

THE
OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects



SEPTEMBER

1930

Volume 2

Number 9

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

THE OCTAGON, WASHINGTON, D. C.

OFFICERS

President.....ROBERT D. KOHN, 56 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.
First Vice-President.....ERNEST J. RUSSELL, Chemical Building, St. Louis, Mo.
Second Vice-President.....HORACE W. PEASLEE, 1228 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
Secretary.....FRANK C. BALDWIN, The Octagon, Washington, D. C.
Treasurer.....EDWIN BERGSTROM, Citizens National Bank Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

For One Year (1930-31)
 CHARLES D. MAGINNIS.....Stetler Bldg., Boston, Mass. (New England Div.)
 CHARLES BUTLER.....56 W. 45th St., New York, N. Y. (New York Div.)
 LOUIS LAUBAUME...730 Compton Bldg., St. Louis, Mo. (Central States Div.)

For Two Years (1930-32)
 FREDERICK W. GARDNER...616 Walnut St., Cincinnati, Ohio (Great Lakes Div.)
 CHARLES T. INGHAM...1211 Empire Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa. (Middle Atl. Div.)
 FRED F. WILSON.....P. O. Box 497, Roseman, Mont. (West Mount. Div.)

For Three Years (1930-33)
 FRANKLIN O. ADAMS...509 Twigg Street, Tampa, Fla. (South Atlantic Div.)
 M. H. FURBRINGER...110 Porter Bldg., Memphis, Tenn. (Gulf States Div.)
 FRED. H. MYERS...525 Market St., San Francisco, Calif. (Sierra Nevada Div.)

LIST OF CHAPTERS, 1930

ALABAMA—*Harry B. Wheelock, Steiner Bank Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.; †James W. Green, 718 Education Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.
 ALBANY—*Norman R. Sturgis, 91 State St., Albany, N. Y.; †Harvey W. Jackson, 32 Clermont St., Albany, N. Y.
 ARKANSAS—*George H. Wittenberg, Home Insurance Bldg., Little Rock, Ark.; †Lawson L. Delony, 2407 Louisiana St., Little Rock, Ark.
 BALTIMORE—*G. Corner Fenhagen, 325 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Md.; †Charles D. Loomis, 347 North Charles St., Baltimore, Md.
 BOSTON—*Wm. Stanley Parker, 120 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.; †Edward E. Prichard, One Beacon St., Boston, Mass.
 BROOKLYN—*Chas. C. Wagner, 32 Court St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; †George Francis Kiss, 130 E. 15th St., New York, N. Y.
 BUFFALO—*Karl G. Schmill, 1342 Prudential Bldg., Buffalo, N. Y.; †Benning C. Buell, 547 Franklin St., Buffalo, N. Y.
 CENTRAL ILLINOIS—*Joseph W. Royer, Flat Iron Bldg., Urbana, Ill.; †Philip R. Hooton, Peoples Bank Bldg., Bloomington, Ill.
 CENTRAL NEW YORK—*Melvin L. King, 300 Denison Bldg., Syracuse, N. Y.; †Merton E. Granger, 474 So. Salina St., Syracuse, N. Y.
 CHICAGO—*Howard L. Cheney, 80 East Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Ill.; †Carl E. Heimbrodt, 20 No. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 CINCINNATI—*Ernest Pickering, 1 Interwood Place, Cincinnati, Ohio; †Russell Potter, 1305 The American Bldg., Cincinnati, Ohio.
 CLEVELAND—*Philip L. Small, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; †James H. Duthie, Union Trust Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio.
 COLORADO—*G. Meredith Musick, Republic Building, Denver, Colo.; †W. Gordon Jamieson, 518 12th Street, Denver, Colo.
 COLUMBUS—*Daniel A. Carmichael, 5 E. Long St., Columbus, Ohio; †W. A. Paine, 584 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
 CONNECTICUT—*George Herbert Gray, 42 Church St., New Haven, Conn.; †Alfred W. Boylen, 19 Whitney Avenue, New Haven, Conn.
 DAYTON—*Edwin F. Simpson, 869 Reibold Bldg., Dayton, Ohio. †Elliason R. Smith, 1006 Commercial Bldg., Dayton, Ohio.
 DETROIT—*Henry F. Stanton, 2231 Park Avenue, Detroit, Mich.; †Bronson V. Gamber, 3500 Union Trust Bldg., Detroit, Mich.
 EASTERN OHIO—*Barton E. Brooks, 321 Dollar Bank Bldg., Youngstown, Ohio.; †Walter J. Canfield, 1301 City Bank Bldg., Youngstown, Ohio.
 FLORIDA CENTRAL—*John W. Vickary, 3119 Jerome St., N., St. Petersburg, Fla.; †C. Sedgwick Mason, 509 J. Bruce Smith Bldg., St. Petersburg, Fla.
 FLORIDA NORTH—*Rudolph Weaver, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.; †W. Kenyon Drake, 21 Ocean Street, Jacksonville, Fla.
 FLORIDA SOUTH—*Richard Kiehn, 630 Seybold Bldg., Miami, Fla. †E. L. Robertson, Calumet Bldg., Miami, Fla.
 GEORGIA—*Ernest D. Ivey, 1429 Candler Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.; †Richard W. Alger, 1310 Candler Building, Atlanta, Ga.
 GRAND RAPIDS—*Harry L. Mead, 902 Michigan Trust Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.; †Roger Allen, 463 Houseman Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.
 HAWAII—*Marshall H. Webb, Box 587, Honolulu, T.H.; †Herbert Cayton, 324 S. M. Damon Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.
 INDIANA—*Arthur H. Sohn, 315 East 22nd St., Indianapolis, Ind.; †Warren D. Miller, 619 Ohio Street, Terre Haute, Ind.
 IOWA—*Anna B. Emery, Observatory Tower, Des Moines, Iowa; †Vernon F. Tinsley, Hubbard Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa.
 KANSAS CITY—*Edward W. Tanner, 6400 Ward Parkway, Kansas City, Mo.; †E. H. Dunham, 300 West 47th Street, Kansas City, Mo.
 KANSAS—*Charles W. Shaver, 147½ South Santa Fe Street, Salina, Kansas; †George M. Beal, 305 Marvin Hall, Lawrence, Kans.
 KENTUCKY—*W. Edwin Glossop, 490 Bloom St., Louisville, Ky.; †W. S. Arrasmith, 1201 Heyburn Building, Louisville, Ky.
 LOUISIANA—Richard Koch, 604 Audubon Bldg., New Orleans, La.; †Mar-timer Favrot, 1205 Hibernia Bank Bldg., New Orleans, La.
 MADISON—*Frank Riley, 34 E. Midlin Street, Madison, Wis. †James R. Law, First Central Building, Madison, Wis.
 MINNESOTA—*Wilbur H. Tualer, 104 S. 9th St., Minneapolis, Minn.; †Guy N. Crawford, 617 Essex Bldg., Minneapolis, Minn.
 MISSISSIPPI—*N. W. Overstreet, 1231-25 Standard Life Bldg., Jackson, Miss.; †Vinson B. Smith, Jr., Gulfport, Miss.
 MONTANA—*Chandler C. Cobagen, Box 1306, Billings, Mont.; †W. R. Plew, Bossman, Mont.
 NEBRASKA—*W. L. Younk, Capitol Commission, Lincoln, Nebr.; †Neil S. Wallace, 2561 Whitmore Ave., Omaha, Nebr.
 NEW JERSEY—*Cornelius V. R. Bogert, 210 Main St., Hackensack, N. J.; †Clement W. Fairweather, Metuchen, N. J.
 NEW YORK—*Wm. Adams Dehano, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; †Julian Clarence Levi, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 NORTH CAROLINA—*James B. Lynch, Southern Bldg., Wilmington, N. C.; †W. W. Dodge, Jr., 20 Woodlink Rd., Asheville, N. C.
 NORTH TEXAS—*Lester N. Flint, 606 Malba Bldg., Dallas, Texas; †Arthur E. Thomas, 712 Construction Bldg., Dallas, Texas.
 NORTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Frederick H. Meyer, 525 Market St., San Francisco, Cal.; †James H. Mitchell, 277 Pine St., San Francisco, Cal.
 NORTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA—*C. Paxton Cody, 116 Tins Square, Erie, Pa.; †J. Howard Hicks, Erie, Pa.
 OKLAHOMA—*Leonard H. Bailey, 1217 Coloord Bldg., Oklahoma City, Okla. †A. Thomson Thorne, 332 Exchange Bank Bldg., Tulsa, Okla.
 OREGON—*Folger Johnson, 422 U. S. Bank Bldg., Portland, Ore. †Fred Aandahl, Lewis Bldg., Portland, Ore.
 PHILADELPHIA—*John S. Schwack, 1805 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; †Horace W. Caster, Stephen Girard Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.
 PITTSBURGH—*Frederick Bigger, Westinghouse Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.; †Robert C. Bowers, 407 N. Craig St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 RHODE ISLAND—*Russell H. Shaw, 2900 Industrial Tr. Bldg., Providence, R. I.; †Albert Harkness, 1428 Industrial Trust Bldg., Providence, R. I.
 SAN DIEGO—*John S. Siebert, 332 Granger Bldg., San Diego, Cal.; †Louis G. Hill, 32 Seton Bldg., San Diego, Cal.
 SANTA BARBARA—*Russell Roy, San Marcos Building, Santa Barbara, Cal.; †E. Keith Lockard, 114 East de la Guerra Street, Santa Barbara, Cal.
 SCRANTON-WILKES-BARRE—*Thos. A. Foster, 909 Brooks Bldg., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; †Lewis Hancock, 1010 Mears Bldg., Scranton, Pa.
 SHREVEPORT—*Clarence W. King, Shreveport, La.; †Edward F. Nald, Shreveport, La.
 SOUTH CAROLINA—Albert Simons, 42 Broad St., Charleston, S. C.; †Lea LeGrand, Greenville, S. C.
 SOUTH GEORGIA—*Walter P. Marshall, 1001 Savannah Bank & Trust Bldg., Savannah, Ga.; †Percy Bugden, 125 East 49th Street, Savannah, Ga.
 SOUTH TEXAS—*John W. Dehnert, Esperson Bldg., Houston, Texas; †Addison S. Nunn, 212 Scanlan Bldg., Houston, Texas.
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Harold C. Chambers, 1107 Hibernian Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.; †H. Roy Kelly, 1102 Architects' Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.
 SOUTHERN PENNSYLVANIA—*Henry Y. Shaub, 20¼ North Queen St., Lancaster, Pa.; †Harry E. Yoessler, 38 Schmidt Bldg., York, Pa.
 ST. LOUIS—*Wilbur T. Trueblood, Chemical Bldg., St. Louis, Mo.; †F. John Hoemer, 3635 LaClede Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
 ST. PAUL—*Beaver Wade Day, 1212 Builders Exchange, St. Paul, Minn.; †Thomas F. Ellerbe, 692 Endicott Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.
 TENNESSEE—*A. B. Baumann, Jr., 813¼ Market Street, Knoxville, Tenn.; †W. A. Rutherford, Jr., Sequoyah Hills, Knoxville, Tenn.
 TOLEDO—*Harry W. Wachter, 1220 Madison Ave., Toledo, Ohio; †Louis U. Bruyere, Department of Architecture, Board of Education, Toledo, Ohio.
 UTAH—*Raymond J. Ashton, Vermont Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah; †Lorenzo Young, 1458 Princeton Ave., Salt Lake City, Utah.
 VIRGINIA—*Marcellus E. Wright, American National Bank Bldg., Richmond, Va.; †S. J. Collins, 230 Institute St., Staunton, V.
 WASHINGTON, D. C.—*Gilbert L. Rodier, 16 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.; †Fred E. Robbins, 16 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.
 WASHINGTON STATE—*Roland E. Borhek, 913 Washington Bldg., Tacoma; †Lance E. Gowen, 307 Lumber Exchange Bldg., Seattle, Wash.
 WEST TEXAS—*Emmett T. Jackson, Builders' Exchange Bldg., San Antonio, Texas; †Robert M. Ayres, Smith-Young Tower, San Antonio, Texas.
 WEST VIRGINIA—*Carl Reger, Morgantown, W. Va.; †Carleton C. Wood, 266 Washington Ave., Clarkburg, W. Va.
 WISCONSIN—*Henry C. Hengle, 445 Milwaukee St., Milwaukee, Wis.; †Alexander C. Gutb, 683 Franklin Place, Milwaukee, Wis.

* Presidents. † Secretaries.

THE OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects

Published Monthly by

The American Institute of Architects

Executive and Publication Offices, The Octagon, 1741 New York Avenue N. W., Washington, D. C.

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS THE COPY. \$1 PER YEAR. (FOREIGN \$2)

Checks or Money Orders should be made payable to The American Institute of Architects. All communications for publication should be sent to The Secretary, The A. I. A.

Copyright, 1929, by The American Institute of Architects

Entered as second-class matter, February 9, 1929, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C.

School Buildings and State Bureaus

By WILLIAM J. SAYWARD, F.A.I.A.

Editor's Note: Several weeks ago the Secretary of the Institute received a letter from the chairman of a special committee of a chapter of the Institute which stated that the Board of Education of his state has developed the practice "of maintaining an architectural office of its own and furnishing working drawings and specifications for school buildings. That office, which probably was first intended to furnish plans and specifications for the smaller type of school buildings in the outlying districts, has long since come to doing buildings of such size and cost as to cause complaint on the part of many architects." The chairman wanted to know how this situation had been met in other states. There was not sufficient data on hand at The Octagon for a reply. The letter was therefore submitted to six members of the Institute, in representative sections of the country, who have had large school building experience. They in turn addressed letters giving information and suggestions to the chapter committee concerned. Copies of those replies were reviewed by William J. Sayward, at the request of President Kohn, in the thought that the growing custom of state agencies designing public (state) work no matter how great its volume or importance is one which should have the attention of the architectural profession.

Mr. Sayward's article follows:

CORRESPONDENCE recently received at The Octagon reveals the fact that, in a few states at least, architectural service for schools has been taken over either wholly or in part by a Department of the State Board of Education—to the detriment not only of the architect but more particularly of good architecture.

In order to determine how far-reaching this tendency was letters of inquiry were addressed to Institute members in widely scattered localities throughout the country. The replies received had a tendency to relieve the apprehension as to any general practice of this sort, but at the same time methods were so varying and in some cases so unsatisfactory that the writer, at the suggestion of President Kohn, has undertaken to summarize the replies with a view to offering some suggestions, at least, to those communities most afflicted with standardized school buildings.

There seems to be a very general practice of furnishing stock plans without further service to rural communities for the small type of school building of not more than two, three, or four rooms. This service is no doubt well justified, and from the standpoint of the architectural profession there

are probably very few architects who could afford to take on this class of work.

As soon, however, as the school arrives at the six-room size or greater, it comes to a point where special architectural service becomes of value to the community, and where the failure to provide it is worth the serious attention of the architectural profession.

It is significant that the greatest difficulties lie with those communities which have only the occasional building. Communities which have a more or less continuous school building program have long since become conscious of the need of real professional service.

Of course, the soundest argument against the state bureau is that in the vast majority of cases it lapses into ruts of design and practice with a resulting sameness of expression which is contrary to the spirit of the problem itself as well as to that of good architecture.

Probably the most illuminating example of departmental control of architecture is that of the Federal Government, under the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury. While this de-

partment turns out a consistently uniform product, probably above the average from the standpoint of design and construction, it is notably true that it furnishes very little inspiration to the communities which have Federal buildings. Methods of design and practice, except in buildings of large size and character, have become so standardized as to be at a dead level in architectural achievement, and incidentally there is little or no saving in cost of production. If this be true of the Federal Government, how much more must it be true of the "architectural bureau" of the lesser community?

Admitting the inadequacy of the "architectural bureau" system, what has the country evolved that is any better?

If good is to be had from a study of this situation, the problem must obviously be approached from the standpoint of *return* to the community rather than that of mere business to the architect. On that basis, if a good case has been proved, its acceptance by the community should be reasonable.

A very interesting example of state practice is reported by John J. Donovan of Oakland, California. There has been created within the California State Board of Education a Division of Schoolhouse Planning.

The director of this division gives his attention to the work of making surveys of school needs in districts which require them. A charge is made to the school district for the labor expended by draftsmen and others to complete the survey. Sometimes this involves the preparation of a preliminary sketch to determine the requirements for the district, but this is as far as the department goes. It is then incumbent upon the Board of Education of the district to employ an architect at the recognized standard fee of six per cent of the cost of the work. The architect, after preparing his preliminary sketches from the data given him by the Board, forwards them to the Division of Schoolhouse Planning above mentioned for approval, modification and suggestion. The Division has complete control over the situation, for the school district cannot build unless the drawings have its approval. Slight departures may be made from the plans during the work, but nothing capital in nature. The jurisdiction of the Department extends throughout the State of California except within incorporated cities. Within them it has no jurisdiction and the matter is left entirely with the board of education and school officials of the school districts of the incorporated cities.

It is to be seen, therefore, that this Department's duties are largely in making surveys, collecting data and preparing instruction drawings for the several departments and departmental rooms of the school problem which extend from the rural school up to and including the senior high school and sometimes the junior college. The checking of the plans,

that is, the checking of the arrangement of rooms, relation of departments and the adequacy of the equipment is a sizable job in itself. The director of this department undertakes to make the local boards of education feel that it is obligatory on their part, for the safeguarding of their work and funds and the safety of the occupants, that in each case they employ a clerk-of-the-works, or inspector, recommended by the architect and paid for by the board. This, of course, does not relieve the architect of the responsibility of superintendence, since it is expected and generally follows that the architect or his office representative visits the job frequently and otherwise assumes his customary functions. It is felt that this system has meant a great deal to the State of California in the way of really good architecture and honest construction; certainly far more in value than the entire cost of the architect's fees and superintendence as well.

From R. Clipston Sturgis, of Boston, comes the report of an interesting development from the standpoint of the large city.

For twenty-odd years previous to 1900, Boston had an official "City Architect" whose architectural product varied with the individual as to excellence, but on the whole was disappointing in quality. This seems to have been due in large measure to the vast amount of work required of the office, which obviously was too great to receive the personal attention of one man. Consequently, in 1900, by act of the legislature of Massachusetts, the authority to plan and construct school buildings was taken from the school committee, an unpaid elected board, and put into the hands of a Schoolhouse Commission composed of three paid commissioners, who gave part time to the work. The first commission was entirely non-professional, but the mistake of this policy was so obvious that within a year after the commission had been established, an architect was appointed to the commission and made its chairman. During his incumbency he established a force which contained an architect, a civil engineer, a heating engineer, an electrical engineer and a plumbing engineer, each of whom was at the head of his own particular division. Notwithstanding the fact that they thus had an efficient organization, they never attempted to handle any architectural work of importance with this force, keeping the force employed on alterations, additions, and repairs, but having it also available for critical review and assistance in connection with plans submitted to the board by the architects employed by them. The board selected its architects from those resident in the city of Boston, and required every architect to give proof of having been in independent practice for at least five years, and of his ability—as shown by his executed work, by working drawings and specifications, and by references both to owners and to buildings. Under this

system a very large proportion of the competent architects in Boston have been employed, and there has been a constant endeavor on their part to supplement the work of the schoolhouse commission and to help raise the standard of plans and to establish standards of construction, material, finish and workmanship. There is no question but that an organization of this sort gives the most efficient results. The head office, in this case the schoolhouse commission, profits by the experience and practice of each architect employed, just as each architect profits by the experience of those architects who

have preceded him. The head office has gradually accumulated master drawings of all the standard equipment required in the various types of rooms and this has been put at the disposition of every architect who has worked for the board.

It seems to the writer that the two instances cited offer much in the way of suggestion. Further comment upon the fundamental principles involved in this discussion are much desired by the Institute. Members are invited to send them to the Secretary at The Octagon.

The Demand for School Buildings

Hubert C. Eicher, Director of School Buildings of the Department of Education of the State of Pennsylvania, estimates that at the present time three billion dollars is needed for new school buildings, and two hundred and fifty-one thousand additional classrooms are required in the United States to meet the enrollment. In commenting on this future problem Mr. Eicher says:

"The evolution in our educational system is bringing about a marked change in the type and design of school buildings, and I predict that the next decade will see us face to face with school building problems which today are not even considered as a possibility. There was a time when a so-called school building consisted of a certain number of classrooms of equal size. Well do we recall the day when an auditorium, gymnasium, shops, and various special rooms were not a part of the school plant, while today a high school building wherein at least some of these special features have not been incorporated could not be called a school building. The school organization would not be recognized as such if certain of these special rooms were not provided.

"The result is that as the school system of America has developed and the various educational depart-

ments have contributed new phases and activities to the educational program the problem of schoolhousing has become more complex. The growing use of the school building by the community presents new problems in the arrangement of rooms, corridors and entrances. The consolidated school and the vocational and junior high schools present problems which are distinct because of the varied nature of the work of each and the necessity for the proper segregation of the different departments.

"School building programs, scientifically conducted, have therefore become important features of the whole school building program. The public now insists upon knowing (1) what kind of a school organization is to be housed in the new building; (2) whether the proposed accommodations guarantee a just return to pupils for the time spent in school and to the community for the money expended; (3) trends, shifts, and increase or decrease in total and pupil population over a period of years; (4) what will it cost? These factors can be determined only after a thorough and scientific study of the school plant has been made and a careful estimate presented covering both present and future needs."

Small House Architectural Competition

Under the Auspices of BETTER HOMES IN AMERICA

Gold medals to be awarded to architects of the best small houses erected in 1929

TO HELP in overcoming the faulty design and inefficient planning which are still so prevalent in small homes erected in our towns and suburbs, Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, as President of Better Homes in America, announces that three gold medals will be given each year by that organization to the architects who have designed the best small houses which have been erected anywhere in the country during the preceding year. These medals, which are the gift of Mrs. William Brown

Meloney, who with the cooperation of President Hoover founded Better Homes in America in 1922 and still serves as its Vice-President, will be awarded annually by a committee of five architects appointed by the President of The American Institute of Architects.

This program will be supplementary to the regular year-round activities of Better Homes in America, an educational organization supported by public and private gifts, which annually organizes local

volunteer committees in thousands of American communities, both urban and rural, to conduct educational programs for home improvement. Over seven thousand communities had such programs last spring during the National Better Homes Week, the last week of April. Prizes will continue to be awarded as in earlier years to the communities arranging the best programs of demonstrations of new and reconditioned houses, contests, exhibits and lecture programs.

It is hoped that the additional award of medals to architects will serve to arouse more general interest on the part of the architectural profession in the practical and urgent problems of improving the prevailing architectural design and planning of homes of families of moderate incomes. The medals are therefore limited to houses of one story, a story and a half, or two stories in height and with a cubage of not more than twenty-four thousand cubic feet above the level of the first floor. This practically limits the competition to houses of from four to six rooms but leaves complete latitude in the design and planning of such houses.

For these 1930 awards the floor plans, blue prints, elevations, interior details and photographs of houses competing may be submitted for any houses actually completed during the year 1929. These materials must be shipped to Better Homes in America, in care of The American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue Northwest, Washington, D. C., so that they will be received *not later than December 1, 1930*, in order that the awards can be made and announced early in January.

Better Homes in America will publish illustrations of the designs awarded medals and such other designs submitted as may seem desirable, so that the public may have opportunity to study the best designs of each of the above types which have been submitted. This project will be welcomed by the architectural profession because of the opportunity which it offers for cooperation with those civic interests that are working year by year for the improvement of the American home. Increasingly the business and pro-

fessional groups of America are contributing disinterestedly to the public welfare of their professional experience. While rapid strides have been made in monumental architecture, in public buildings, office buildings and expensive private residences, small houses have lagged behind in the quality of their design and construction. Much excellent work has been done by the Architects' Small House Service Bureau, which is endorsed by The American Institute of Architects, and by newspapers and magazines, to call public attention to better designs for small homes. The award of these annual medals should supply still a new incentive to interest the architectural profession in the subject, will serve to develop public appreciation of architectural design and by calling attention to the best small house architecture each year should help to overcome bit by bit, the monotony and drabness of the residential streets of our cities, towns and villages by the construction of houses individual in design and embodying high architectural standards.

The Secretary of the Interior, Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, in his capacity as President of Better Homes in America has stated the purpose of this new project in the following terms:

"Although this movement deals with the home in all of its aspects we wish so far as possible to emphasize good architectural design and sound construction in small homes and arouse public appreciation of good architecture. We also wish to interest architects as widely as possible in the design of small homes, so that the hideous structures so common in our cities, suburbs and countryside may be replaced by dwellings that are worthy of an enterprising and relatively prosperous citizenry."

Any questions relating to the competition may be sent to Better Homes in America, 1653 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C.

A memorandum of conditions governing the competition follows.

JAMES FORD,
Executive Director,
Better Homes in America.

Better Homes Medals

MEMORANDUM OF SPECIFIC CONDITIONS TO GOVERN THE ENTRIES

(1) The awards are to be made to practicing architects for the best design submitted in each of three types of house—three medals in all.

- (a) One story house.
Storage space but no living accommodations may occur in roof space.
- (b) Story and a half house.
Living accommodations partly in a sec-

ond story which is actually a "half story."

(c) Two story house.

(2) *Size of house.* The awards are aimed to stimulate interest in the really small house. To this end the actual cube of the house, above the level of the first floor, shall not be greater

than 24,000 cu. ft. Open porches estimated at $\frac{1}{2}$ cube.

- (3) *Documents to be submitted.* Floor plans, blueprints or otherwise, showing first floor, and second floor if it has living accommodations. Two elevations. Interior details. One or two photographs of exterior, preferably two. Two photographs (but not more than two) of interior may be submitted if desired, but the award is to be based upon the design of the structure, not on its furnishings, and interior photographs if submitted should be selected with this in mind.
- (4) *Date of construction.* This award is intended as an annual award. Houses entered for the 1930 award shall be houses the construction of which was finally completed during 1929. Designs of houses which have been submitted in any given year cannot be resubmitted to the committee in later years.
- (5) *Shipment of exhibits.* Exhibits shall be shipped addressed to Better Homes in America, care of The American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue, Washington, D. C., so as to be received not later than December 1, 1930. They will be handled as carefully as possible but must be sent at the risk of the sender. If any value is placed upon

them by the sender he should take such steps as he sees fit to insure against their loss.

Better Homes in America shall have right to publish illustrations of designs awarded medals, and such other designs submitted as may be deemed desirable.

Exhibits will be returned to exhibitors at the expense of Better Homes in America.

- (6) *Jury.* The awards will be made by a Jury of five architects appointed by the President of The American Institute of Architects. The awards will be made and announced about January 1, 1931, or as soon thereafter as practicable.

The Jury is not required to make any or all of the awards should there be no houses submitted which in its opinion deserve a medal. In addition to the medals, however, the Jury may also grant honorable mentions to designs which are deemed worthy.

Prize winning designs will be published and at the discretion of the committee designs winning honorable mentions will also be published. Any publication of the designs which are awarded medals or honorable mention will be copyrighted. In each case due prominence will be given to the name and address of the designer, and with the statement that the design is his private property.

Awards at Lake Forest

President Kohn appointed David Adler, A.I.A., and William J. Smith, A.I.A., to represent the Institute on the Jury to judge the work of the students of the Foundation for Architecture and Landscape Architecture, at Lake Forest, Illinois.

The report of the Jury has appeared in the public press and is summarized here for the information of the profession at large.

The members of the Jury were: David Adler and William J. Smith, architects, both of Chicago; Arthur Shureliff and Fletcher Steele, landscape architects, both of Boston; and A. A. Carpenter, who served as the lay member of the Jury.

Two European traveling fellowships established by bequest of the late Edward L. Ryerson and two American fellowships, the gift of Conde Nast of New York, were awarded. The Ryerson fellowships went to Clifford W. MacCoy, architect, Toledo, Ohio, of Ohio State University; and Donald B. Partridge, landscape architect, Marshalltown, Iowa, of the University of Illinois.

The Conde Nast fellowships were awarded to Marvin R. Dobberman, architect, Chicago, of Armour Institute; and J. Martin Frizzell, landscape architect, Muskegon, Michigan, of the University of Michigan. Honorable mention was given to Russell T. Smith, architect, Concord, Massachu-

sets, of Harvard University; and Lawrence F. Murray, landscape architect, Wauseon, Ohio, of Ohio State University.

Each fellowship carries a stipend of \$1,250 for the purpose of travel and study during the next ten or eleven months.

The foundation was organized five years ago for the purpose of offering students of unusual ability and promise in the fields of architecture and landscape architecture opportunities for intensive and special study of their respective arts, with particular reference to collaboration between them.

The sixteen students of the foundation are the honor men of the graduating class of their various schools—for the most part middle western universities—and they are selected by their own faculty and recommended to the foundation as a reward of merit. Their work is entirely collaborative, always an architect and a landscape architect working together. It consists of free-hand outdoor sketching, measured drawings of existing buildings and gardens and collaborative problems in design.

The Ryerson fellows of last year, Otis Winn, architect, and Carl Berg, landscape architect, have just returned from their European travels and were present at the closing exercises.

Honor Awards

In some of the Chapters, the large number of entries in the various classes of buildings under consideration for honor awards has resulted in strenuous programs for the juries charged with the making of the awards. One solution of this difficulty was offered by the Jury of Awards which functioned in the territory of the Southern California Chapter during the current year. It was:

In submitting our report as the Jury for the Honor Awards of the Chapter, we desire to express our appreciation of the high standard of excellence that has been attained in the architectural productions of this district during the past three years, and our conviction of the impossibility of doing full justice to the many admirable examples that have been brought to our attention within a period of three days, to which our deliberation and comparisons have necessarily been limited.

In general, we are impressed by an extraordinary unanimity of purpose shown in the great mass of buildings submitted, to work within the limits of a character

of expression and enrichment that has been well tried and found to be in harmony with the history, climate and habits of this locality. Although the time has been lacking to differentiate with exactness between the detailed merits of individual works, we hope and believe that the list of buildings that we have selected for awards may be of educational value in encouraging a civic consciousness of the fact that no work of architecture stands or falls by its own merit alone, but rather by its relation to what has preceded it and what is to follow it.

In many parts of the country, the lack of enthusiasm for honor awards seems to be based primarily upon the feeling that nominations for this kind of recognition should not emanate from the architects or owners themselves. In the future conduct of these honor awards, we suggest that some method be sought whereby the nomination and preliminary weeding out of the various works shall be entrusted to a committee of the Chapter to the end that through a more deliberate study of fewer works, the final jury may reach results of more permanent value to the public.

Billboards in New York State

New York has no law against disfigurement of the countryside by billboards. This is quite evident by the erection of a large billboard in the immediate vicinity of the new mid-Hudson bridge in the Poughkeepsie territory. The effect of the billboard is to spoil the setting of the bridge, which is one of great natural beauty. Colonel Frederick Stuart Greene, State Superintendent of Public Works, has ordered a lattice screen to be painted the same color as the bridge to be built immediately in front of the commercial advertisement. Also, he has been served with a court order to show cause why he should not be restrained from erecting the screen.

Colonel Greene has declared that in every practical instance, so far as the mid-Hudson bridge is concerned, he will erect screens on state property to block billboards that are erected on privately-

owned lands. In commenting on the principle at issue Colonel Greene is quoted as follows:

In two sessions of the legislature I have had bills introduced to eliminate certain outdoor advertising through the medium of a state tax. The bills were killed in committee. I was told at the time that I would get nowhere with such legislation as certain outdoor advertising companies contributed too heavily to political campaign funds.

Some of these fellows have so little sense of decency that they do not hesitate to block off all the scenery and have the motoring public pass through lanes of glaring billboards instead of the natural setting.

In any event this outspoken official merits the commendation, congratulations and good wishes of all public-spirited citizens. Would that there were more of such state officials with such a valuable combination of backbone and good taste.

Public Information

The Boston Plan.

To aid the public in meeting the problems of architecture, the Architects Information Bureau has been established at 16 Somerset Street, Boston.

The bureau is sponsored by the Boston Society of Architects, a chapter of The American Institute of Architects, with a membership of more than 200 in Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Vermont.

"The object of the bureau," according to an announcement by the society's committee on public information, of which S. Bruce Elwell, of Cambridge, is chairman, "is to act as a clearing house for all information relating to the practice of architecture, to interpret architecture to the public, and to encourage greater general interest in architectural works of special character. This work is to be done without obligation to the public of any sort."

At this office a secretary will be at the disposal of those who seek advice. All persons who intend to build or to carry out alterations and who wish to know about architectural service are invited to utilize the bureau.

Will Not Choose Architect. The bureau does not offer recommendations as to the choice of an architect. It is, however, prepared to describe in detail how one should choose an architect, exactly what an architect does, how he performs an indispensable function in all building operations, and the charges he usually makes, as well as all other aspects of architectural practice.

Asks Cooperation. The committee has sent to the architects of northern New England a communication asking their cooperation in carrying out the purposes of the bureau.

"This committee," the communication said, "feels that there is a decided need to strengthen the value

of architectural services in the eyes of the general public and to do so it is first necessary to unite the architects and their interests.

"Through this office in Boston it is hoped that more unity and cooperation among the architects can be secured and that this unity will make the distribution of information easier; help to remedy some of the present evils; and thus benefit the whole profession."

Georgia Reconsiders

In the August number of THE OCTAGON it was reported that the Georgia Chapter had under consideration a plan for group advertising, to be financed by assessments levied upon members of the chapter.

At the meeting of the chapter following the Institute convention there was extended discussion on the principle involved in paid group advertising.

The past Vice-President, William J. Sayward, stated the position of the Institute and the Board. After the discussion a resolution was adopted to the effect that the idea of paid advertising in newspapers or magazines should be dropped from further consideration by the chapter. It was the sense of the meeting, however, that other forms of public information should be investigated later.

Cooperation with State Registration Boards

The following resolution, adopted by the Southern California Chapter, concerning cooperation with the State Board of Examiners of California, is self-explanatory. Its spirit and purpose is commended to every chapter of the Institute whose territory lies within a state having a registration or license law:

Whereas, The State Board of Architectural Examiners has recently passed a ruling that all candidates for license to practice architecture in the State of California be required to take a written examination, and

Whereas, The Southern California Chapter, The American Institute of Architects, at its April meeting has unanimously voted its commendation of the action of the State Board, and

Whereas, The State Board of Architectural Examiners has requested the cooperation and help of the Southern California Chapter of The American Institute of Architects in the matter of setting up standards of requirements for examination for license to practice architecture in the State of California, and

Whereas, The Executive Committee of the Chapter is desirous of cooperating with the Board to the end that the standards of the profession be advanced, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the Southern California Chapter, The American Institute of Architects, be and is hereby directed, in accordance with the Constitution and By-Laws of this Chapter, to appoint a special committee to be known as

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE

for the purpose of cooperating and assisting the State Board as above set forth, and that he be further directed to appoint special sub-committees to work out the details of the requirements established by the Professional Standards Committee for submission to the Executive Committee of the Chapter and for the approval and use by the State Board of Architectural Examiners. The work of these committees to cover the entire field of the examination, including the following general divisions thereof:

- (a) *Design Committee*, to handle the general subject of architectural design, including
 - Architectural History,
 - Theory of Design,
 - Design Problems.
- (b) *Engineering Committee*, to handle the general subject of engineering, including
 - Structural Design,
 - Strength of Materials,
 - Mechanical Engineering.
- (c) *Practice Committee*, to handle the general subject of practice, including
 - Office Administration,
 - Specifications,
 - Working knowledge of the laws and ordinances affecting buildings,
 - Proper conception of the relation of Architect, Client and Contractor, and Architect to Architect,
 - Professional Conduct and Character.

City Planning

In Seattle.

The Seattle City Planning Commission has been replaced by a new body composed of appointees made by the mayor of the city without restriction, and various city officials serving ex-officio.

Charles H. Alden, F.A.I.A., editor of the monthly bulletin of the Washington State Chapter, reviews the difficulties which the outgoing commissioners encountered and sums up its accomplishments. In concluding his editorial, Mr. Alden writes as follows, and what he has to say can be applied to any number of other American cities as well as to Seattle. It is commended to those chapters not now active in the solution of the civic problems of their communities.

The Washington State Chapter, A.I.A., has continuously and consistently advocated the comprehensive plan to properly direct the growth of the city. There was never as great a need for such a plan than at present and efforts now made give promise of important future accomplishment. Abundant evidence is at hand that not only have the members of the Planning Commission now retiring from city planning service been made to realize the importance of such a plan, but its importance has been recognized through them in a very considerable measure by the organizations they represent and there is other public support for such an endeavor. City planning in Seattle is getting increased attention from the public press and the Mayor of Seattle gave considerable space in his recent annual message to constructive recommendations for the planning and zoning of the city.

The time is now opportune to 'break down,' as Mr. Hammond says, 'the resistance of the public.' If this resistance can be superseded by a general demand for a cessation of the waste and inefficiency occasioned by the lack of an up-to-date plan our elective public officials will in time be compelled to provide this economic provision in the interests of the public welfare. With an adequate comprehensive plan for future development the city zoning plan can then be brought up-to-date to conform, giving it more legal stability, and with a zoning

board of adjustment, as in other cities where zoning is successfully administered, we can have this sound legal means of protecting the city firmly established in the interests of the public health, safety and general welfare, the legal justification for zoning. With a comprehensive plan, traffic can be provided for, not in an isolated piecemeal manner, leaving it undecided what will occur outside these limits, but city wide and connecting at the city limits with regional traffic provisions provided by cooperation with our Regional Planning Commission already organized and desiring opportunity for service. Seattle will then be taking its place with other progressive cities in economically and efficiently correcting its planning defects and providing for its future growth.

In Washington, D. C.

The Congress of the United States set an example for the states of the Union, and their cities, when it passed the Shipstead Bill (S. 2400), the purpose of which is to regulate the height, design, and construction of private and semi-public buildings in the National Capital.

This legislation was sponsored and urged by The American Institute of Architects, through its committee on the National Capital, Horace W. Peaslee, Chairman.

At the last convention the Board expressed its appreciation of the service rendered by this committee, which has a representative in every chapter of the Institute. It also pointed out the many advantages which will result in the appearance of the city of Washington. For the information of chapter committees and others interested in this subject, the title of the legislation as signed by the President is as follows:

"An act to regulate the height, exterior design, and construction of private and semi-public buildings in certain areas of the National Capital. (Public—No. 231—71st Congress—S. 2400.)" Copies may be obtained from the Secretary of the Institute.

As of Interest

International Congress will meet in the United States.

The membership has been advised of the action of the last convention, in inviting the International Congress of Architects to meet in the United States in 1933.

In accord with the convention resolution President Kohn addressed an invitation to the Congress, which was delivered on September 13 by the delegate of the Institute—Frank C. Baldwin.

Apparently the invitation was an effective one in every respect for a cablegram has been received from Mr. Baldwin stating that the next Congress will meet in America.

Such a meeting, in conjunction with the Sixty-sixth Convention of the Institute, should prove of

very great interest. Information concerning any tentative plans for the meeting, and a report on the work of the Congress recently concluded in Budapest, will become available upon Mr. Baldwin's return.

Meetings of the Board of Directors.

The semi-annual meeting of the Board of Directors will take place in Detroit, Michigan, on November 12, 13, 14, and 15.

On the first day, November 12, the chairmen of the standing and special committees of the Institute will meet with the Board, in joint session, for the purpose of discussing committee work and unifying the program of the Institute for the coming year.

The meetings of the Board on November 13 and 14 will be devoted to the general affairs of the Institute, including the adoption of a three-year budget.

The fourth day, November 15, probably will be utilized for discussions with the officers and members of the Detroit Chapter, and for informal conferences.

Any member of the Institute has the full privilege of addressing the Officers or the Board on any matter. Any such communication should be sent to the Secretary of the Institute, at The Octagon, on or before November 8—as the agenda of the Board will be made up as of that date. Any suggestions, comments, or inquiries relating to the welfare of the Institute and its chapters, or to the progress of the architectural profession, or to any other matter of importance within the jurisdiction of the Board, will be carefully and fully considered. The action taken thereon will be transmitted to the interested member after the Board meeting.

Honorary Members—Acknowledgments of Election.

Two very gracious letters have been received by the Institute, in acknowledgment of election to Honorary, and to Honorary Corresponding Membership. One came from Andre Arfvidson, of Paris, and expresses his sentiment in the following paragraph:

I am deeply touched by the mark of esteem which my American friends have bestowed on me, and I wish to express to the members of The American Institute of Architects my thanks, and to assure them of my gratitude.

The other was a letter from John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who expresses his appreciation of the honor, and said:

I accept this honor most gratefully and with deep appreciation, although fully conscious of the fact that credit for the public services for which it was awarded is largely due to the members of your profession who have aided me in these enterprises.

The Annuary and the Proceedings.

By the time this number of THE OCTAGON reaches the membership all active members, associates, and juniors, will have received the Annuary for the year 1930-1931. It contains the complete roster of Institute membership, and the personnels of all of the standing and special committees. It also includes the various ethical documents, and the newly amended By-laws.

The Proceedings were mailed a few days later than the Annuary to all who requested copies. Members wishing extra copies for educational purposes, or for presentation to local libraries, may have them on request, as long as the surplus lasts.

A New Foreign Institute of Architects.

The architectural profession continues to meet the pressure of modern civilization with organization.

Greetings and best wishes for a long career of usefulness are extended to "The Institute of Southern Rhodesian Architects"—a body recently incorporated in Rhodesia, South Africa. In reporting the first meeting, "The African World" says:

A number of Bulawayo architects took advantage of the Rhodes and Founder's Day holidays to travel to Salisbury, where they met the local architects in a general meeting at the Grand Hotel, Salisbury, and elected the first Council of the Institute of Southern Rhodesian Architects, thus beginning a new page in the architectural history of Rhodesia. Never before have so many architects met together in Southern Rhodesia to discuss matters appertaining to their profession.

The new Council will shortly take over from the Inaugural Board appointed by the Government, and the Institute will then manage its affairs under the Architects Act and the regulations drawn up by the Inaugural Board. The Board is to be highly commended upon the results of their labours. Its regulations, which have now become law, have been described by competent authorities as being most comprehensive and efficient.

International Competition—For the Ukrainian State Theatre.

The Soviet Union Information Bureau has addressed a letter to the Institute, transmitting a copy of the prospectus for the International Competition for the Ukrainian State Theatre.

The prospectus, which is on file at The Octagon, is an extensive document, which states that drawings for the project, with all explanatory notes, should be mailed not later than December 25, 1930, to the Construction Committee, Town Council, Tevelyev Square, Khrakov, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The postal receipt should be sent under separate cover to the same address, and the date of the mailing of the drawings should be confirmed by cable.

As requested, this competition is called to the attention of the members of the Institute, who are advised that copies of the prospectus, and other information concerning procedure, may be obtained direct from the Soviet Union Information Bureau, at 1637 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C.

Modernism—and Late Hours.

There must be two schools of thought in the Wisconsin Chapter with regard to developments in contemporary architecture. The following is quoted from the minutes of the July meeting of that chapter:

It was a typical midsummer meeting, nothing special had been laid on the trestle board so someone started something about this so-called new non-explosive civilized architecture, with especial attention given to the contribution of the New York architects. It took like wild fire and soon it was a free for all. But it all ended happily though not entirely satisfactorily, at ten minutes to 2 o'clock.

A Traffic Control Plan.

The Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City announces the publication of "A Traffic Control Plan for Kansas City," by Dr. Miller McClintock, Director of the Albert Russel Erskine Bureau of Harvard University.

It is stated that the report is a most comprehensive one and of interest to all cities suffering from the effects of street congestion and traffic accidents.

It sets forth a plan whereby the standards developed by the National Conference on Street and Highway Safety may be applied to the average city. The book is 8½x11" in size, contains 272 pages, with 57 full-page illustrations and charts. The price is \$5.00. Orders should be sent to the Chamber of Commerce, Kansas City, Missouri, attention of the Civic Department.

Applications for Membership

September 30, 1930.

Notice to Members of the Institute:

The names of the following applicants may come before the Board of Directors or its Executive Committee for action on their admission to the Institute and, if elected, the applicants will be assigned to the Chapters indicated:

<i>Boston Chapter</i>	- - -	CLIFFORD ALLBRIGHT, JOHN BARNARD, ASA WHITE KENNEY BILLINGS, JR., THOMAS M. JAMES
<i>Brooklyn Chapter</i>	- - -	EDWARD F. SIBBERT
<i>Chicago Chapter</i>	- - -	HERBERT AMERY BRAND, J. EDWIN QUINN
<i>Colorado Chapter</i>	- - -	CHARLES FRANCIS PILLSBURY
<i>Detroit Chapter</i>	- - -	DOUGLAS D. LOREE
<i>Louisiana Chapter</i>	- - -	ANDREW M. LOCKETT, JR.
<i>Mississippi Chapter</i>	- - -	A. HAYS TOWN
<i>New Jersey Chapter</i>	- - -	GEORGE VICTOR HARVEY
<i>New York Chapter</i>	- - -	VAHAN HAGOPIAN, WILLIAM ROYSTER JOHNSON, THEODORE STARRETT
<i>Northern California Chapter</i>	- - -	EDWARD L. FRICK
<i>Pittsburgh Chapter</i>	- - -	CHARLES B. ALLISON, BRANDON SMITH
<i>Tennessee Chapter</i>	- - -	LELAND KING CARDWELL, SAMUEL H. COILE, HENRY CLINTON PARRENT, JR.
<i>West Texas Chapter</i>	- - -	JEREMIAH SCHMIDT

You are invited, as directed by the By-laws, to send privileged communications before October 30, 1930, on the eligibility of the candidates, for the information and guidance of the members of the Board of Directors in their final ballot. No applicant will be finally passed upon should any chapter request within the thirty-day period an extension of time for purpose of investigation.

CHARLES T. INGHAM,
Acting Secretary.

ped
way
book
full-
.00.
om-
the