

REMARKS ON CELLULAR SEPARATION

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649446711

Remarks on Cellular Separation by William Parker Foulke

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

WILLIAM PARKER FOULKE

**REMARKS ON
CELLULAR
SEPARATION**

◊
REMARKS

ON

CELLULAR SEPARATION.

FROM THE PUBLICATION COMMITTEE
OF THE
PHILADELPHIA SOCIETY FOR ALLEVIATING THE
MISERIES OF PUBLIC PRISONS.

PHILADELPHIA:

1861.

STEREOTYPED BY L. JOHNSON AND CO.
PHILADELPHIA.
H. B. ADEHEAD PRINTER.

December 26, 1860.

DEAR SIR,

We take great pleasure in communicating to you the enclosed resolution, adopted unanimously by the Acting Committee of the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons, on Thursday last.

We feel persuaded that the publication of your valuable essay will greatly promote the cause which our Society has so much at heart,—the extension of the Pennsylvania system of prison discipline.

We remain,

Very truly, yours,

JAMES J. BARCLAY, *Pres't.*

JOHN J. LYTLE, *Sec'y.*

WM. PARKER FOULKE, Esq.

At a stated meeting of the Acting Committee of the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons, held 12th month 20, 1860, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That William Parker Foulke be requested to furnish a copy of the essay read at the late meeting of the American Association for the Improvement of Penal and Reformatory Institutions, held in New York, and that the same be stereotyped and published under the direction of the committee on the distribution of the *Journal*; and also that a copy be bound up and distributed with the January number of the *Journal*.

(Extracted from the minutes.)

JOHN J. LYTLE, *Secretary.*

December 28, 1860.

GENTLEMEN,

The American Association for the Improvement of Penal and Reformatory Institutions, at whose request my essay was prepared, has no permanent fund; and its purpose in relation to the essay was answered by the reading of it at the recent meeting in New York.

Since the executive board of the Philadelphia Society is of opinion that the essay may be of further use, I cheerfully consent to its publication, relying upon its readers for an indulgent consideration of the unfavorable circumstances in which, as they will learn, it was written.

I am,

Very truly, yours,

WM. PARKER FOULKE.

To Messrs. JAMES J. BARCLAY, *Pres't.*JOHN J. LITTLE, *Sec'y.*

MR. PRESIDENT :

My appointment to deliver to the Association an address upon the SEPARATE SYSTEM OF PRISON DISCIPLINE, imposes an obligation; yet how to fulfil it, is for me a difficult question. The subject has become an old one among jurists, and among administrators of penal law. Since the latter part of the last century, it has been discussed by a constantly increasing number of students. In Pennsylvania, the opinion of the promoters of convict-separation found some expression in prison construction and management almost seventy years ago, upon the recommendation of the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons; and their measures had been preceded by changes having a like object in a few British prisons. During the next twenty-five years, the subject continued to occupy the attention of many thoughtful men. The government of Pennsylvania enlarged the facilities for the administration of the separate method by the erection of two large penitentiaries, one, under the law of 1818, for the Western District, and

the other, under the law of 1821, for the Eastern District; and New York, adopting other conclusions respecting the means of penal discipline, established her great experimental prison at Auburn. Scarcely had these institutions been authorized, when there sprang up in Massachusetts, in the year 1825, the Boston Prison Discipline Society, having for one of its objects the investigation of the penitentiary question, but avowing its preference for the plan of convict-congregation. Thus, two associations, at Philadelphia and at Boston, with experiments assumed to be typical, came into controversy upon the evidence. The sincerity of each insured the maintenance of discussion. No sooner had the separate penitentiaries begun to make annual reports, than the interest of Europe was awakened in a remarkable manner. In 1831 the French Government, in 1832 the British, and in 1834 the Prussian, sent to the United States commissioners to examine the most important of our prisons. France repeated her inquiry among us. Belgium and Russia authorized a like inspection on their own behalf. From the commencement of these investigations, the public discussion of the question between Auburn and Philadelphia went on abroad with great vigor. In fact, the question may almost be said to have been transferred to Europe. The commissioners were men of eminent fitness for their special duty. Their reports underwent a searching scrutiny; they were debated in the executive councils and in the legislatures of their respective nations. A new lite-

ration seemed to be forming. Not only in the bureaux of government, but in the halls of science, prison discipline became a familiar theme. Volume followed volume from the press; so that in the year 1846, when a new era was opened, there had been accumulated a library of works, in the principal languages of Europe, upon this question so peculiar to modern times. The range of argument continually widened, until it embraced penology in its largest sense; and the philosophy of penitentiaries took its due place in jurisprudence. It was in the year last mentioned that there assembled in Germany, at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, a congress of men the most capable in Europe for the profound discussion of penal systems. That was not an assembly of a few persons, citizens of one State. From England, France, Sweden, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Russia, Prussia, and various other parts of Germany, came those who had been the leaders of reform for their respective nationalities; commissioners to whom had been intrusted the duty of foreign visitation, legislators, councillors of state, judges, inspectors-general, architects, medical officers, chaplains of prisons, members of voluntary associations—such observers and writers as Julius, Mittermaier, Suringar, Ducpetiaux, Moreau-Christophe, David, Russell, Varrentrapp. At Brussels, in the following year, their truly learned and dispassionate discussions were resumed. Meantime there had been formed in New York a third American association, the members of which were pledged to