and Kirschheimer as well as the theory of Althusser regarding the apparatus of the state. They have similar views with those of the first group concerning the development of total institutions, but they explain the process by the motivation of another cause and effect connection. According to their views, hospitals, schools, prisons and other total institutions serve the interests of the state, both from the social order and economic point of view. Thus the basic question that they primarily study is as follows: whose interests do these institutions really serve?

Researchers of the 1990s study the development of institutions of power from a different angle compared to their ancestors, and handle both the above mentioned approaches critically. Though the new generation accepts as a fact the definitions of total institutions lying at the basis of their research made by their predecessors, their views are more subtle and detailed. The questions waiting for an answer have remained the same: what did determine the time of appearance of prisons, why did loss of freedom take over the place of pillory, why did penal labor almost immediately follow detention? Why does the same state power that promised total freedom to its citizens at the birth of the democratic state visibly show its powers by introducing loss of freedom, establishing different institutions and locking-up individuals in them? Contrary to previous theories, authors of the 1990s find somewhat different answers to these questions; among them we mention the works of Adam Hirsch¹⁵ and Michael Meranze.¹⁶

Hirsch rejects the cause and effect connections between the criminology theories of Beccaria¹⁷ and the appearance of the institutions. According to him, the patrons of prisons were looking for alternative methods of punishment in order to restrain crime, and were studying their relative effects.¹⁸ Prison at the same time could offer a practical solution to other social and economic problems, such as the social off-balance caused by population explosion. Hirsch also rejects the views of critical researchers according to who the state or certain classes could have benefited of penal labor. He draws our attention to the fact that the Quakers who were the

main supporters of establishing prisons, were actively taking part in the liquidation of slavery. Hirsch makes a distinction among the types of penal labor, such as slave-labor that led to economic benefits, and the work going on in prisons that was part of the reform process. All in all, Hirsch does not attribute the appearance of prisons to the enlightenment or economic interests, but to the social changes of that age. He agrees with his predecessors about the fact that prisons or other total institutions have not develop over night but have transmitted the structure, the models of the institutions of power and their mechanisms from the past. According to his observations, work as an activity imposed by power plays the role of threat or therapy, depending on the different cases. At this point his opinion meets the theory of Foucault, Rothman and Goffman regarding the instruments used by power.

The work of Michael Meranze published in 1996 includes similar approaches as Hirsch's. He throws light on the mechanisms of power that wanted to shape souls using different methods and on their past groundings, also dealt with by Foucault. The study is built up around the establishment and development of Philadelphia Prison, which is well-known to have served as a model for the development of prison-institutions in the western society, while its basic concept is deeply rooted in religious beliefs. In accordance with the new political, social and economic situation in France, Great Britain and the US, institutionalization, determining total functions – although its elements were taken from the past – ensured a proper change as far as the expectations of the newly evolved democratic society were concerned. Meranze agrees with Hirsch about the mentality of reformers, but disproves his theory regarding the motivation of reformers. He partly agrees with the theory of Rothman, rejecting – just like Hirsch – his theories regarding the role of the enlightenment. He is on the same position regarding the social importance of the debates carried out on the definition of crime, taking into consideration the interests of the different strata, groups and the state. He founds his views on the establishment of the liberal state, not forgetting the contradictions lying in it. He refers to the tensions existing in the structure of the liberal state, which appear due to the different power and subordination relationships. He studies the means of supporting power just like his predecessors did, irrespective of being formal elements or operational mechanisms.

Penitentiary: the birth of a new architectural function

The scaffold, where the body of the tortured criminal had been exposed to the ritually manifested force of the sovereign, the punitive theatre in which the representation of punishment was permanently available to the social body, was replaced by a great enclosed, complex and hierarchized structure that was integrated into the very body of the state apparatus. ... The high wall, no longer the wall that surrounds and protects, no longer the wall that stands for power and wealth, but the meticulously sealed wall, uncrossable in either direction, closed in upon the now mysterious work of punishment, will become, near at hand, sometimes even at the very centre of the cities of the nineteenth century, the monotonous figure, at once material and symbolic, of the power to punish.¹⁹

The new civil fortress defined by Foucault has developed on basis of its pre-conceptions. The models were those buildings that had had similar basic functions, and in many cases the same buildings were transformed according to the new demands: lock-ups, approved schools or prisons holding galley slaves became the scene of the newly spread forms of punishment, the scenes of detention.

Until the mid eighteenth century prisons could hardly be isolated as forms of architecture or functional units. The models contributing to their development were those buildings that had had similar basic functions, and in many cases the same were later transformed according to the new demands. Previously – and the earlier institutions had been prepared for this purpose – detention lasted for a mainly short period while the prisoner was waiting for delivering the sentence. Sentence consisted of a fine, physical punishment or execution instead of loss of freedom as punishment, in other cases loss of freedom was combined with a sentence to forced labor. Loss of freedom for a defined period of time first appeared in the life of monasteries. Pevsner mentioned the existence of such cells at Cluny Benedictine Monastery that could only be accessed from the top; they did not have any windows or doors. The Cistercians empowered their abbeys to establish prisons in 1206. (Pevsner, 1976) Short-term detention was mostly characteristic to Middle Ages, which was hosted by not especially purpose-built buildings or parts of buildings. Different bastions, towers, caves, dungeons of palaces, cells of monasteries and others, spaces connected to the headquarters of the legislative body were used for this purpose. For example, Newgate in London served such a purpose, being one of the three gates to the city. The classification of

prisoners was arranged vertically, the convicted, most of who were strangers, were grouped around different stairs. The gate serving such function had a symbolic importance: the opening leading into the city had also the role of a filter cleaning the dirt. These early prisons were totally chaotic as far as their operation is concerned. (Bender, 1987; Markus, 1993) The system of punishment had to adapt itself to the ideas of the Renaissance, to the new discoveries accompanying the economic-social upswing. The use of loss of freedom as a capital punishment became more and more general, which could not be separated of stronger or slighter physical punishments yet. This also meant the necessary change of Middle Ages methods of detention, mainly because tower-prisons had a reduced capacity. Special, purpose-built facilities were needed, this is the turning point we can reckon the establishment of a new type of building.

The first endeavors to determine the architectural form of prisons were only done theoretically and have survived in fragments. We can find design ideas and functional descriptions in the work of Filarete, who described two different sized buildings: the smaller one was adequate for short-time detentions and was located close to the palace, the bigger one consisted of more cells being adequate for long-time detentions as well as for the classification of prisoners according to their rank and crime. We can notice the plans of Josef Furtenbach in the 16th and 17th centuries that follow the ideas of Filarete adapting them to the expectations of his age. The smaller plan of the two that have survived, made around 1617, shows a simple spatial arrangement: more cells are opening to a central square that is also suitable for work, so that one guard can watch more prisoners. The other plan of Furtenbach is of bigger dimensions, sketches a quadratic building that is also organized around an inner, square core. The central part is encircled by a corridor where different sized cells open from. This can be regarded as the first architectural drafting of the possibility that prisoners be classified according to their social status and the committed crime. The famous workhouses of the age, the Rasphuis in Amsterdam for men (1595) and Spinhuis for women (1597) were to be born based on the model drawn above. The manufactures flourishing in the seventeenth century resulted in the workforce becoming more expensive. This can give an explanation to the introduction of penal labor among prisoners regardless of being beggars, shirkers or criminals. This demand resulted in the enlargement of a building program: space was needed for the employment. The smaller prison plan of Furtenbach with a gangway was already hiding the possibility; it only needed the enlargement of the

corridor into a hall. In the case of the workhouses from Amsterdam, the studies of that age only helped with their functional structuring as both of them had been transformed from monastery buildings. Education through work was completed by religious services, which were held around an altar placed in the middle of the central space.

The functional and operational incoherence of the institutions serving as detention facilities towards the end of the seventeenth century is presented in the work of Cesare Beccaria entitled *Dei Delitti e Delle Pene (Of Crimes and Punishments)* published in 1764, who makes an attempt to a theoretic clarification. The theories of Beccaria were put into practice due to two important circumstances, according to Markus: typhoid epidemic attack and immorality flourishing among the prisoners confined in the same cell. The roots of both problems laid in mass detention and lack of hygiene. All these problems led to the solutions drawn above by Filarete and Furtenbach: first of all the classification of prisoners, separation of genders, detention based on the committed crime could ensure moral hygiene. All these classifications were accompanied by distinctive educational activities: work and religious education. The improvement of the hygiene of the building was attempted by ensuring cleanness and by changing the size of the cells. This is the age when they worked out possibilities for the ventilation of buildings, which have become decisive in the formal development of future prison types.

The ideological change going on in the 18th century, which appoints loss of freedom to be a general punishment, took everybody by surprise. The gap arising from the abolition of different tortures and the re-interpretation of sins punished by death became immediately filled by *detention*, especially due to the American Quakers and the changing European social conditions. We can observe that the reformers of this period were dreaming of distinctive types of punishment which would punish the crime committed and not the individual: stealing is punishable by confiscating, embezzlement by fine, murder by death and so on.²⁰

We find imprisonment among the punishments, but only as a possible punishment in case of certain sins: individuals are punishable by imprisonment if they make an attempt on other people's freedom, or they abuse freedom. Imprisonment had had many critics because as a punishment it lost its specific character towards the crime, and its social educational role – due to the absence of the punishment as a public spectacle – could not compete with the imaginable forms of punishment. According to Foucault's summing-up

Prison as the universal penalty is incompatible with this whole technique of penalty-effect, penalty-representation, penalty-general function, penalty-sign and discourse.²¹

It is also Foucault who draws our attention to the paradox of the situation: the ideas of Le Peletier and his followers regarding distinctive forms of punishment are in fact about the different forms of imprisonment. Punishing the sanguinary, their suffering would have practically meant confinement in dark cells aggravating it with cutting off light and reducing ration. The lazy ones were put to forced labor, which could be carried out – based on existing models – through detention. Three main techniques of imprisonment were formulated in their theories as methods used in the execution of punishment: *dark-cell*, *cell* and *prison* in the sense we use it today. Consequently the imagined variety was simplified to imprisonment in general. The forms of punishment used in Europe until then have been particularly quickly replaced, in less than twenty years, by loss of freedom.²²

What was the reason for this fast and almost smooth change? Knowledge about past models played an important role in this process as well as the desire to eliminate the problems connected to them. The overcrowded institutions of the past, their lack of hygiene, their bad handling, and the continuous organizational and administrative issues all contributed to the development of a new system. Social changes that increasingly demanded equality among individuals, together with the appearance and strengthening of new social strata did not tolerate the defenselessness of human body to power. The developed tension was increased by the existing American and British reforms regarding the execution of punishment. Due to these models, the dominant, centuries-old European legislation was successfully overcome and the despotic forms of operating prisons were abolished.

As the functional change occurred so sudden, the thinkers and architects of the age could not clearly define the formal and functional requirements of the new situation, the only solution was the transformation of the existing buildings and the adaptation of previous models. From critical point of view, the architectural form – following the model of previous buildings – was subordinated to different safety requirements connected to the everyday schedule of the inmates, the surveillance needed for the different times of the day and the classification of prisoners. Nevertheless, the more essential aspects of the *new forms* were *the establishment of a new connection with*

society – and all the chances were given due to the change of forms of punishment that meant the abolishment of the punishment-theatre, which gave way to building up a new, socially more human relationship that would stimulate the possible social resettlement of prisoners –; *planning the life of prisoners for a longer period according to the facilities offered by the building* – as in many cases only the robot-like repetition of everyday events were accentuated, neglecting one of the most basic characteristics of the functions of the building that of the individual being continuously inside and its effect on the individuals, which was gradually making the social reintegration of the “healthy”, “converted” criminal, that the system was hoping for, more difficult;²³ as well as *spanning the gap between the prisoners and the free people* – to the same extent with the free people working in prisons (though they took advantage of their privileged situation many times, they were still the only connection to the outer world, even symbolically), with family members, friends (who obliged the prisoner to keep its social connections at their rare visits) – were neglected for lack of groundings and sufficient experience.

The *new function* that was developed has had two faces and interpretations until nowadays: one is an all-pervasive picture showing towards society, while the other is the power educating the individual, the criminal. Its task is the impediment of the idea of crime as well as the repression of crime in society. In the case of the individual we can speak about a more complex task: changing the individual within the walls of the institutions serving for the execution of punishment. These are the two components that result in the tension between the *function* and later in its development, and *form*. We aim to study the historic background of this relationship in the next part in the light of the eighteenth and nineteenth century architectural endeavors.

The conjunction of function and form

As one can notice the use of detention, classification and forced activities are the elements that delineate a new group of total institutions, a group of functional institutions representing state and social power by the end of the seventeenth century. The first building complex having multiple functions, gathering all the total institutions defined by Goffman under one roof was the Hospital General in Paris during the reign of Louis XIV. La Pitie and La Salpêtrière were the most important ones

among the eight institutions of Hospital General until 1684, when a new prison called La Force with a capacity of 300 prisoners was established within La Salpêtrière, which was to operate until the revolution. Though Hospital General played an important role as an institutional grounding in the development of hospitals, asylums, orphanages and prisons, from the point of view of architecture and programs it only had a tangential influence on their development.

The first fruition of the program defined by Hospital General was the San Michele detention centre in Rome, built especially for this reason. (Carlo Fontana, 1703) The building served four functions: asylum, orphanage, prison and hospital. All these functions operated isolated from each other. The institution was based on the Ospizio Generale founded by Pope Innocent XI in 1686 that collected the poor in Rome. It was enlarged from functional point of view with orphanage, workshops and classrooms by Pope Innocent XII. San Michele approved school was built by Pope Clement XI who divided the institution into independent units. In 1734 the prison functioning as a male-prison was enlarged with a female-prison. The two-storeyed building had 20 rooms on each floor connected by a hanging corridor. The working space occupying the total height of the interior space was set in the middle of the building. A weaving-mill was functioning in the cellar of the building, while in the working space of the ground floor there was a spinning-mill. There was an altar at the end of the ground floor, while at the other end there was a fountain. According to the original plans made by Fontana, the altar should have been placed in the middle of the space, this way it would have been visible from any point of the two-storeyed interior space. His statement is supported by the radii drawn on its plans that were starting from the centre. (We will see later on how this kind of space alignment becomes widespread mostly due to the plans of the Panopticum designed by Bentham.) During the day prisoners were working together, for the night they were locked in their cells. Each cell had its own latrine.

Work was done in total silence in San Michele. The inscription appearing in the common working space was also attracting attention: *Silentium*. According to Marcus

The *Silentium* prophetically foreshadowed what was coming: discipline, segregation, surveillance, attention to fresh air and sanitation, silence, work and penance. Its three-storey galleried hall was a prototype that survived into the late nineteenth century.²⁴

Actually the spatial structure of San Michele, the position of cells, attention focusing to the central space, the position of the altar, the way of surveillance, the way work was organized, the classification of prisoners and the appearance of isolation cells would be found in the prison architecture of the coming centuries. Regarding structure and form, San Michele foreran the more cleared-out building models appearing in the course of history in many ways. The coming prison forms are looking for solutions to the problems that arose there for the first time, though the model defined by San Michele serves as a reference all the time.

The theoretical work of Beccaria published in 1764, and San Michele detention centre designed by Carlo Fontana first of all resulted in the development of the oblong prison type, having an interior yard. The ground-plan of Newgate Prison in London (George Dance, 1768) – block of buildings centered around two interior yards, which was divided by the home of the governor in the middle. (See: 14-15. graph) – carrying on the concept of San Michele, tried to find a solution to guarding exterior spaces and their perspicuity. This is the model that was followed by most of the contemporary Italian detention centers and workhouses. The detention centre of Milan, called Casa di Corezzione (Francesco Croce, 1758-66) and the workhouse of Napoli (Albergo dei poveri, Ferdinando Fuga, 1751) originate from this period. The functional renewal of the detention centre of Milan – the interior yard found with Newgate that also made the classification of prisoners possible, and the closed corridor developed in the centre, the most protected part of the building – laid the basis of a building type that was suitable for the use of a more developed system of punishment.

By the end of the eighteenth century the idea of correction by work degenerated to taking maximum advantage of the free workforce, together with the increase of the population compared to the Middle Ages resulted the overcrowded prisons and detention centers. This prevented any human idea and intention of correction from fulfillment. The isolation of prisoners became impossible due to overcrowded conditions even in those institutions that were originally built with this possibility. The definition of a newer form of building that would process the conclusions of the forms of prisons until then became urgent. The new structure had to answer many problems arising from the increasing number of prisoners. First of all they had to work out a new form of classification and separation that would prove to be both theoretically and practically efficient. Education of prisoners through work and religion had an accentuated role, and it

needed wide, well-controlled spaces. In spite of the increasing number of prisoners, the smallest possible number of guards was desired from the new form.

First only theoretic studies and ideal prison plans were made in order to meet all these requirements. The work of Pierre Bugniet had a prominent role, whose studies written around 1760 played a decisive role in the development of prison facilities. The importance of the ideal prison plans made by Bugniet was first of all based on the gathered experiences and their adaptation to the expectations of a new age. The formal basis of his plans was given by the common working space surrounded by hanging corridors worked out by Fontana, the private cell system defined by Croce and the cell units gathered around a common interior yard that made the classification of prisoners into smaller groups possible. The innovation of Bugniet consisted in the structuring of the space ensuring the common daily activities and these units: we meet for the first time the concept of a concentric prison, gathering around a single point and being controlled from a single point. His success is underlined by the types developed during the coming centuries.

The effect of the plans made by Bugniet on prison architecture was soon appearing. In 1772 the building of the *Maison de Force* in Gent designed by Vilain was started, which reproduced the structuring of the octagonal ground-plan that Bugniet had made. The cell units built around eight spacious interior yards surrounded an octagonal common central work space. The altar was set on the one side of the common central space. The cells situated in the interior yard consisted of different size cells, thus ensuring isolated or group detention. The isolated cells were aligned back to one another in the radial wings starting from the top of the central octagon. The guards could control the central space and every interior yard from the hanging corridors surrounding the central work space. In 1775 the building works of *Maison de Force* were stopped after completing a pentagonal part of the original octagonal building. The completed building could hold 110—1400 people, having by far the biggest capacity among the prisons built until then. Due to the structure of the ground-plan, it ensured the control of prisoners using a reduced number of guards, as well as the total perspicuity inside the prison.

By the end of the eighteenth century many designers joined the achievements of Beccaria and Bugniet. *Maison de Force* proved the practical execution and operational success for the conclusions of their studies, the formal and operational principles and the structure of the

ground-plan defined by them. One of the most important personalities of that age dealing with prisons was John Howard who after having arrived home from captivity, as the chief sheriff of Bedfordshire consecrated his whole work to the study and development of institutions designed for execution of punishment. He published his first theoretical work entitled *The State of Prisons* in 1777. He analyzed the inventiveness of the ground-plan at Maison de Force, but he did not take over the concentric structure in his conclusions regarding the plan of the ideal county prison, only the structure of the different units facing the interior yard. Though Howard was aware of the fact that no prison reform could be carried out without a proper building, he did not realize the advantages lying in the structure built in Gent especially regarding perspicuity and prompt control. In one of the two presented plans he left part of the ground floor unbuilt in order to eliminate the humidity of cells, thus realizing more interior yards surrounded by arcades. His other plan was the developed version of the Croce Casa di Correzione building, which was exclusively built using isolated cells system. This idea also found with Buignet became the basic question of the correction movement regarding punishing systems at the beginning of nineteenth century.

The evolving British model adds isolation to the principle of work as the main condition for reformation. The scheme was worked out by Hanway in 1775 that supported it with negative arguments: promiscuity serves a bad example in prisons, offers an opportunity for prison-breaking at present, blackmailing and accomplice possibilities in the future. Prison would very much resemble the manufacture if prisoners worked together. The positive arguments: isolation means shock, if the convicted moves away, by getting rid of bad influences can have time for himself, deep inside himself can discover the sound of good, solitary work thus becomes both conversion and the practice of apprenticeship, he not only renews the space of the interests of the homo oeconomicus but also the imperatives of the ethical individual. This apparatus aiming the changes occurring to individuals is known as the reformatorium of Hanway. Howard uses these general principles when the independence of the United States prevents deportations, and is preparing the motion for law regarding systems of punishment. (Foucault, 1975) This is the time when Great Britain decides to build two prisons, one for men and one for women. A committee is set up in London in order to carry out the reform of prisons, which also tried to advance the case by announcing a competition for plans.

We can see outstanding plans both formally and functionally among the works handed in for competition in 1782, which was won by the plans of William Blackburn designed for men prison, and the plans of Thomas Hardwick designed for women prisons. These plans have never been carried out; Blackburn though became the most well-known prison architect of England of that age as the most important follower of Howard. His plans made for Ipswich Prison in 1786 define a new typology of prison architecture from formal point of view: radical design. From structural point of view, the cell wings starting from one point ensured a more efficient control of the guards than the *Maison de Force*, as even one guard could control the corridors of all the wings. The lengths of the wings were not delimited from formal point of view, as they had been with the polygonal prisons, but their size could be fitted according to local necessities. The radii did not only restructure the interior space and functional relationships, but also solved the structure of exterior yards. The position of yards was another advantage from the point of view of guarding and controlling. The radical design soon became the most popular form of prison not only in Great Britain where Blackburn designed many city prisons with this system (Salford, Liverpool), but also overseas, in the United States.

From formal point of view the radical design was a totally crystallized model. The prisons of the coming centuries that chose the same formal solution, only added functional and operational reforms to Blackburn's scheme. One of the most well-known radical design prisons is the Eastern Penitentiary in Philadelphia (1821-36), which revolutionized the system regarding the execution of punishment, making the European experiences perfect. Eastern Penitentiary is the prototype of isolated cells system, the symbol of destructed and restarted life. In Cherry Hill "the walls are the punishment of the crime, the cell confronts the convict with himself; he is forced to listen to his conscience."²⁵ Control is focused in the centre, and then divided into levels and wings. Each of the cells aligned along the central corridor has a small yard. Originally every isolated cell had a yard suitable for meditation, but every wing had to be built on storeys because of lack of space. The chapel was also set in the geometrical centre. The eighth wing had administrative function and made contact with the gate building. The designer of Eastern Penitentiary, John Haviland plays up the deterrent design-function of building aiming the neighbouring society, and surrounds the prison with a 10 meter high wall resembling the castles of the Middle Ages.

Haviland got hundreds of assignments after completing Eastern Penitentiary, and even during building it. During the consistent application of the method the architectural frame that was necessary for realizing efficient re-education became clear. Besides deterring from crime and educating to work, the effect that the staff of the institution and the governor could have on the prisoners kept in isolated cells became obvious, not only by restricting abuses but also by developing personal contact. (Markus, 1974) This is the way theories on correction intentions have been fulfilled, which was also known in Europe where they were only adopted in a few institutions. Until building Pentonville Prison there has been no prison with radical design ground-plan resembling the prison of Philadelphia. Pentonville Prison was built between 1840 and 1842 based on the plans of Joshua Jebb, and became a reference for radical design prisons. In the coming decades around fifty similarly structured institutions had been established in Great Britain, and it soon spread in many European countries (Termond, Belgium; Heilbronn, Germany).

The advantages and disadvantages of the radical design are gradually shown in the course of history, due to the frequent application of this type. We can highlight one of its disadvantages that was also known in the time of Blackburn, and led to the development of a newer model marking an era at the end of the 18th century. Although radical design solves the question of central control, it cannot establish a direct visual contact between the guards representing power and the inmates. As we have noticed, the development of prison was in many cases not determined by the nature of crimes or humanitarian ideas, but by the intention of the power keeping people under restraint to gradually hide in the shade. The fact that the system for execution of punishment wanted to hire as few staff as possible had administrative reasons. An organizationally and operationally centralized system is much easier to control for the power. At the same time, reduced number of staff has economic advantages. Although, as we have already seen, Blackburn's radical design was very close to solve this problem. The other fact that power wished to achieve was invisibility, an untouchable presence filling everything, having similar effects to religious power. The person having an answer to this wish was Jeremy Bentham with his Panopticon prison-scheme published in 1787, which concluded all the researches made until then, and shaped its concept based on them. Bentham's innovation cannot be restricted to formal elements in the case of the Panopticon. As Markus draws our attention to it, Bentham turns over the existing direction of the attention

focusing to the centre of the multi-storeyed interior space (remember the first versions of San Michele, where Fontana set the altar in the middle of the space so that everyone could see it), and directs it from the centre to the hanging corridors, to the cells. This is an essential moment in the relationship of the supervised, influenced by the structure of the building, and the supervisor, as the centre that has had the function of hope becomes the source of fear and control.

Panopticon has never been carried out according to the form designed by Bentham. We see buildings resembling the Panopticon in many cases, but besides their circular or semi-circular design the power-play designed by Bentham has never been fulfilled in its full spatial and functional structure. The monumentality of their design, the feeling of defenselessness of prisoners, the spaces totally unsuitable for common daily activities or mere missing spaces have urged the interior reconstruction of this model and its enlargement with other parts of building. The operational strategies together with the criminological, correctional and ideological strategies of the institutions housing the execution of punishment have undergone continuous changes. Nowadays both from administrative and architectural point of view the design of prisons is a continuous experiment where not only the correct proportion between the different theories should be found, thus defining *function*, but the new social, *architectural* face should also be defined. The above mentioned types (rectangular, system opening to the central interior space or to the interior yard outside the building, radical design, and their mixture) are building types still used today. From architectural and formal point of view, the institutions of the 20th century have only transformed the existing models according to the functional needs. How do we use and transform these building types, how do we contribute to their present program, which are those approaches that may lead to a new formal reform, go beyond the borders of architectural research.

NOTES

- 1 Rothman, D., *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*, Little Brown, Boston, Mass., 1971.
- 2 Foucault, M., *Surveiller et punir*, Editions Gallimard, Paris, 1975 (*Discipline & Prison: The Birth of the Prison*, Vintage Books, New York, 1977).
- 3 Ignatieff, M., *A Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution, 1750-1850*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1978.
- 4 Goffman, E., *Asylums. Essay on the Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*, Anchor Books, New York, 1961, pp. 4-5.
- 5 "A total institution may be defined as a place of residence and work where larger number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round if life. Prisons serve as a clear example, providing we appreciate that what is prison-like about prisons is found in institutions whose members have broken no laws." *Idem* p. xiii.
- 6 *Idem* p.7.
- 7 Rothman, D., *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*, Little Brown, Boston, Mass., 1971, p. xiii.
- 8 *Idem*, p. 128.
- 9 Foucault, M., *Madness and Civilization*, Vintage Books, New York, 1988, originally published *Histoire de la Folie*, Librairie Plon, 1961.
- 10 *Idem* p. 5.
- 11 It is important to mention that there were 6000 people living in Hospital General, 1% of the population of Paris. See: *Idem* p. 43.
- 12 Foucault, M., *Surveiller et punir*, Editions Gallimard, Paris, 1975 (*Discipline & Prison: The Birth of the Prison*, Vintage Books, New York, 1977), p. 143.
- 13 The lock-up of tramps and the miserable, the colleges operating by the scheme of monasteries, boarding-schools, which are presented as the most perfect educational systems, the barracks that keep the army in one place and deter looting and violence, the manufactures giving birth to the factory are given as examples that are related to „monasteries, fortresses, closed cities". *Idem* pp. 142-153.
- 14 *Idem* p.143.
- 15 Hirsch, A., *The Rise of the Penitentiary: Prisons & Punishment in Early America*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1992.
- 16 Meranze, M., *Laboratories of Virtue: Punishment, Revolution and Authority in Philadelphia, 1760-1785*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill/London, 1996.
- 17 According to the classical criminology theory man is a rational human being acting logically and taking logical decisions. According to Rousseau, there is an unwritten contract between the man and the state, which states that man gives up part of its freedom in change for social safety guaranteed by the state.

The classical criminology theory of Rousseau was transformed into methods of execution of punishment by Cesare Beccaria in his book entitled *Dei Delitti e Delle Pene (On Crimes and Punishments)* published in 1764. Beccaria says that the individual can freely choose the way he reaches happiness and the way he avoids pain. According to Beccaria punishment should punish the crime and by doing so the one who committed it. The motifs, personality, gender, age or intellectual health can only play secondary roles in the process of imposing punishment. Beccaria's views were later corrected by the followers of neoclassical ideologies, and made a distinction between children and the ones mentally retarded and the other criminals, as these people – according to their statements – are incapable of understanding happiness and pain. It was also accepted in this age that the degree of complicity should be also taken into account. (Fox, 1976; Atlas, 1991)

18 (Men) “focusing primarily on the relative effectiveness of alternative modes of punishment to control crime.” Hirsch, A., *The Rise of the Penitentiary: Prisons & Punishment in Early America*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1992, p. 54.

19 Foucault, M., *Surveiller et punir*, Editions Gallimard, Paris, 1975 (*Discipline & Prison: The Birth of the Prison*, Vintage Books, New York, 1977), pp. 115-116.

20 Le Peletier was one of the reformers who defined the principle of symbolic communication when he submitted a draft for a new law in 1791: “Exact relationship between the nature of crime and the nature of punishment should be established”, who was a sanguinary criminal would do hard work, the one who was base should endure immoral punishment. We can find the whole scale of striking punishments in the drafts of law of the age. According to Malby “be aware not to impose the same punishment”. Vermeil also had similar proposals. All these are comprehensively presented by Foucault in the above quoted work.

21 Foucault, M., *Surveiller et punir*, Editions Gallimard, Paris, 1975 (*Discipline & Prison: The Birth of the Prison*, Vintage Books, New York, 1977), pp. 114-115.

22 Imprisonment became widespread outside France in Russia during the reign of Catherine II, and in Austria during the reign of Joseph II.

23 This is the reason why many thinkers of that time rejected imprisonment as form of punishment, because they did not find any alternative in order to avoid daily routine in the life of criminals: “There without any work, without any entertainment, in the uncertainty of waiting for the day of being free, the inmate spends restless, long hours, deep in his thoughts that appear on the mind of every sinner.” Caleb Lownes, in: N. K Teeters: *Cradle of Penitentiary*, 1955.

24 Markus, T., *Buildings & Power. Freedom and Control in the Origin of Modern Building Types*, Routledge, London, 1993, p. 121.

25 Foucault, M., *Surveiller et punir*, Editions Gallimard, Paris, 1975 (*Discipline & Prison: The Birth of the Prison*, Vintage Books, New York, 1977), p. 239.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Atlas, R., "Changes in prison facilities as a function of correctional philosophy", in Dunham, R. (ed.), *History of Prisons*, 1991
- Bender, J., *Imagining the Penitentiary: Fiction and the Architecture of Mind in Eighteenth Century England*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1987
- Foucault, M., *Histoire de la Folie*, Librairie Plon, 1961 (*Madness and Civilization*, Vintage Books, New York, 1988)
- Foucault, M., *Surveiller et punir*, Editions Gallimard, Paris, 1975 (*Felügyelet és büntetés*, Gondolat, Budapest, 1990)
- Fox, V., *Introduction to Criminology*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA, 1976
- Goffman, E., *Asylums: Essay on the Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*, Anchor Books, New York, 1961
- Ignatieff, M., *A Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution, 1750-1850*, Pantheon Books, New York, 1978
- Hirsch, A., *The Rise of the Penitentiary: Prisons & Punishment in Early America*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1992
- Harcourt, B., *From the Asylum to the Prison: Rethinking the Incarceration Revolution*, *Texas Law Review*, Vol. 84:1751
- Hart, H.L.A., *Punishment and Responsibility*. Clarendon, Oxford, UK, 1968
- Markus, T., "Pattern of the Law", in *The Architectural Review*, vol.116, oct. 1974
- Markus, T., *Buildings & Power. Freedom and Control in the Origin of Modern Building Types*, Routledge, London, 1993
- Meranze, M., *Laboratories of Virtue: Punishment, Revolution and Authority in Philadelphia, 1760-1785*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill/London, 1996
- Nemes, M., "A börtönépítés kezdeti és jellegzetes épülettípusa alakulása", in *Építés és építészettudomány*, XI/1-2, Budapest, 1979
- Pevsner, N., *The History of Building Types*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1979
- Rothman, D., *The Discovery of the Asylum: Social Order and Disorder in the New Republic*, Little Brown, Boston, Mass., 1971
- Semple, J., *Bentham's Prison, A Study of the Panopticon Penitentiary*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1993
- Shah, R. C., Kesan, J. P.: How architecture regulates, www.governingwithcode.org, 2004
- Snarr, R., Wolford, B., *Introduction to corrections*, Dubuque, USA, William C. Brown, 1985
- Virilio, P., *L'espace critique*, Editions Christian Bourgois, 1984 (*Spațiu critic*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Idea Design & Print, 2001)
- Werret, S., *Potemkin and the Panopticon: Samuel Bentham and the Architecture of Absolutism in Eighteenth Century Russia*, Cambridge University, 1998