

The Sincerest Form of Flattery

Imitation and Early Prison Design in New Zealand

Christine McCarthy

Victoria University

Abstract

Buildings, as much as writing, construct architectural history. Built quotations validate architectural historical arguments for architectural influence. For example, the avid imitation of the Parthenon - which spawned buildings as geographically diverse as Birmingtons' Town Hall, and Nashville's Tennessee Centennial Exposition's Parthenon, and, in New Zealand, the Auckland War Memorial Museum - demonstrate both flattery and influence. While the Parthenon is perhaps the most widely copied building, the practice was particularly common prior to twentieth-century modernism, and also articulated specific geo-political relations, such as that between colony and coloniser. England's Pentonville Model Prison (London, 1840-42), like the Parthenon, was an influential building, helped in no small measure by the effectiveness of the British Commonwealth as a mechanism for disseminating architectural and other ideas. Colonised co-incident with the building of the Model Prison, New Zealand's thinking about prisons particularly felt the impact of Pentonville, both in the penal system's built form and in its failure to live up to the expectations of this British model. Insufficient funds to build complete buildings, and the incomplete copying of the policies and systems, around which Pentonville was designed, resulted in what are perhaps best described as partial quotations and misquotations, rather than a more comprehensive imitation or plagiarism. Parliamentary politics was also a barrier to a simple adoption of English models. This paper will examine two early New Zealand prisons reputedly indebted to Jebb's Pentonville: The Wellington Gaol 1843 and the Central Prison proposed for New Plymouth in the 1870s.

Introduction

New Zealand's colonisation in 1840, coinciding with the construction of Pentonville Model Prison in London (1840-42), made Joshua Jebb's prison design the obvious model for the juvenile New Zealand penal system.¹ However, the adoption of the idea of prisons during colonisation was not straightforward. While prisons were an immediate presence in colonial New Zealand, they were notoriously incompetent buildings. Pratt, for example, noted that in Nelson gaol "the prisoners walked out of the window whilst the constable was standing at the door", and in 1843, one prisoner claimed that he was forced to escape a prison in order to "save his life", given the poor conditions he was subject to.² The poor quality of other prison buildings meant that prisoners had to be chained because the buildings provided no certain ability to contain them.³

Despite this, in NZ's prison history, Pentonville, as an aspirational architectural model for the nineteenth-century, stands tall. This prison, and its Separate System, was, as McGowen put it:

the model for the construction of many local [English] prisons ... and attracted worldwide attention ... [It] was a monument to English engineering [and f]or a regime that was intended to individualize punishment, it did its best to erase any trace of individuality".⁴

Pratt described one of New Zealand's first permanent prisons, Wellington Gaol (1843), as a design which "drew very heavily on the Pentonville format", whereas Methven described this building as "[a] truncated version of the Pentonville model".⁵ Newbold referred to another NZ prison, Mt Eden, as built on "the same "radial" pattern used at places like ... Pentonville", and stated that "Mt Eden prison was planned twenty years after its antecedent at Pentonville".⁶ Lister likewise associates Invercargill Prison with the design of Pentonville.⁷

Predictably, the "truth" in all these cases frequently lies somewhere approximate to these assertions. This paper consequently examines the history of two early NZ prisons, one partly built (Wellington Gaol, 1843) and one unbuilt (Central Prison, New Plymouth, 1870s) and looks at written and drawn contemporary accounts to tease out some aspects of the relationships of New Zealand's penal architecture to that of Pentonville.

Description of Pentonville

Pentonville's radial geometry was created from a central hall with four three-storey wings of cells radiating out from it. Inside each cell wing a galleried central corridor was lined on each side with three storeys of replicated cells. The central hall enabled supervision down these corridors, via glazed bays jutting out of the governor's office.⁸ As Evans noted, this shifted the direct observation of the prisoner, seen in Bentham's Panopticon, to a surveillance of the space between prisoners.⁹

The 520 cells were 13' long, 7' wide and 9' high,¹⁰ and were:

designed to prevent communication between prisoners. They contained all the necessities of prison life, including a hammock, table, water closet, basin and gas light. The prisoners ate, slept and worked in their cells, leaving them only for religious worship and exercise. The cell windows could not be opened and therefore a heating and ventilation system had to be included. ... The strict segregation extended to both the exercise yards and the chapel. ... In the chapel, each inmate had their own individual pew which allowed them to see the preaching clergyman but prevented contact with other inmates.¹¹

These aspects of prisoner management were core to the Separate System. The exercise yards were designed as individual yards, but not built.¹² Instead segregation during exercise was effected through inmates wearing "a mask of brown cloth with slots only for the eyes", while "holding taut a rope

knotted at 15 foot intervals".¹³ The prevention of communication was comprehensive. Silence enabled the detection of any infringement, assisted by the inclusion in "the warder's uniform ... [of] a pair of thick felt overshoes to mask the sound of their footfall".¹⁴ Inter-cell side walls were 18 inches thick, and floor thickness was at least 1 foot.¹⁵ Care was however taken to ensure that each cell received sunlight at some time of the day, though the placement of the unopenable window ensured that it was "just high enough to be difficult to see out of".¹⁶ Inmates were fed in their cells, via a slot in the cell's sheet metal-clad timber door.¹⁷ The building's heating and ventilation system was convoluted, designed as it was to prevent inmate communication.¹⁸

Pentonville "became one of the most copied prisons in the world", visited by heads of state, and commissioners from France, Prussia, Austria, Holland, Denmark, and Sweden.¹⁹ Within six years the Pentonville design had been used in over 50 buildings, and by 1854 it "had become the norm".²⁰ Pratt claimed that Pentonville "set the tone ... for much of the rest of the 19th century", and Pubrick described the prison as "much copied from the moment it opened in 1842".²¹

Wellington Gaol

The most immediate influence of Pentonville in New Zealand was an ambitious Wellington project to build a replica of Pentonville prison in 1843, which aimed to ultimately accommodate 384 prisoners.²² It is not apparent that this was an assertive commitment to a British penal policy, but is perhaps more accurately described as symbolic of the default setting of a colonial mindset. The architect was 19-year-old Irish-born Thomas Fitzgerald, who had arrived in NZ in 1842, as an assistant surveyor for the New Zealand Company.²³ The Wellington Gaol appears to have been his first New Zealand architectural work, followed by military barracks at Paremata in 1846, and hospitals in 1846 and 1850.²⁴ Pratt described the project as "the first detailed plans for a New Zealand prison", reflecting the *ad hoc* accommodation for prisoners in the first years of colonisation.²⁵

A set of undated drawings documents the shift from ambition to reality.²⁶ They also demonstrate that the initial proposal was a hub and detached wing design, unlike Pentonville; a design refined and taken up in the early nineteenth-century by George Byfield, David Asher Alexander and George Thomas Buller's Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline designs in prisons such as Bury St Edmunds County Gaol (1802-3), Maidstone County Gaol (1810-17), and Middlesex Houses of Correction (1834). There are key differences between the English designs and the Fitzgerald plans for Wellington Gaol. These include Fitzgerald's plan being a half-octagon and lacking longitudinal partitions dividing the corridor of cell wings to effect prisoner categorisation. The central hub building was also conventionally three storeys high (Fitzgerald's was only one storey) and included a chapel and infirmary - both absent from the Wellington plans. This hub and detached cell wing design was also seen closer to home in Sydney's Darlinghurst Gaol (1836-40).

Each floor lacked bilateral symmetry, and was without the gallery nave of Pentonville. A single cell type was not repeated, cell doors and windows were not symmetrically located in the cell wall, and the narrow and vertically-oriented windows were placed to support regularity in the external facade rather than a specific geometry of the interior. There were four entries into each cell wing on the ground floor and a central corridor which runs the length of the building. Details of the boundary wall and airing yard partitions are also included and are reminiscent of the much earlier William Blackburn Gloucester County Gaol, Northleach (1785).

A radical change occurs with the third and fourth sheets of drawings. These also represent a Fitzgerald design but they now depict a cell-block architecture more typical of Pentonville, transforming the male cell block from a slender 84' x 21'6" to a squat 73'6" x 40'. A key difference between the hub and detached wing designs and Pentonville's radial design was the attached wings, which enabled surveillance down internal galleries. In this revised Wellington Gaol design, the variety of cell sizes was replaced by an unrelenting repetition of a 12 x 6'6" cell with symmetrically-placed

door and window; the windows now horizontally-disposed. A wider central corridor (10') accommodated a longitudinally-aligned stair and a double-height gallery space. A single entry into the building is aligned with the axis of surveillance. The change to uniform cells is significant as this represents a new policy of the Separate System, originating at Cherry Hill, Philadelphia and perfected at Pentonville, which typically incarcerated single prisoners in their cells 23 hours each day.

The first stage of the prison was completed by February 1844,²⁷ two years after Pentonville's completion. The 1843 Bluebook described the brick and American deal construction as a two-storey prison wing (33'6" x 40') of 16 separate system cells (12' x 6'6" x 10') arranged in two rows on each side of a double-height space. The building was 23'6" high (from ground to eaves) with 18" thick walls surrounded by a boundary wall.²⁸ These dimensions represented a distorted Pentonville, with diminished hall width (from 16' to 10'), cell sizes shrunk in floor area (from 91sqft to 78sqft), but extruded in height (from 9' to 10'). The preservation of Pentonville's 18" wall thickness suggests a higher priority was given to physical separation than the space for accommodating prisoners.

Two six-foot-high (two feet wide) doors, 2" thick, made of vertical boards with three horizontal rails, were accommodated at the inner and outer surfaces of the thick cell wall, within the space of a single door frame (18" deep). Two oversized bolts were to secure the cell door which had two openings: one for provisions, and one for surveillance (the inspection hole). The corridor side is secured by an iron bar. A rectilinear opening in this door "covered with wire gauze" is to enable "Prisoners to speak to their friends though ... [without] personal contact".²⁹ This elaboration of the doors echoes those at Pentonville, even down to the door swings (left hung on the cell side; right hung on the gallery side), and wire gauze covering the opening for speaking through the corridor side door.³⁰

The number and size of the airing yards indicate that Wellington Gaol did not implement Pentonville's intended separate provisions in its exercise yards, but rather adopted the cheaper and more pragmatic eighteenth-century association yard - albeit with an ability to accommodate three classes of prisoner.³¹ The Bluebook also confirmed that while the single wing was incomplete, it was intended to be the first of four wings with 96 cells each, enabling total accommodation for 384 prisoners,³² but a project for four - rather than two - wings is not apparent in any of the drawings. While aspiring to enable the separate system in each cell, the sheriff noted that the lack of ablution facilities (a water closet and washing sink) undermined this.³³ This was another important distinction from Pentonville's elaborate provision of services in individual cells. The building was hence incomplete in numerous ways, such as its size and capacity, and the facilities needed to support the desired Separate System modelled at Pentonville. Atop Mt Cook, the building was a dominant landmark, and consequently subject to constant criticism by a city unimpressed by the symbolism of a prison visible from all key civic vantage points.

The site, unlike England, was vulnerable to earthquakes and, in the 1848 Marlborough earthquake, the Mount Cook gaol was "so much cracked as to be no longer habitable".³⁴ The following decade would see the transfer of prisons into a provincial system of government (1852-1876), which made the operation of a coherent and consistent penal system difficult. Despite this, it was during this time that momentum grew for a Central Prison in New Zealand.

The Central Prison

A central gaol, "for the confinement of felons from all parts of New Zealand", had been proposed in May 1857.³⁵ A 1858 motion in the House of Representatives to investigate the matter, was followed by provision in the 1860 budget, and the appointment of a Select Committee in 1866. In December 1867, a Royal Commission on Prisons was established; its scope of investigation included "whether it would be desirable that a General Penal Establishment should be instituted for the Colony".³⁶

In the General Penal Establishment or "Central Prison", classification would be achieved through architecture "in each individual jail [and through gathering] ... the greatest criminals ... together in one establishment".³⁷ Persistent through public discussion about the design and siting of the prison were three main issues. The first was the potential of prison labour building local infrastructure in order to benefit local economies and provide hard labour, and a number of towns were proactive in their desire to secure the Central Prison because of this.³⁸ A second concern was the inadequacy of New Zealand prisons to effect classification,³⁹ which had been introduced as an idea in the late eighteenth-century reforms in England, with inmate probationary classes derived from time spent in gaol and inmate behaviour. This was a shift from prior groupings according to the crime committed, social status, gender, and age. The discussion regarding the Central Prison focused on a rudimentary classification; the separation of "hardened criminals" from first-time offenders, identified as able to be reformed.⁴⁰ The inability of NZ prisons to affect the Separate System, namely cellular confinement for each prisoner,⁴¹ was the third concern. In addition to insufficient provision of individual cells, the timber construction of our prisons was identified as also inadequate for separation. For example, at Mt Eden's Stockade, "[w]ith a purely wooden building", prevention of prisoners communicating with each other through the cell walls was "impossible".⁴² This materiality also no doubt undermined the deliberate iconography of English prisons with medieval castles, implemented to maximise the dungeon's symbolic value or effect deterrence.

The Royal Commission concluded that "one Penal Establishment should be instituted for the whole Colony". There was no reference to specific prisons as exemplar, but among the documents which the Commission examined was Pentonville designer Joshua Jebb's 1850 Report.⁴³

The political context of the Provincial system and domestic economic situation caused time delays between the Commission's Report (1868) and site surveys, which commenced early in 1876.⁴⁴ Confirmation of a harbour near the Sugar Loaves to be made by prison labour also occurred in January.⁴⁵ The 30 acre-site for the prison, to be built from stone quarried from Paritutu, was to be near Ngamotu pa, with building to commence in early March, but a delay in receiving information from England about "the most modern mode of construction", delayed accepting construction contracts.⁴⁶

The Architecture of the Central Prison

It appears that there are no existing plans of the Central Prison, which was designed by the Colonial Architect, William Clayton.⁴⁷ Two extensive (and in part contradictory) newspaper accounts do however survive.⁴⁸ These articles describe a radial prison of four wings (with only one to be built initially) with a two storey administrative wing. The prison would be built of concrete and timber walls clad in corrugated iron, which was a significant departure from the brick of Pentonville. Isaacs recorded iron as a wall material reported in the NZ Census from 1874.⁴⁹ He also stated that nails and corrugated iron were "[t]he only building products that can traced both in weight and value over the entire period 1870 to 1970", again indicating the prevalence of corrugated iron as a building material.⁵⁰ Skinner noted that the impact of earthquakes on buildings created an appreciation of timber building as "both fitting and desirable", and stated that "[t]he dangers of brick construction and the obvious suitability of timber were understood in New Zealand from 1848 ... Timber construction became a utilitarian preference grounded in pragmatic practice".⁵¹ This mid-nineteenth-century context may explain the departure from the use of brick, such as that used to build the earthquake-prone Wellington Gaol on Mount Cook.

The stated rationale for this material selection was that corrugated iron-clad timber had been "found to be far more secure than stone, for there is no way of cutting a hole through it except by a drill and a file; but in using these tools the iron would vibrate, and the noise cause immediate detection".⁵² This strategy differed to that underpinning Pentonville,⁵³ the acoustic design of which was informed by an experiment undertaken at Millbank which aimed to "build walls through which no message could pass".⁵⁴ Twelve variations of brick cavity walls were tested.⁵⁵ Evans stressed that "[t]he important

thing to note is that the Millbank walls were not meant to reduce the transmission of noise; they were meant to eradicate the transmission of information".⁵⁶ In contrast, the construction of NZ's Central Prison would amplify acoustic irregularities. Foucault's writing on Bentham's strategic use of visibility, makes this same point about detection: "By the effect of backlighting, one can observe from the tower, standing out precisely against the light, the small captive shadows in the cells of the periphery".⁵⁷

The prison would include a chapel and a hospital, and the cell wings (105' x 34') would be three storeys high, each accommodating 102 prisoners in separate cells (9' x 6') organised in two rows separated by a galleried hall. The administrative block was the most comprehensively described. Behind its 172' front elevation would be a courtyard. It would connect to a 10-sided building (from which the cell wings radiated) via an 86' x 45' block accommodating the governor's room, kitchen, officers' mess, and offices. Above these is a double-height chapel (60' x 40'), a library and a school room. The polygonal building accommodated a hospital, warders' rooms and two rooms for the chaplain, whereas the courtyard building contained reception cells, fumigation, the registry and apartments for warders. The central hub, radial cell wings and administrative block relate strongly to the formulaic planning which had been cemented with the culmination of Pentonville. The conceptual reference in the *Taranaki Herald* to when looking at the plans "one is forcibly reminded of a wind-mill"⁵⁸ vividly recalls the plan of Pentonville's forbearer at Cherry Hill, but it is also a prison-type recommended by Thomas le Breton in his 1822 *Thoughts on the defective state of prisons*, published prior to Pentonville's creation.⁵⁹

Just as tenders had been submitted and the estimated cost of £20,000 for the building was published,⁶⁰ the government's Opposition raised concerns regarding the cost of the building; the cost of money already spent on enlarging gaols; and conflict over the right system of prison management (including assertions that the design was for "an associate or intermediate prison" not a Central Prison), as well as the possibility that the allocated funding might be better channeled into public works in Auckland.⁶¹ It was also noted that England was amidst a similar debate, suggesting NZ should wait for its resolution,⁶² and raising the issue of whether or not NZ should blindly follow England.

The Government responded that "[t]he necessity for reforming our prison system can no longer be deferred".⁶³ However, the challenges to the three issues core to publicly-stated rationale for the project (classification, separation and provision of public works), as well as criticisms of the effectiveness of the design and the idea of centrality, proved insurmountable. A motion in Parliament, which the Government lost by 13 votes, postponed the construction for a year. By this time a new government, and a worsening economic context, undermined the Taranaki project for a New Zealand Central Prison.⁶⁴

Conclusion

The design development of Wellington Gaol, which saw the shift from a detached wing prison in the mode of Darlinghurst, designed and built on the eve of NZ's colonisation, to a Pentonville model demonstrates a fast response to new architectural thinking in the colonies. The detail and dimensioning common to Pentonville in the cell walls and doors confirms the priorities of separation in the colonial context. In contrast, without drawings, it is difficult to ascertain the detail intended for Taranaki's Central Prison. The reporting of the corrugated iron-clad timber frame wall construction does however suggest that at this stage in NZ's colonisation English models both informed and were comprehensively adapted to better suit NZ building resources and seismic context.

The idea of a Central Prison would be revived again in the 1880s. This time the site would be the country's capital and the construction of a brick radial prison, another image of Pentonville, was commenced on Mount Cook in 1882. In many ways, it appears to reconstitute Wellington's first

QUOTATION: What does history have in store for architecture today?

attempt to formalise prison architecture in 1843, and its comprehensive allegiance to the image of Pentonville contrasts the material selection of Clayton's Central Prison design.

While NZ's mid nineteenth-century attempts to replicate Pentonville failed, they did not extinguish the NZ link to English thinking on penal architecture. Instead, the persistence of Pentonville's design as what a prison should look like in NZ can be seen in later prisons at Addington, Invercargill, Mt Cook II and Mt Eden. It is tempting, but too early, to securely state that the era of Provincial government, with its more complex layers of governments, enabled greater adaption and experimentation with imported English architectural ideas in the Colonial Architect's office, but the image of a corrugated iron-clad Central Prison conjures up such a possibility, and possibly sheds light on NZ's long architectural history of mis-quoting Britain.

Endnotes

- ¹ Allan, Brodie, Jane Croom and James O'Davies, *Behind Bars: The Hidden Architecture of England's Prisons* (Swindon, UK: Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England; English Heritage, 1999), 11; Robin Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue: English prison architecture, 1750-1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 346-347. As Evans noted, architect Charles Barry designed the Italianate entrance facade, Jebb designed the interior and planning. Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 370.
- ² John Pratt, *Punishment in a Perfect Society: The New Zealand Penal System 1840-1939* (Wellington: Victoria University, 1992), 76.
- ³ Peter Clayworth, 'Prisons - Early prisons, 1840-1876' *Te Ara: the Encyclopaedia of New Zealand* (20 June 2012) <http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/prisons/page-2>
- ⁴ Randell McGowen "The Well-ordered Prison: England, 1780-1865" *The Oxford History of the Prison: the practice of punishment in Western Society* ed. Norval Morris and David J. Rothman (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 101.
- ⁵ John Pratt, *Punishment in a Perfect Society*, 84; Peter Methven, *The Terrace Gaol: a short history of Wellington's prisons, 1840-1927* (Aotearoa: Steele Roberts, 2011), 20.
- ⁶ Greg Newbold, *Punishment & Politics: The Maximum Security Prison in New Zealand* (Auckland: Oxford University Press, 1989), 2, 3; Greg Newbold, *The Problem of Prisons: correction reform in New Zealand since 1840* (Wellington: Dunmore Publishing, 2007), 170.
- ⁷ Philip Lister, "A Prison of Rare Distinction", *New Zealand Historic Places* 80 (2001), 42.
- ⁸ Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 349.
- ⁹ Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 4, 329.
- ¹⁰ Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 354; Brodie et al. state the height of Pentonville cells as 10'.
- ¹¹ Evans *The Fabrication of Virtue* pp. 4, 362; Johnston, Norman *Forms of Constraint: A History of Prison Architecture* (Urbana; Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000), 92.
- ¹² Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 361; Johnston stated that the original design for the exercise yards was built but later demolished. Johnston, *Forms of Constraint*, 92.
- ¹³ Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 361.
- ¹⁴ Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 349.
- ¹⁵ Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 354; Johnston, *Forms of Constraint*, 91.
- ¹⁶ Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 354.
- ¹⁷ Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 357.
- ¹⁸ Johnston, *Forms of Constraint*, 91-92.
- ¹⁹ Johnston, *Forms of Constraint*, 93.
- ²⁰ Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 370.
- ²¹ Pratt, *Punishment in a Perfect Society*, 16; Louise Purbrick, 'The Architecture of Containment' *The Maze* (London: Granta Books; the National Museum of Photography, Film and Television; University of Brighton, 2004), 101; also, Johnston, *Forms of Constraint* 90.
- ²² Pratt, *Punishment in a Perfect Society*, 242; New Zealand Bluebook (1844), 214. IA 12-06, Archives New Zealand, Wellington, <http://www.archives.govt.nz/exhibitions/permanentexhibitions/bluebooks/view.php>
- ²³ "Wellington Gaol. To Contractors [Tender]" *New Zealand Gazette and Wellington Spectator* (8 February 1843): 1. Methven, *The Terrace Gaol*, 20; Geoff Mew, and Adrian Humphris *Raupo to Deco: Wellington Styles and Architects 1840-1940* (Wellington: Steele Roberts Aotearoa, 2014), 39.
- ²⁴ Mew and Humphris, *Raupo to Deco*, 39.
- ²⁵ Pratt, *Punishment in a Perfect Society*, 84.
- ²⁶ T.H. Fitzgerald, [Plan for a gaol at Wellington] (undated). Reference: AAFV 997 Box 50 Record Numbers: G118A, G118B, G118C, G118D, Archives New Zealand, Wellington
- ²⁷ 'Barracks' *New Zealand Gazette and Wellington Spectator* (10 February 1844): 2.
- ²⁸ New Zealand Bluebook (1843), 232; also New Zealand Bluebook (1844), 214.
- ²⁹ Fitzgerald, [Plan for a gaol at Wellington] Record Number: G118B.
- ³⁰ Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 359.
- ³¹ New Zealand Bluebook (1844), 214.
- ³² New Zealand Bluebook (1844), 214.
- ³³ New Zealand Bluebook (1844), 217.
- ³⁴ 'New Zealand Spectator, and Cook's Strait Guardian' *New Zealand Spectator and Cook's Strait Guardian* (18 October 1848), 2.
- ³⁵ "The Lyttelton Times: Wednesday, May 13th", *Lyttelton Times* (13 May 1857): 6.

-
- ³⁶ G. Grey, "Victoria, by the grace of God [notice announcing Commission]" *New Zealand Gazette* 67 (16 December 1867): 481.
- ³⁷ "The New Zealand Herald: Auckland, Friday, January 3, 1868", *New Zealand Herald* (3 January 1868): 2.
- ³⁸ "The Oamaru Times and Waitaki Reporter: Tuesday, March 24, 1868", *North Otago Times* (24 March 1868): 2. "General Summary for the Panama Mail", *North Otago Times* (1 May 1868): 3.
- ³⁹ e.g. 'The Otago Daily Times: Tuesday, May 14, 1872', *Otago Daily Times* (14 May 1872), 2.
- ⁴⁰ e.g. *The New Zealand Herald*, Auckland, Friday, January 3, 1868', 2.
- ⁴¹ e.g. 'The Otago Daily Times: Tuesday, May 14, 1872' p. 2.
- ⁴² 'The New Zealand Herald: Spectemur Agendo: Monday, June 26, 1871' *New Zealand Herald* (26 June 1871): 2.
- ⁴³ Royal Commission on Prisons 'A-12: Reports of the Royal Commission on Prisons' *Appendices to the Journal of the House of Representatives [New Zealand]* (Wellington, 1 January 1868): 1, 3. There does not appear to be a report written by Jebb in 1850. He did however author: *Report of the Surveyor-General of Prisons on the construction, ventilation and details of Pentonville Prison* (1844), and *Second Report of the Surveyor-General of Prisons* (1847).
- ⁴⁴ 'Central Prison' *Auckland Star* (12 January 1876): 2; 'Southern Telegrams: New Plymouth, Tuesday' *Thames Advertiser* (19 January 1876): 3.
- ⁴⁵ 'The Taranaki Herald ... Saturday, January 22, 1876' *Taranaki Herald* (22 January 1876): 2.
- ⁴⁶ 'Local and General News' *Colonist* (27 January 1876)" 3; 'The Taranaki Herald ... Saturday, February 12, 1876' *Taranaki Herald* (12 February 1876): 2. A later article stated that the site was 40-50 acres. 'The Central Prison Establishment' *Taranaki Herald* (29 April 1876): 2; 'The Grey River Argus ... Monday, January 31, 1876' *Grey River Argus* (31 January 1876), 2; 'The Southland Times ... Tuesday, February 8, 1876' *Southland Times* (8 February 1876), 2; 'Post-Sessional Speeches: Mr. T. Kelly's Address to the Town Electors: Harbour and Prison' *Taranaki Herald* (6 December 1876), 2.
- ⁴⁷ W.H. Clayton, Colonial Architect 'Appendix E. Annual Report on Public Buildings and other works by the Colonial Architect' (7 July 1876) E-1. Public Works Statement by the Minister for Public Works, the Hon. Edward Richardson (Tuesday 25 July 1876) *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives [New Zealand]* (1876), 70.
- ⁴⁸ The reports were: 'The Central Prison Establishment' p. 2 and 'The Central Gaol' *Taranaki Herald* (24 June 1876), 2.
- ⁴⁹ This was specified as Gospel Oak 24 gauge corrugated galvanised iron for exterior walls; internal partitions to be clad in 18 gauges. This would be 'riveted at the outer edge to 1 1/2-inch angle iron, and the sheets are to be riveted to one another.' 'The Central Gaol', 2; Nigel Isaacs, 'Making the New Zealand house 1792-1982' (Wellington: Victoria University PhD thesis, 2015), 34.
- ⁵⁰ Isaacs 'Making the New Zealand house', 48.
- ⁵¹ Robin Skinner, 'Understanding the risk: seismicity and architectural development in nineteenth-century New Zealand' *Fabrications* 19, 1 (2009), 123, 130.
- ⁵² 'The Central Prison Establishment', 2.
- ⁵³ Pentonville cells did however use metal-clad timber doors. Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 357.
- ⁵⁴ Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 335.
- ⁵⁵ Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 336.
- ⁵⁶ Evans, *The Fabrication of Virtue*, 337.
- ⁵⁷ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the prison* trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1995; first published 1975), 200.
- ⁵⁸ 'The Central Prison Establishment', 2.
- ⁵⁹ Thomas le Breton *Thoughts on the defective state of prisons* (London, 1822), pp. 7-8.
- ⁶⁰ 'Tenders are invited [Central Prison at New Plymouth]' *Evening Post* (30 May 1876), 3. The submission date was extended from 12 July to 26 July on 1 July. 'Evening Star: Friday, September 15, 1876' *Evening Star* (15 September 1876), 2.
- ⁶¹ 'Evening Post: Friday, July 28, 1876' *Evening Post* (28 July 1876), 2; 'Parliamentary: Building of the Prison Postponed for Twelve Months' *Taranaki Herald* (26 August 1876), 2; 'Evening Star: Friday, September 15, 1876', 2.
- ⁶² '[Untitled] The establishment of central prisons' *Taranaki Herald* (6 September 1876), 2.
- ⁶³ 'The Taranaki Herald ... Saturday, August 19, 1876' *Taranaki Herald* (16 August 1876), 2.
- ⁶⁴ 'Parliamentary: Building of the Prison Postponed for Twelve Months,' 2.

