

THE
OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects



JANUARY
1937

Volume 3

Number 1

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)		For Two Years (1930-32)	
CHARLES D. MAGINNES.....	Stator Bldg., Boston, Mass. (New England Div.)	FREDERICK W. GARDNER.....	616 Walnut St., Cincinnati, Ohio (Great Lakes Div.)
CHARLES BUTLER.....	56 W. 46th St., New York, N. Y. (New York Div.)	CHARLES T. INGRAM.....	1211 Empire Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa. (Middle Atl. Div.)
LOUIS LAUBAUM.....	720 Compton Bldg., St. Louis, Mo. (Central States Div.)	FRED F. WILLSON.....	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. FURRINGIER.....	110 Porter Bldg., Memphis, Tenn. (Gulf States Div.)		
FRED. H. MEYER.....	525 Market St., San Francisco, Calif. (Sierra Nevada Div.)		

LIST OF CHAPTERS, 1931

- ALABAMA—*Harry B. Wheelock, Steiner Bank Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.; †Jesse W. Green, 713 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—*Henry S. T. White, 527 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Md.; †Charles D. Loomis, 12 East Pleasant Street, Baltimore, Md.
- BOSTON—*Wm. Stanley Parker, 120 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.; †Edward H. Priehard, 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. Buel, 547 Franklin St., Buffalo, N. Y.
- CENTRAL ILLINOIS—*Philip R. Hooton, Peoples Bank Bldg., Bloomington, Ill.; †E. L. Stouffer, 206 Administration Bldg., University of Illinois, Urbana, 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, 818 12th Street, Denver, Colo.
- COLUMBUS—*W. C. Roman, 1694 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio; †Ralph Chas. Kempton, Atlas Building, 8 E. Long St., Columbus, Ohio.
- CONNECTICUT—*George Herbert Gray, 42 Church St., New Haven, Conn.; †Louis A. Walsh, Acting Secy., 51 Leavenworth St., Waterbury, Conn.
- DAYTON—*Edwin F. Simpson, 889 Reibold Bldg., Dayton, Ohio; †Elliason; R. Smith, 1005 Commercial Bldg., Dayton, Ohio.
- DETROIT—*Branson V. Gamber, 3500 Union Trust Bldg., Detroit, Mich.; †Arthur K. Hyde, 904 Marquette Bldg., Detroit, Mich.
- EASTERN OHIO—*Barton E. Brooke, 821 Dollar Bank Bldg., Youngstown, Ohio.; †Walter J. Caulfield, 1301 City Bank Bldg., Youngstown, Ohio.
- FLORIDA CENTRAL—*John W. Vickary, 515-11th Ave., N.E., St. Petersburg, Fla.; †C. Sedwick Moss, 609 J. Bruce Smith Bldg., St. Petersburg, Fla.
- FLORIDA NORTH—*Mellen C. Greeley, 32 West Forsyth St., Jacksonville, Fla.; †W. Kenyon Drake, 21 Ocean Street, Jacksonville, Fla.
- FLORIDA SOUTH—*Richard Kishnel, 930 Seybold Bldg., Miami, Fla.; †E. L. Robertson, Calumet Bldg., Miami, Fla.
- GEORGIA—*Francis P. Smith, Norris Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.; †Preston S. Stevens, 101 Marietta Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.
- GRAND RAPIDS—*Harry L. Mead, 902 Michigan Trust Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.; †Roger Allen, 468 Houseman Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.
- HAWAII—*Marshall H. Webb, Box 537, Honolulu, T.H.; †Herbert Cayton, 324 S. M. Damon Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.
- INDIANA—*Arthur Bohm, 215 East 32nd St., Indianapolis, Ind.; †Warren D. Miller, 619 Ohio Street, Terre Haute, Ind.
- IOWA—*Vernon F. Tinsley, Hubbell Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa; †Edwin H. Wetherell, 517 Shops Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa.
- KANSAS CITY—*Edward W. Tanner, 6400 Ward Parkway, Kansas City, Mo.; †H. E. Dunham, 300 West 47th Street, Kansas City, Mo.
- KANSAS—*Charles W. Shaver, 147 1/2 South Santa Fe Street, Salina, Kansas; †George M. Beal, 305 Marvin Hall, Lawrence, Kans.
- KENTUCKY—*Wm. G. O'Toole, 714 Louisville Trust Bldg., Louisville, Ky.; †G. M. Grimes, 1708 Hayburn Building, Louisville, Ky.
- LOUISIANA—Richard Koch, 604 Audubon Bldg., New Orleans, La.; †Mormner Favrot, 1205 Hibernia Bank Bldg., New Orleans, La.
- MADISON—*Frank Riley, 24 E. Mifflin Street, Madison, Wis.; †James R. Lew, First Central Building, Madison, Wis.
- MINNESOTA—*Wilbur H. Tuelor, 104 S. 9th St., Minneapolis, Minn.; †Guy N. Crawford, 517 Essex Bldg., Minneapolis, Minn.
- MISSISSIPPI—*Emmett J. Hull, Merchants Bank Bldg., Jackson, Miss.; †Frank P. Gates, Merchants Bank Bldg., Jackson, Miss.
- MONTANA—*Chandler C. Cohagan, Box 1308, Billings, Mont.; †W. R. Piew, Roseman, Mont.
- NEBRASKA—*W. L. Younkin, Capitol Commission, Lincoln, Nebr.; †Noel 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—*Stephen F. Voorhees, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; †Theodore I. Coe, 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—*Roscoe P. DeWitt, Kirby Building, Dallas, Texas; †M. C. Kleuser, Construction Bldg., Dallas, Texas.
- NORTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Henry H. Gutterson, 526 Powell St., San Francisco, Cal.; †James H. Mitchell, 369 Pine St., San Francisco, Cal.
- NORTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA—*Karl E. Morrison, Marine Bank Bldg., Erie, Pa.; †Walter T. Monahan, 808 Palace Hardware Bldg., Erie, Pa.
- OKLAHOMA—*Leonard H. Bailey, 1217 Colcord Bldg., Oklahoma City, Okla.; †A. Thomson Thorne, 332 Exchange Bank Bldg., Tulsa, Okla.
- OREGON—*Harold W. Doty, 697 East 46th Street, Portland, Oregon; †W. H. Crowell, 1041 Pacific Building, Portland, Oregon.
- PHILADELPHIA—*John S. Schwacke, Architects' Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; †Horace W. Castor, Architects' Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
- PITTSBURGH—*Frederick Briggs, 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 Barkness, 1423 Industrial Trust Bldg., Providence, R. I.
- SAN DIEGO—*John S. Sheber, 532 Granger Bldg., San Diego, Cal.; †Louis J. Gill, 32 Sefton Bldg., San Diego, Cal.
- SANTA BARBARA—*Russell Ray, 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. Nield, Shreveport, La.
- SOUTH CAROLINA—*Albert Simons, 42 Broad St., Charleston, S. C.; †Samuel Lapham, 42 Broad St., Charlotte, S. C.
- SOUTH GEORGIA—*Walter P. Marshall, 1001 Savannah Bank & Trust Bldg., Savannah, Ga.; †Percy Sugden, 125 East 49th Street, Savannah, Ga.
- SOUTH TEXAS—*Alfred C. Finn, 506 Bankers Mortgage Bldg., Houston, Texas; †J. Russ Baty, 506 Bankers Mortgage Bldg., Houston, Texas.
- SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Harold C. Chambers, 1107 Hibernian Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.; †H. Roy Kelley, 1102 Architects' Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.
- SOUTHERN PENNSYLVANIA—*Henry Y. Shaub, 20 1/2 North Queen St., Lancaster, Pa.; †Harry E. Yesaler, 38 Schmidt Bldg., York, Pa.
- ST. LOUIS—*Wilbur T. Trueblood, Chemical Bldg., St. Louis, Mo.; †P. John Hoener, 3805 Laclede Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
- ST. PAUL—*Thomas F. Ellerbe, 692 Endicott Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.; †Ray R. Gauger, 606 New York Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.
- TENNESSEE—*William Crutchfield, 1st Nat. Bank Bldg., Chattanooga; †Louis H. Bull, 1301 Volunteer Bldg., Chattanooga, Tenn.
- TOLEDO—*Harry W. Wechter, 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—*Philip N. Stern, 21 Law Building, Fredericksburg, Va.; †S. J. Collins, 230 Institute St., Staunton, Va.
- WASHINGTON, D. C.—*Gilbert L. Rodier, 726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.; †Fred E. Robbins, 736 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.
- WASHINGTON STATE—*Roland E. Borhek, 918 Washington Bldg., Tacoma; †Lance E. Gowen, 907 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.; †Carlton C. Wood, 366 Washington Ave., Clarksburg, W. Va.
- WISCONSIN—*Henry C. Hengale, 445 Milwaukee St., Milwaukee, Wis.; †Alexander C. Guth, 1249 N. 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
and with the recommendation that each Chapter of the Institute consider the conditions in its own city
or community with a view to encouraging the formation of an Advisory Council of Architects.—

Copyright, 1929, by The American Institute of Architects

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

Architects Advisory Councils

By HORACE W. PEASLEE, A.I.A.

This statement was prepared by Mr. Peaslee at the request of the Board of Directors. It is transmitted to the membership at the direction of the Board with its endorsement of the plan set forth, and with the recommendation that each Chapter of the Institute consider the conditions in its own city or community with a view to encouraging the formation of an Advisory Council of Architects.—
Editor's Note.

AT the November meeting of the Board of Directors of the Institute, held in Detroit, the following resolution was adopted:

Whereas, The successful operation for eight years of an Architects' Advisory Council, established in the National Capital by the Washington, D. C., Chapter, has demonstrated the advantages of such service to the public and to the profession; and the establishment of a second council in Cincinnati, in cooperation with the Art Institute, has indicated the feasibility of extending similar service in other cities; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors commends for the consideration of the chapters generally the establishment of such councils, and offers the assistance of The Octagon staff in furnishing detailed information and assistance.

The data which follows has been prepared by the organizer of the Washington council at the request of the Secretary of the Institute, to present the underlying idea to the chapters of the Institute at large so that they may fully consider it and the possibility of adopting a similar system in their own communities.

The purpose of the council was outlined to the Washington public and to the local profession at the time of its inception, in part as follows:

The majority of people can tell whether a building is beautiful, mediocre or ugly; but in completed buildings nothing can be done about it. The trained eye can detect potential ugliness and possible improvements in blueprints. At this stage, improvement may be made in proposed buildings. If the members of the architectural profession will focus their trained eyes upon buildings in the blueprint stage, and will give cooperative, con-

structive criticism of each other's work, and if even a minority of the public will lend moral support, there need no longer be any reason why entire sections need be repeatedly injured by endless rows of mediocrity; or well ordered neighborhoods by single eyesores. Well designed buildings need cost no more than mediocre structures. They are better investments for the purchasers and for the community as a whole.

It is all very well to talk generalities of city beautifying; but do you meet your personal responsibility to the extent of your personal opportunity? The responsibility for the beauty or ugliness of the great bulk of your city rests with you, the individual, for whom and by whom this bulk is created building by building: homes, offices, shops, institutions. In its bulk it seems impossible of correction; but building by building as erected, results can be accomplished.

This was a statement of conditions, with a definite plan for their betterment. It seemed very doubtful whether the members of the busy profession could and would find the time from their routine work to give to this civic philanthropy. It seemed doubtful whether any definite results would be accomplished even if the effort were given by the architects. But now, after a period of eight years of continuous successful operation, we may take stock of the actual accomplishment.

For eight years, once a week three architects, drawn from a jury panel, have criticised constructively all plans filed for building permit in the District of Columbia. One new man goes on the jury each week, one former juror dropping off: the term of service being three weeks. When it was proposed last summer that because of the heat and

vacations the service might be dropped for a couple of months, those architects scheduled for summer service unanimously agreed that under no circumstances would they take advantage of the situation. It would seem, therefore, that in so far as the architects themselves are concerned they have found the effort interesting and worth while.

What is there in this work which would take these busy men from their offices regularly, week after week, year after year? There is not only the satisfaction of definite accomplishment for the improvement of their city, but a personal benefit in sharpening their analytical and critical faculties and in improving their own work. They see what other architects are doing, how other architects handle their problems. They discuss these problems with their peers, and in return have full and frank discussion of their own problems in the earlier stages. One finds among the Washington architects the same freedom in discussing their problems which one finds in the school drafting rooms; and this mutual confidence which has been established has been largely instrumental in effecting the organization of representative Washington architects in the Allied Architects corporation which has successfully produced the new office building for the House of Representatives.

The jury, in reviewing the plans before it, groups them into five classes, divided as follows:

Distinguished: Outstanding among buildings of its type.

Commended: Meeting exceptionally well the standards which should be maintained for private buildings in the National Capital.

Approved: Meeting the standards which should be maintained for private buildings in the neighborhood.

Average: A building which does not tend to improve the neighborhood.

Disapproved: The type of building which is considered "below average"; to be discouraged.

Where a building seems eligible for the Distinguished Architecture award, or Commendation, this particular project is referred to a "board of review" composed of the elders of the tribe, who meet at six-weeks intervals. Their function is to insure a continuity in the classifications, and especially to make final decision as to whether a building warrants the Distinguished rating. In any event, no Distinguished award may be made except on a completed project.

It should be noted that there is no delay whatever in the issuance of building permits, even though the council meets only once a week. On the day of the meeting, all plans received since the previous

meeting are placed before the council, whether or not permits have been granted. It is frequently too late to make radical changes; but it is never too late to simplify, and that is usually the need in an ugly building. It is never too late to correct the one detail which may spoil an otherwise good design. To make the workings of the council even more effective, the architects are urged on their major projects to bring their plans before the jury in preliminary sketch form rather than in the form of final working drawings.

As to the effect on building generally, it is a matter of common observation that the quality of speculative building in the National Capital has made tremendous improvement within the last half decade. Where organized opposition to the council existed at its beginning, we now find cooperation between architects and builders. It is perfectly true that the architects by their freely given constructive criticism—not too detailed, but rather general in character,—have given service for which they have received no direct compensation, and have improved the character of the work of operative builders and mediocre architects who might be regarded as in competition. But on the other hand, the work of the architects themselves has been improved by constructive criticism, and in many cases they have been retained by operative builders who in the past have had their work done by unqualified draftsmen.

The findings of the council are published regularly in the current press. The Commended awards are featured by any builder who receives them, and the public generally has come to have confidence in and respect for the work of the council. The latest development along this line has been the establishment of another council upon almost exactly corresponding lines, by the architects of Cincinnati, who attended a jury session during the last convention and acquainted themselves at first hand with the workings of the council. It is the hope of the Directors of the Institute that other chapters will investigate the workings of the Washington council. Further detailed information will be furnished upon the request of any interested group.

The architects as a whole have exerted their organized influence for better city plans, park improvements and the like; but after all, they have not put their full force into effect in their own special field, where it can have most weight. Regardless of any city plan or park system, it is the individual buildings of a city which make it or mar it. The experience of the Washington architects,—no longer an experiment,—has demonstrated that if these buildings can be dealt with one at a time, as erected, the appearance of the city as a whole can be immeasurably improved.

One Chapter—Cincinnati—has already acted in this matter and the communication sent by the Committee of the Architects' Advisory Council of the Cincinnati Chapter to its members reads as follows:

To the Architects of Cincinnati:

The jury list of the Architects' Advisory Council is enclosed. The jury consists of three men, one new man coming on each week, and one man retiring. In this way the term of service will be three successive weeks of one hour each week.

If any architect finds, upon looking at the schedule, that he will be out of town upon the dates assigned, or knows now or later of some reason which will prevent his attendance, he is asked to communicate as soon as possible with Mr. Russell Potter, Cherry 5873, in order to arrange for substitutions. You are urged, however, to meet the assignments if at all possible, in order to avoid confusion and extra work upon the other members.

You may, however, not find your name upon the jury list. This may be due to our not having been able to get in touch with you, or because we did not hear from you in answer to our request to serve. Those whose names do not appear upon the list will be placed upon the unassigned list, and will be asked to work when vacancies occur.

Let us emphasize the responsibility which the architects of the community are assuming. We should be careful not to attempt any "Censorship of art." We are not trying to legislate good taste, instead the aim is to eliminate ugliness and to create a public spirit which will demand better architecture. You can help by serving on this jury.

THE COMMITTEE OF THE
ARCHITECTS' ADVISORY COUNCIL.

The example set by the Washington, D. C., and the Cincinnati Chapters is commended to every other Chapter of The American Institute of Architects.

The Sixty-Fourth Convention

San Antonio, Texas—April 14, 15, 16, 1931

PRELIMINARY information concerning the Sixty-fourth Convention, nominations of officers, and other items, was sent to every member in the December number of *THE OCTAGON*, page 9. It is not possible at this date to state the details of the program, which is now being developed by the officers of the Institute in conference with the officers of the West Texas Chapter and the Convention Committee.

Full announcement of the subjects to be given prominence at the Convention will appear in the February number of *THE OCTAGON*.

In the meantime the Chapters are requested to give early and close attention to the question of their participation in the work of the Convention. In the year which has almost elapsed since the Sixty-third Convention much has happened, and the architectural profession has keenly felt the severe economic depression which has existed in the building industry throughout the United States.

The problems which confront the architectural profession, and the individual architect, as a result of the depression are serious ones. Their early and effective solution calls for the combined judgment and the united effort of the best men from every Chapter and Division of the Institute. No one can say what the future has in store—for architecture or architects—but every member of The American Institute of Architects should take some part in preparing himself and his profession for the new and

exacting conditions which are sure to arise from the present industrial crisis.

No matter how strong our desires to be and to remain individualists, in both private and professional life, each of us must admit that the future position of the architectural profession, and the independent professional status of the individual architect, depend almost entirely upon what the architects do as a group, and upon the course which they elect to follow.

It is obvious that no body of professional men in the United States can stand against the force and movement of our system of civilization, under which we must make our daily bread. We can influence civilization, we may change its trends, but we cannot halt its changes or escape its demands. The architectural profession, like other groups in our complex structure, can make a choice. In fact, it has to make a choice. It may either protect its ranks from encroachment and follow a program of self-preservation which looks well into the future, or it may disregard the signs of the times and indulge in the hypnotic belief that the architect retains his position by the Divine right of genius. This is not meant to say that the art of architecture is about to perish. It is meant to say that the traditional position of the architect as the master builder, and as the responsible and controlling head of the building operation, can be and may be taken away from him by the developments of tomorrow.

The Institute, on behalf of the entire architectural profession, has a great responsibility to perform. It must correctly analyze the conditions which exist today in the building industry as they affect the practice of architecture, and it must chart the course to be followed tomorrow. To do anything less is to fail completely. It is probable that the Sixty-fourth Convention will resolve itself into a meeting of self-examination, and into a meeting for planning for the future. Some of the subjects tentatively suggested for extended discussion relate to—

(1) The broadened status of the architect in modern building operations.

(2) The larger aspects of land and building development.

(3) The status of the architect with respect to governmental, state, and municipal architecture.

These comments should not be taken as a definite outline of the Convention program. They constitute a brief informal report of discussions concerning the character and scope of the coming Convention.

A complete and final statement concerning the subjects of the Convention will be published in the February or March number of *THE OCTAGON*.

In the meantime, the officers would be glad to have suggestions from members and Chapters of those matters which they believe should receive special attention at the coming meeting in San Antonio.

In 1932 the Institute will acknowledge its Seventy-fifth Birthday. It has passed through many vicissitudes from within and from without. It has endured well, and has served well. This is true because the Institute has preserved in theory and in practice a truly democratic form of government and leadership.

In 1931, as in every year since 1857, the responsibility for exercising leadership and the responsibility for planning for the welfare of the profession we chose to follow rests upon us as individuals and as Chapters.

This will repeat and urge the suggestion previously made—that the Chapters set aside their March meetings for Convention affairs and for a consideration of those somewhat intangible but vitally important problems of self-improvement and self-preservation with which the architect is now face to face.

FRANK C. BALDWIN,
Secretary.

Contemporary Architecture—Brochure and Lantern Slides

THE Delegates who attended the Sixty-third Convention will recall with interest the Symposium on Modern Architecture.

By direction of the Convention and the Board, the Committee on Education has prepared a brochure which contains all of the addresses delivered at the Convention on the subject of "Contemporary Architecture," and also the addresses of Leicester B. Holland and Walter Pritchard Eaton.

The brochure will be mailed shortly to all Members, Associates, and Juniors of the Institute, also to the architectural schools and others who are interested.

In addition, the Committee on Education has had made two series of lantern slides illustrating the addresses of Earl H. Reed, Jr., and Everett V. Meeks.

These slides are at The Octagon. Five sets of

each series of slides illustrating the two addresses are available. Any Chapter wishing to have a special meeting devoted to the subject of "Contemporary Architecture" with a showing of one or both of the series of illustrations may secure the slides by addressing the Chairman of the Committee on Education, Charles Butler, The Octagon, Washington, D. C.

The Iowa Chapter has already used the slides at a most enjoyable meeting. The talk was delivered by William L. Steele, formerly of that Chapter, and now located in Omaha. The President of the Chapter, Seth J. Temple, has expressed his appreciation of the very valuable material made available by the Committee on Education.

At least ten days' time should be allowed for delivery of the lantern slides after receipt of the request at The Octagon.

The Architectural Development of Washington— Film Available

A NEW copy of the three-reel film of Washington has been obtained by the Committee on City and Regional Planning for circulation about the country, the old one having been worn out after almost continuous use during the eighteen months when it was seen by over 200,000 people in 35 cities under the auspices of The American Institute of Architects.

The film showing the growth of the National Capital, from its inception down to the proposed new building group for the triangle area north of the Mall, has been secured from Secretary Mellon for the use of the Chapters of the A. I. A. and other educational bodies. It can be had for the payment of express charges to and from Palos Verdes Estates, California, or to the next booking place.

It is suggested that the Chapters offer the film at an open meeting for members, draftsmen, students

and their friends and then arrange for its showing during the remainder of a week at a local moving picture house or educational institution with a public introduction by some Chapter member.

The story of the film is explained by the speeches of President Hoover, Secretary Mellon, and Milton B. Medary given in full in *The American Architect* for May 20, 1929.

The film is standard size, in three reels and takes approximately forty-five minutes to run, with explanations.

For advance dates and reservations address the Chairman of the Committee on City and Regional Planning, Charles H. Cheney, Palos Verdes Estates, California. (telegrams to Redondo Beach, California).

Competition for a Steel Highway Bridge

STUDENTS of architecture in the United States and Canada are invited to participate in a competition for the design of a highway bridge in steel. Previous competitions of this nature have been held under the auspices of the Beaux-Arts Institute of Design. This year the competition will be held directly by the American Institute of Steel Construction, which offers the prize money of \$500 for the first, \$250 for the second and \$100 for the third best design judged by a committee of architects and engineers of international importance.

The change in procedure was made in order to conform to the plans for a similar competition held by the Steel Institute among students of engineering. Students of architecture who wish to enter this competition are invited to submit to the American Institute of Steel Construction, 200 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., their preliminary sketches to be placed in judgment on April 3, 1931. From these the ten best will be selected for final development; and the final drawings will be judged on May 1 next. Full information may be had from the address above stated.

History of the Institute—Postponement

NOTICE is given that the preparation of the proposed history of the Institute and its Chapters has been postponed.

This project was initiated more than a year ago, and the Chapters were asked to report on the co-operation each could render. A large number of them responded in favor of the undertaking, and offered a full measure of support.

The Board of Directors, at its last meeting, after considering the cost and effort required, and in view of more pressing demands on the financial resources

and energy of the Institute and the Chapters, decided that the proposal be laid aside, at least until 1932.

Some Chapters have appointed committees or individuals to go ahead with the collection of data for their respective sections in the history. It is suggested that such appointments be continued. In due course the Institute Board will again take up the compilation and publication of a history of the Institute and the Chapters and at that time notice will be sent to every Chapter.

With the Editors—From January Numbers

The American Architect.

Diplomat, Mechanical and Structural Engineer, Office Manager, Lawyer, Politician, Research Engineer, Cost Accountant, Financier, Employment Manager, Insurance Broker, Auditor, Banker, Public Speaker, Society Man, Purchasing Agent, Salesman, Judge.

Who said that the practice of architecture is a profession? Who said that architects are not business men? They are business men. They are making a commodity—buildings. They have a service to offer that at times is highly personal in character. But fundamentally they differ little if any from any other manufacturer of a product.

Any argument that the architect is not a business man has no place in today's program. As soon as he leaves school and seeks a position as a draftsman he becomes a business man. He must sell his ability, in most cases to an employer who knows nothing about him or what he can do. If he isn't a business man he will in all probability remain a draftsman all his life.

The Architectural Forum.

The great danger in our current emphasis on economics, mechanical efficiency, materials and methods is that they may become ends in themselves. Above all, human relationships, man's needs and desires, must be paramount in our thinking. All other factors must be subservient and contributory. Good architecture is humanized,—not merely mechanized, for the sociological and psychological aspects of each building are of prime importance. Fundamentally, architecture is the art of enclosing space and providing facilities for various human activities in such a way that they contribute not only to physical well-being but to the finer sensibilities. If we will keep the fundamentals constantly before us during the coming year, it will be reflected in the quality and character of American architecture, and buildings will be created that are more truly functionally efficient, economically sound and aesthetically satisfying,—in other words,—Good Architecture.

Architecture.

At today's monthly meeting of the architectural editors we discussed the rather broad question of where the architect is going. Unquestionably no other profession has so widened in scope during the last few generations. In former days, an architect could concentrate on his plan, walls and roof. Now the thousand and one questions of heating, ventilating, vertical transportation, air conditioning, electrical equipment, hydraulics, sanitation, rise up to

complicate his duties, to say nothing of the overwhelming increase in the variety of newly introduced materials and methods of construction. It seems almost inevitable that the profession must become departmentalized in some way, or practitioners confine themselves to specialties. In addition to these complications there is the growing power of large building organizations—organizations so large that it is they who first confer with a client, and establish sites, costs, and even materials, before the architect is brought into the picture. At the other end of the scale lies the field of small-house design in which, under present conditions, the architect cannot profitably practice. He is being hemmed into a middle ground which seems likely to become more constricted as time goes on, rather than otherwise.

Considering the size and complexity of the problem, it is not surprising that no solution was found, no conclusions reached.

Journal of the R. I. B. A.

Conference on the Formation of an Advisory Council for the Building Industry, held at 9 Conduit Street on Thursday, 4 December, 1930. Sir Banister Fletcher, F.S.A., President of The Royal Institute of British Architects, in the chair.

The following resolutions were moved and carried:

Moved by Mr. Maurice Webb [F]: (1) That this Conference endorses the action taken by the Committee of the Conference on Building Regulations; (2) that this Conference endorses the action of the Committee in going forward to the L. C. C. with a deputation on 8 December.

Moved by Lord Ebury: That this Conference agrees to the formation of a Technical and Economic Advisory Council for the Building Industry to consist of the bodies here represented and such others as may be considered to be entitled to membership, and resolves that such an Advisory Council be hereby formed.

Moved by Mr. Holloway: That this Advisory Council of the Building Industry resolves to appoint the existing provisional Committee of the Conference on Building Regulations to be an Organising Committee with the following terms of reference:

(a) To make recommendations as to the representation to be given to each organisation and interest;

(b) To make recommendations as to finance;

(c) To draft the Constitution and Rules of the Council and to take such other steps as may be necessary to carry through the preliminary organisation and work of the Council.

Pencil Points.

* * * And then he told his story: how he had graduated in architecture with honors, won a traveling scholarship, came back, taken his master's degree; how he had been made honorary member of half a dozen societies; how he had been working on his first book, "The Relation of Design to Industry," when the slump came. At this time he was chief designer for a small firm doing big work—or a big firm, doing small work—I forget which. But it doesn't matter—he was a designer and he had a job. * * *

That was four months ago, and now the unfortunate wretch is selling apples. * * *

He was obviously mad. I felt uneasy and edged away a bit. But he moved towards me. And tak-

ing me by the lapels of my coat, he stared into my face with a wild, frantic stare.

"It's our education," he breathed into my face. "Our education. The whole weakness of our architectural education. Architects should be trained to design in three dimensions, build up their masses with clay, work in the solid, always in the solid, do away with line drawings with their artificially rendered lights and shadows, do away with paper entirely until they've got the mass right, the relation of the parts—then start the mechanical business of drawing, committing the thing to paper. Work in the mass, always in the mass, get the parts right." * * *

But all that afternoon as I walked around town, his words kept ringing in my ears—"There's no end to what you can do with a box of apples."

Report of Joint Committee of Architects and Engineers

Members of the Institute are asked to bear in mind the following items in their consideration of this matter:

The report is tentative. It has not been accepted by The American Institute of Architects, or by the American Society of Civil Engineers.

One member of the Executive Committee of the Institute does not concur in several important details of the report.

The Joint Committee of Architects and Engineers, which formulated the report, will hold further meetings, in an attempt to reach an agreement acceptable to all of the organizations represented.

The Chairman of the special committee representing the architects, Past President D. Everett Waid, has stated:

It would be of interest to the architects to know that the one objection to the Report of the Joint Committee made by the American Society of Civil Engineers as expressed by their Secretary, is as follows: "the definition of structures as given is wider in its scope than is desirable. The Board feels that the scope of the word structure should be changed so as to include such structures as office buildings, apartments, hotels and buildings that are strictly of an architectural nature in contra-distinction to such structures as dams, bridges, loft buildings, power houses and a great many other buildings that are commonly designed primarily by Engineers".

All members of the Institute are invited to consider the report and to send in constructive criticisms to the Chairman of the Special Committee representing the architects, namely, Mr. D. Everett Waid, One Madison Avenue, New York City.—*Editor's Note.*

To The American Institute of Architects
 American Society of Civil Engineers
 American Society of Mechanical Engineers
 American Institute of Electrical Engineers

Gentlemen:

The Joint Committee appointed by your several societies to consider and report upon legislation regulating the practice of architecture and engineering and upon allied matters of common interest to both professions, submits herewith a report of its findings and recommendations.

The Committee has sought first to establish a common ground of principle upon which the members of both professions may stand in considering and advocating legislation that might affect their relations with each other and with the general public they both serve.

It has tried also to formulate suggestions as to how these principles may be embodied in the model registration laws now sponsored by the national architectural and engineering societies.

Finally, it has considered how the members of both professions, both as individual citizens and through their several organized groups, can best bring their influence most helpfully to bear upon specific legislative action that may be in hand or in prospect.

The conditions and principles accepted by your Committee to govern its recommendations are as follows:

1. In considering the professional practice of the architect and the engineer there is of necessity a certain overlap between the functions and responsibilities of the former profession and those of certain groups of the latter.

2. With the growing need for more engineering in architecture and more architecture in engineering, it is becoming increasingly difficult to draw sharp lines to define this overlap and more necessary to establish and maintain cordial and sympathetic cooperation between the two professions.

3. Within the ranks of the professions themselves such cooperation will be developed and fostered out of the sense of professional responsibility felt by every professional man toward his client; that is to say, architects may be relied upon to call in the services of engineers and engineers likewise may be expected to enlist architectural services when desirable.

4. On the other hand, the drafting of laws needed to regulate professional practice, makes it necessary to define the scope of the professions and to describe the essential qualifications of their practitioners more precisely than otherwise might be necessary.

5. In considering legislation to regulate the practice of the architectural and engineering professions, it must be accepted as basic that such legislation finds its justification in the police power of the state, exercised to guard the safety and security of the life, health and property of its citizens.

6. Lack of aesthetic quality in the design of buildings may seriously injure their commercial value, and the "safety and security of property" may be jeopardized as truly by bad aesthetic design as by unsafe structural design. A deteriorating effect on property values due to bad design, especially of exteriors exposed to general view, will be recognized as of increasing importance with the growth and cultivation of public taste. This fact leads your Committee to emphasize the great importance of fostering a feeling of interdependence between the professions of architecture and engineering and a realization of the need of proper collaboration on most building operations.

7. In drafting laws it has been found relatively easy to define the scope of the architect's qualifications and practice, but those of the engineer as set forth in many of the existing registration laws are so broad and diversified as to require in certain respects more detailed definition in the interest of law-makers and the lay public. At the same time, the members of both professions recognize the essential unity of engineering science and practice and endorse the efforts of the engineers to maintain the solidarity of their profession and to resist any tendency to break it down into separate groups.

8. To this end your Committee approves the policy of having one general registration for professional engineers just as there is a similar general registration for architects, and recommends that any differentiation between engineers required to meet the needs of law-makers and of the public be effected by the requirement of special qualification

under the basic registration laws rather than by the establishment of separate groups under special legislation.

REGISTRATION LAWS

In an effort to embody the above principles in the basic registration laws of the two professions, the following suggestions are submitted for amendments to the model registration laws sponsored by the national societies of both architects and engineers:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO UNIFORM REGISTRATION LAW FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND LAND SURVEYORS

In section 2 insert a new paragraph between present first and second paragraphs as follows:

The term "professional engineer," qualified by the adjective "structural," when used in this act shall mean a professional engineer who represents himself as competent to design, or supervise, the construction, enlargement or alteration of structures or any part thereof. The term "structures" within the meaning of this act denotes all structures having as essential features foundations, columns, girders, trusses, arches and beams, any or all of these and or other parts, in which safe design and construction require that loads and stresses be computed and the size and strength of parts be determined by mathematical calculation based upon scientific principles and engineering data; and these shall include such structures as may be covered by the term "buildings" as defined in any act enforced in this state regulating the practice of architecture.

* * * * *

In section 12, subhead (1), transpose items a and b. Change subhead (2) to read (3). Insert between subhead (1) and (3) the following:

(2) As a professional engineer (structural):

In addition to the qualifications prescribed for a professional engineer, such evidence as may be satisfactory to the board that the applicant is competent to be placed in responsible charge of design or supervision of the construction, enlargement or alteration of structures as defined in section 2.

* * * * *

In section 15, amend the last paragraph to read as follows:

Each registrant hereunder shall, upon registration, obtain a seal and stamp of the design authorized by the board bearing the registrant's name and the legend "Registered Professional Engineer," "Registered Professional Engineer (Structural)," or "Registered Land Surveyor." Plans, specifications, plats and reports issued by a registrant shall be stamped with the said seal or with a rubber stamp of the same design, during the life of registrant's certificate, but it shall be unlawful for anyone to stamp or seal any docu-

ment with said seal or stamp after the certificate of the registrant named thereon has expired or has been revoked, unless such certificate shall have been renewed or re-issued.

In section 19 (Public Works), add the following clause:

"And provided further, that nothing in this section shall be held to restrict the practice of architecture by an architect duly qualified, and/or registered under the laws of this state."

* * * * *

Change the numbering of Sections 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25 to 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26, respectively, and insert a new Section 21, as follows:

"Section 21—Nothing in this act shall be so construed as to restrict the practice of architecture by any architect, duly qualified, registered and practicing in conformity with the laws of this state."

* * * * *

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE MODEL FORM OF LAW FOR THE REGISTRATION OF ARCHITECTS

Change the numbering of Sections 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33 to 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34, respectively, and insert a new Section 28, as follows:

"Section 28—Nothing in this act shall be so construed as to restrict the right of registered professional engineers whose certificates indicate their proficiency in the structural branch of their profession, to design, file plans for, and supervise the construction, enlargement or alteration of buildings and other structures."

* * * * *

The purpose of the amendments to both acts here proposed is to define those special qualifications which should be possessed by an engineer who holds himself out as competent to engage in the practice of architecture insofar as that practice may affect the safety and security of life and property.

We recommend, therefore, that the individual members of our two professions and our various societies, both national and local, should work for the general adoption of registration laws conforming in spirit with the model and uniform laws now endorsed by our national societies with the amendments here proposed and for the amendment of existing registration laws to conform as closely as practicable thereto.

We recommend further that in bringing the influence of our two professions to bear upon legislation affecting building design and construction and the practice of architecture and engineering, the principles herein laid down be observed.

Recognizing the desirability of higher educational qualifications for registration, we quote with approval and commend to those members of our respective professions who are concerned with improved registration laws, the following extract from "Supplement to Handbook 36 of the University of the State of New York," on the subject of Higher Education in Engineering and Land Surveying:

"The State Board of Licensing for Professional Engineers and Land Surveyors does not accept a record of professional experience as being 'of a character satisfactory to the board' or as 'warranting the issuance of a certificate' unless such professional experience has a background of preliminary and professional education commensurate with the modern requirements of the competent practice of the respective professions of Engineering and Land Surveying."

As an aid to continued harmonious cooperation, we recommend that no architects or engineers, either individually or through their respective societies and other groups, should undertake to influence legislation affecting the practice of the other profession without first consulting with recognized representative groups of that profession.

There is great need, in the interests of the public, to promote and foster sound legislation for better and safer building. This need is a challenge to both our professions, and to meet it we shall require the most intelligent and whole-hearted cooperation. Our interests in this respect are common and closely interwoven and if we are to make our efforts count for genuine progress, it will be necessary for us to avoid conflicting representation to legislative bodies and to maintain close cooperation and unity of effort.

With all these considerations in mind, your Committee presents these findings and recommendations in the hope that they will have the endorsement of architects and engineers both individually and through appropriate action by their several organized groups.

Respectfully submitted,

W. T. CHEVALIER, J. RIELY GORDON,
F. A. MOLITOR, JOHN HALL RANKIN,
ROBERT RIDGWAY, D. EVERETT WAID.

January 8, 1931.

Applications For Membership

January 31, 1931.

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>Albany Chapter</i>	- - - -	J. RUSSELL WHITE
<i>Brooklyn Chapter</i>	- - - -	WILLIAM H. SYPHER, II
<i>Central New York Chapter</i>	- - - -	WILLIAM McLEISH DUNBAR, JAMES R. VEDDER
<i>Connecticut Chapter</i>	- - - -	T. MERRILL PRENTICE
<i>Florida Central Chapter</i>	- - - -	ROY W. WAKELING
<i>Florida North Chapter</i>	- - - -	ALVIN ROGER MOORE
<i>Nebraska Chapter</i>	- - - -	JOSEPH EDGAR SMAY
<i>New York Chapter</i>	- - - -	WALTER THOMAS WILLIAMS
<i>Southern California Chapter</i>	- - - -	HORATIO WARREN BISHOP

You are invited, as directed by the By-Laws, to send privileged communications before March 7, 1931, 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.

FRANK C. BALDWIN,
Secretary.

Members Elected from Dec. 31, 1930, to Jan. 13, 1931.

<i>Alabama Chapter</i>	- - - -	PAUL WILLIS HOFFERBERT
<i>Boston Chapter</i>	- - - -	EDWARD A. HUBBARD
<i>Cincinnati Chapter</i>	- - - -	C. C. WEBER
<i>New Jersey Chapter</i>	- - - -	GEORGE R. JENSH
<i>New York Chapter</i>	- - - -	CASS GILBERT, JR., WILLIAM HENRY JONES
<i>Oregon Chapter</i>	- - - -	LESLIE D. HOWELL
<i>Tennessee Chapter</i>	- - - -	JAMES G. GAUNTT
<i>West Texas Chapter</i>	- - - -	ROY L. THOMAS

