

THE
OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects



A Museum of American Architecture

The Gulf States Conference

Notice of Board Meeting

P. W. A. Art Exhibition

Volume 8

NOVEMBER

Number 11

1936

Chapters and Officers

PRESIDENTS (*) AND SECRETARIES (†) LISTED AS OF NOV. 20, 1936

- ALABAMA—*Frederic Child Birgin, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.; †Hugh Martin, 910 Title Guarantee Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.
- ALBANY—*Clarence H. Gardiner, 54 Bellview Terrace, Rensselaer, N. Y.; †Gilbert L. Van Auken, Delmar, N. Y.
- ARKANSAS—*Harry Wanger, 1916 Donaghey Bldg., Little Rock, Ark.; †Lawson L. Delony, 2407 Louisiana St., Little Rock, Ark.
- BALTIMORE—*James R. Edmunds, Jr., Calvert Building, Baltimore, Md.; †Francis H. Jencks, 113 West Mulberry St., Baltimore, Md.
- BOSTON—*Henry E. Shepley, 122 Ames Bldg., Boston, Mass.; †G. Houston Burr, 58 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.
- BROOKLYN—*Stephen W. Dodge, 198 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; †Ralph M. Rice, 33 West 42nd St., New York, N. Y.
- BUFFALO—*John J. Wade, 728 Marine Trust Bldg., Buffalo, N. Y.; †David B. Crane, 1 Niagara Square, Buffalo, N. Y.
- CENTRAL ILLINOIS—*F. N. Emerson, 1600 Peoria Life Bldg., Peoria, Ill.; †Thomas E. O'Donnell, 119 Architecture Bldg., Urbana, Ill.
- CENTRAL NEW YORK—*Conway L. Todd, 315 Alexander St., Rochester, N. Y.; †Walter V. Ward, 315 Alexander St., Rochester, N. Y.
- CHICAGO—*John O. Merrill, 533 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; †Carl E. Heimbrot, 20 No. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
- CINCINNATI—*H. P. Van Arsdall, 1024 Dixie Terminal Building, Cincinnati, Ohio; †George F. Roth, Jr., University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- CLEVELAND—*A. C. Robinson, National City Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio; †J. Elmer Baez, 1508 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
- COLORADO—*Frank W. Frewen, 1015 Midland Savings Bldg., Denver, Colo.; †Roland L. Linder, Insurance Building, Denver, Colo.
- COLUMBUS—*Galen F. Oman, 2569 North High St., Columbus, Ohio; †Ralph Chas. Kempton, 50 West Broad St., Columbus, Ohio.
- CONNECTICUT—*Douglas Orr, 956 Chapel St., New Haven, Conn.; †Herbert Gibson, Jr., 204 Main St., Hartford, Conn.
- DAYTON—*Clifford C. Brown, 1129 Reibold Bldg., Dayton, Ohio; †Geo. T. Neuffer, 437 Ludlow Arcade, Dayton, Ohio.
- DELAWARE—*Walter Carlson, 3038 du Pont Bldg., Wilmington, Del.; †Reah de Bourg Robinson, Equitable Bldg., Wilmington, Del.
- DETROIT—*Alvin E. Harley, 1507 Stroh Bldg., Detroit, Mich.; †N. Chester Sorensen, 2201 Industrial Bank Bldg., Detroit, Mich.
- EASTERN OHIO—*Ellis M. Keppel, 506 Second National Bank Bldg., Warren, Ohio; †Wm. H. Cook, 33 North Hazel St., Youngstown, Ohio.
- FLORIDA CENTRAL—*Geo. Foote Dunham, P. O. Box 206, Orlando, Fla.; †Frank A. Parsiale, 412 Robertson Bldg., Ocala, Fla.
- FLORIDA NORTH—*H. J. Klutho, 2030 Main St., Jacksonville, Fla.; †Lee Roy Sheftall, 305 Main St., Jacksonville, Fla.
- FLORIDA SOUTH—*Phineas E. Palst, 1136 Ingraham Bldg., Miami, Fla.; †Robert F. Smith, 2242 S. W. 27th Ave., Coconut Grove, Fla.
- GEORGIA—*H. C. McLaughlin, Commercial Exchange, Atlanta, Ga.; †Geo. W. Cooper, Jr., 327-30 Forsyth Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.
- GRAND RAPIDS—*Harry L. Mead, 901 Michigan Trust Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.; †John P. Baker, 702 Building and Loan Building, Grand Rapids, Mich.
- HAWAII—*C. W. Furer, 506 Hawaiian Trust Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.; †Claude A. Stehl, 2566 Woodlawn Drive, Honolulu, T. H.
- INDIANA—*Kurt Vonnegut, 4365 No. Illinois St., Indianapolis, Ind.; †Herbert Foltz, 1033 Architects Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind.
- IOWA—*Charles Altfillisch, 117 Winnebago St., Decorah, Iowa; †Edwin H. Wetherell, 506 Shops Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa.
- KANSAS CITY—*Alfred E. Barnes, 2500 Telephone Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.; †John R. Brunt, 2500 Telephone Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.
- KANSAS—*Arthur R. Mann, 721 Wiley Bldg., Hutchinson, Kan.; †Raymond A. Coolidge, 1175 Fillmore St., Topeka, Kan.
- KENTUCKY—*C. Julian Oberwarth, 301 Second St., Frankfort, Ky.; †Osolan P. Ward, 1902 Washington Bldg., Louisville, Ky.
- LOUISIANA—*F. Julius Dreyfous, 600 Maison Blanche Bldg., New Orleans, La.; †H. Mortimer Favrot, 401-3 Nois Bldg., New Orleans, La.
- MADISON—*Arthur Peabody, State Capitol, Madison, Wis.; †Edward J. Law, First Central Building, Madison, Wis.
- MAINE—*John Calvin Stevens, 187 Middle St., Portland, Me.; †Phillip S. Wadsworth, 193 Middle St., Portland, Me.
- MINNESOTA—*Louis B. Bersbeck, 702 Wesley Temple Bldg., Minneapolis, Minn.; †Edwin W. Kraft, 715 Rand Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.
- MISSISSIPPI—*E. E. Norwood, National Bank of Gulfport Bldg., Gulfport, Miss.; †James R. Stevens, III, 742 North State Street, Jackson, Miss.
- MONTANA—*Fred A. Brinkman, Kalispell, Mont.; †W. R. Piew, Bozeman, Mont.
- NEBRASKA—*Wm. L. Steele, 2236 St. Mary's Ave., Omaha, Nebr.; †H. S. Seymour, 708 World-Herald Bldg., Omaha, Nebr.
- NEW JERSEY—*Kenneth W. Daisell, 41 Maple St., Summit, N. J.; †Clement W. Fairweather, Metuchen, N. J.
- NEW YORK—*Hobart B. Upjohn, 5952 Grand Central Terminal, New York, N. Y.; †Frederick G. Froot, 144 East 30th St., New York, N. Y.
- NORTH CAROLINA—*Walter W. Hook, 1205 Commercial Bank Bldg., Charlotte, N. C.; †Erie G. Stillwell, Hendersonville, N. C.
- NORTH LOUISIANA—*Edward F. Neild, Shreveport, La.; †Seymour VanOs, (Acting) Ricou Brewer Building, Shreveport, La.
- NORTH TEXAS—*Walter C. Sharp, 707 Construction Bldg., Dallas, Tex.; †Geo. L. Dahl, Insurance Bldg., Dallas, Tex.
- NORTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Will G. Corlett, 1801 Bank of America Bldg., Oakland, Calif.; †James H. Mitchell, 369 Pine St., San Francisco, Calif.
- NORTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA—*Clement S. Kirby, Commerce Bldg., Erie, Pa.; †J. Howard Hicks, 124 W. 7th St., Erie, Pa.
- OKLAHOMA—*Joseph Edgar Smay, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.; †Leonard H. Bailey, Colcord Bldg., Oklahoma City, Okla.
- OREGON—*Fred Aandahl, 911 Lewis Bldg., Portland, Ore.; †John T. Schneider, 1009 Spaulding Bldg., Portland, Ore.
- PHILADELPHIA—*Walter T. Karcher, 1520 Locust St., Philadelphia, Pa.; †Roy F. Larson, Architects' Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.
- PITTSBURGH—*Raymond M. Marlier, Empire Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.; †Ralph M. Reutti, 5941 Baum Blvd., Pittsburgh, Pa.
- RHODE ISLAND—*F. Ellis Jackson, 1216 Turks Head Bldg., Providence, R. I.; †J. Peter Geddes, II, 840 Hospital Bldg., Providence, R. I.
- SAN DIEGO—*Frank L. Hope, Jr., Bank of America Bldg., San Diego, Calif.; †Sam W. Hamill, Bank of America Bldg., San Diego, Calif.
- SANTA BARBARA—*William A. Edwards, 116 E. de la Guerra St., Santa Barbara, Calif.; †Ralph W. Armitage, 235 West Victoria St., Santa Barbara, Calif.
- SCRANTON-WILKES-BARRE—*Searle H. Von Storch, Waverly, Pa.; †Arthur P. Coon, Union Bank Bldg., Scranton, Pa.
- SOUTH CAROLINA—*Samuel Lapham, 42 Broad St., Charleston, S. C.; †J. Whitney Cunningham, 2 Pierson Bldg., Sumter, S. C.
- SOUTH GEORGIA—*Henrik Wallis, 408 East Bay St., Savannah, Ga.; †Percy Sugden, 125 East 49th St., Savannah, Ga.
- SOUTH TEXAS—*Birdsall P. Briscoe, 4301 Main St., Houston, Tex.; †R. W. Leiba, 711 National Standard Bldg., Houston, Tex.
- SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Ralph C. Fiewelling, 614 Architects Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.; †George J. Adams, 5514 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, Calif.
- SOUTHERN PENNSYLVANIA—*Chas. Howard Lloyd, 1011 North Front St., Harrisburg, Pa.; †James W. Minick, 600 North Second St., Harrisburg, Pa.
- ST. LOUIS—*P. John Hoener, 3605 Laclede Ave., St. Louis, Mo.; †Benedict Farrar, 1367 Arcade Bldg., St. Louis, Mo.
- ST. PAUL—*Edgar W. Buenger, 1100 Minnesota Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.; †Roy H. Haslund, 1509 Pioneer Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.
- TENNESSEE—*Jos. W. Hart, 602 Hitchcock Bldg., Nashville, Tenn.; †H. C. Parrent, Jr., American Trust Bldg., Nashville, Tenn.
- TOLEDO—*Karl B. Hoke, 1217 Madison Avenue, Toledo, Ohio; †Thomas D. Best, 303 Richardson Bldg., Toledo, Ohio.
- UTAH—*John Fetzer, 506 Templeton Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah; †Leslie Hodgson, Eccles Bldg., Ogden, Utah.
- VIRGINIA—*M. C. Lee, Federal Housing Administration, American Bank Bldg., Richmond, Va.; †W. R. Crowe, 610 Kruse Bldg., Lynchburg, Va.
- WASHINGTON, D. C.—*Frederick V. Murphy, 1413 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C.; †E. Philip Schreier, 1517 H St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
- WASHINGTON STATE—*L. E. Gowen, Textile Tower, Seattle, Washington; †William Bain, 704 Textile Tower, Seattle, Washington.
- WEST TEXAS—*Carlton W. Adams, Insurance Bldg., San Antonio, Tex.; †Bartlett Cocks, Maverick Bldg., San Antonio, Tex.
- WEST VIRGINIA—*C. C. Wood, (Acting) Lowndes Bldg., Clarksburg, W. Va.; †C. E. Silling, Box 861, Charleston, W. Va.
- WISCONSIN—*William G. Herbst, 1249 North Franklin Place, Milwaukee, Wis.; †Alexander C. Guth, 1249 North Franklin Place, Milwaukee, Wis.

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.

A Museum of American Architecture

A proposed Institution of Research and Public Education)

BY CHARLES E. PETERSON, A. I. A.

EDITOR'S NOTE:

The Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis is a project originally proposed by the citizens of that city acting through an association of which Louis LaBeaume, F. A. I. A., is Professional Advisor. A great variety of schemes have been suggested for the development of this great memorial. Among these are a Naval arsenal, a public parking garage, a maternity hospital, an airport and a railway terminal. We believe that the following proposed plan will be of great interest to the profession.

Communications concerning the Museum plan may be addressed to Superintendent John L. Nagle, National Park Service, 216 Buder Building, St. Louis.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT

THE United States of America and the City of St. Louis have agreed to erect together a great monument to President Thomas Jefferson and the pioneers who laid the foundation for the westward development of our country. The area to be embraced in the project—the *Jefferson National Expansion Memorial*—consists of thirty-seven city blocks covering the site of the fortified village of St. Louis, established by French traders in 1764. Lying on the west bank of the Mississippi near its junction with the Missouri, the place has enjoyed a special importance from the earliest times. At the dawn of the 19th Century it was a strategic point on the frontier of Spanish America. Shortly afterwards it passed to the United States with the Territory of Louisiana, and in the following decades became the base of operations for the winning of the West.

The United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission was created by Joint Resolution of the Senate and the House in 1935 to "consider

and formulate" plans for the memorial. The National Park Service was designated as the executive agency to study plans and prosecute the construction, pursuant to the Historic Sites and Buildings Act.

Thirty million dollars has been approved as the ultimate cost of the project, although its exact nature has not yet been determined. There are many forms it could assume. Indications are that the public will want it to be more than the customary specimen of architectural symbolism. Such civic embellishments have an important place in every city, but their sphere of influence is limited. The establishment of one or more living institutions for the collection and dissemination of knowledge relating to the development of the Northwest would seem to be more appropriate. The establishment of a *Museum of American Architecture* has been proposed.

Thomas Jefferson was an enthusiastic student of architecture, and through his part in securing the original designs for the United States Capitol and the White House, and by his revival of the Roman

style in the Virginia State Capitol and his own residence "Monticello" and others, probably exercised a greater influence on American architecture than any other single man. The Memorial must tell of the westward development of the country. What more graphic expression of political and social history can be found than the builder's art? The meeting house of New England, the planter's mansion of the South, the log cabin of the Western pioneer, the hacienda of the Southwest and the log fort of Alaska relate a more forceful story than any arrangement of words. The nature of the American people and the chronology of their movements are permanently recorded in their structures.

THE PURPOSE OF THE MUSEUM

The purpose of the Museum of American Architecture would be *to conserve for the benefit and enjoyment of the people their heritage of architectural achievement.*

There could be no better time than the present in which to begin this work. After five thousand years of building with wood, stone and brick, industrial research has provided construction materials of entirely new natures. Architectural practice in general has for fifty years lagged behind that of engineering in its preoccupation with antique styles. "Revivals" have come and gone. There have even been revivals of revivals. But at last architectural design is beginning to reflect the progress of construction methods, and so great has been the spread of influence of the new school that it seems not unlikely that the prevailing eclecticism of recent times will become as dated as the schooner and the horse-drawn street car. An alert agency will have to put up a stiff fight to preserve the best of the old, and the three hundred year occupancy of this land by the white race has produced many architectural monuments of importance.

It would not be the hope of this institution to retard the progress of American Architecture by encouraging wholesale imitation of antique design. That would be impossible—architecture has always been in a state of evolution and will continue to be so. Its purpose would be *conservation*, always the principal objective of the National Park Service. In every generation both good and bad buildings have been, and probably will be built. Only by exercising some discrimination in eliminating the

bad and preserving the good can we expect a visible rise in the architectural standard of our country. A national institution for the education of the people could do much to create a popular appreciation that will bring up real estate values corresponding to architectural values. There is abundant evidence that such a movement is already fashionable—in Virginia and Connecticut, for instance—where many fine old country houses valued for their historic or architectural beauty have been restored for present day use.

American architecture of the Seventeenth, Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries is now far enough behind so that we can appraise its worth in retrospect. It is a complicated subject, the result of recurrent European aesthetic influences working among American economic forces. This is not to say that American builders have not made a substantial contribution to the world's wealth of architecture. A comparison with English Georgian buildings of the same size and period will illustrate the freshness of conception and execution that our native builders gave to old themes in Early American houses. A carefully arranged collection with the advantages of modern museum technique can bring this out.

The last few years have seen work on many projects for preserving old buildings outstanding for their architecture or their history, or both. Much has been accomplished by historical and patriotic societies and by individuals. The Federal Government, through the National Park Service, maintains as "historic" twenty-five buildings scattered from San Diego to New York. But neither this movement, nor any other will be able to preserve the greater part of our ancient structures which will go down from lack of maintenance, mechanical obsolescence or other economic causes. The least that can be done is to record them for the archives before they disappear, and to preserve such fragments as may be of particular interest. The Pictorial Archives of Early American Architecture and the Historic American Buildings Survey have made a good start on the former. The proposed Museum of American Architecture would supply the latter need.

Our National Museum, because of its lack of space, and, possibly, of interest, can show very few accessions of architectural nature. A number

of Museums—with the Metropolitan of New York in the lead—exhibit early American interiors. Their specimens generally include only outstanding specimens of artistic merit from residences of importance. Some have study collections of builders' tools and craftsmanship such as the Bucks County Museum at Doylestown, Pennsylvania. A few have models of whole buildings such as the New York Museum of Modern Art with its 1932 show of contemporary architecture.

There are also in this country a number of collections of entire buildings being maintained as outdoor museums. The Edison Institute collection (Greenfield Village) at Dearborn, Michigan is not primarily architectural. The groups at Williamsburg and Yorktown in Virginia, Fairmont Park in Philadelphia, Spring Mill Village in Indiana and the 17th Century group in Salem, Massachusetts—to name a few examples—are highly important, but they show only local phases of design. The Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities maintains twenty-eight worthy antique buildings, but these are scattered through New England. The State of Illinois has also developed an extensive series in the last few years.

There should be some means of studying the whole range of American architecture comparatively. While our libraries—notably the Library of Congress with its complete collection of books and the Historic American Buildings Survey records—offer opportunities for the research worker to dig out the facts and make his own comparisons, the layman is not going to find out what American architecture is by that method. The material to tell the story must be gathered in one place where it can be arranged in a graphic manner.

The Museum would have no favorites in styles—and there have been a good many between the first habitations of Sante Fe and Jamestown and the skyscraper dwelling of today's metropolis—the whole story would be laid out for the visitor to select his own preferences. Facts will be emphasized in bringing out, for instance the truth about the origin of the American log cabin and other surprisingly obscure subjects.

A Museum of American Architecture as a research unit would be a well-nigh indispensable help to the architects in the general program of the National Park Service for the physical study and

preservation of government owned buildings in historical areas throughout the country. At the present time there is no general agency of this kind—either public or private. The efforts of individuals working on the subject have necessarily been sporadic and somewhat disconnected. The only definitive studies completed up until the present time are limited in subject to the works of individual architects, or to special localities. The field of American Architecture is a vast one and can be investigated thoroughly only by a permanent institution with ample resources of personnel and finance. Up to the present time it has hardly been possible for a man to plan a life's career in such work. Those scholars who have made contributions to our knowledge of American Architecture have had to subsidize themselves by other means. It does not seem fitting that a nation which professes to be proud of its native architecture should do so little to learn about it.

The Historic Sites and Buildings Act of 1935 has made it possible for the Federal Government to make such studies and the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial project offers an opportunity to provide the necessary plant and equipment.

NATURE OF THE EXHIBITS

The museum would have at least six different types of exhibit—each of interest to both the scholar and the general public: (1) entire buildings, (2) parts of buildings—specimens of construction and ornament, (3) small scale models of buildings, (4) specimens of drawings by architects and builders, especially those made for important competitions, (5) photographs of buildings, (6) craftsmen actually working materials in the ancient traditions.

The use of entire antique buildings at St. Louis would be limited to local types connected with the early years of the city. The first phase of development was the French house on which considerable data is available. Examples still exist in certain parts of Illinois and Missouri. There are a number of stone mansions of the early 19th Century American type which might be acquired for the Museum. Most of them are now threatened with destruction. Like the French houses they have disappeared from the riverfront before the St. Louis building boom of the steamboat period. Certain good examples of early brick buildings should also

be secured. It is possible that a limited area at the south end of the reservation could be used for such purposes. It would be contrary to the policy of the Museum to cause any buildings important as historic sites or landmarks to be moved from their original location. On the other hand, good examples of architecture which would otherwise disappear would be accepted whenever possible.

It is believed by many that the Old Cathedral, a fine Greek Revival building of 1834, should be allowed to remain on its original site granted by the Spanish government. By careful study the central architectural composition of the Memorial can probably be adjusted to include it without impairing the monumental quality of the whole. If that idea is carried out, the restoration and exhibition of the building might be a function of the Museum.

The collection of examples of architectural ornament would be one of the most important functions of the Museum. Collections from Greek and Roman and even Egyptian and Assyrian ruins have enjoyed a considerable vogue since the Classic Revivals in architecture. The "Elgin Marbles" of the British Museum are probably the most notable, but many American institutions have assembled fine collections—both of original and of casts. Architectural ornament from this country is seldom seen in such collections, and it is a regrettable omission. We have produced work here which should be at least as interesting to Americans as that of the ancient Mediterranean countries.

The Geffrye Museum of London is an institution operated by the County Council which conserves select fragments of construction and decoration from London buildings demolished to make way for civic improvements. By careful study they have been able to arrange series of specimens of panelling, hardware, balusters, and other architectural parts from the earliest times to the present. Such arrangements illustrate strikingly the evolution of building craftsmanship as well as of architectural design.

The real value of such collections lies in the lessons to be learned from their skilled arrangement rather than in the rarity of individual specimens. There seems to be no public museum in this country today equipped to accept and display architectural material of this kind in a collection large enough to be of real value.

The collection of the structural and ornamental

parts of buildings would have a splendid start using selected fragments from the more than four hundred buildings to be razed before the construction of the Memorial. Specimens illustrating a period of one hundred years can be acquired during the demolition for no more work than pains to select and store them in study rooms. Cast iron facades of great merit exist in numbers—the St. Louis riverfront may well contain the finest collection in the country. It might easily be supposed that there is plenty of such material now existing throughout the country, and that it is not valuable enough to be housed in a museum. Observers, however, report that the earlier examples are getting noticeably scarce and it seems time that comprehensive collections were being organized. Had an active museum of Colonial architecture been operating before the close of the 18th Century we would today be much richer in important early work than we are now.

A special justification for saving these things exists in the strong sentiment in St. Louis at this time for the preservation of what is architecturally good in the riverfront area. A study of the structures under discussion will show that they are mostly warehouse and loft buildings with their architectural interest confined to their street fronts. Since these facades are of limited cubage, it would be possible to arrange some of the more interesting examples within the museum building without affecting its exterior design. In this way much that is worth saving can be preserved.

MODELS, DRAWINGS AND PHOTOGRAPHS

The model exhibits would form perhaps the most valuable part of the museum's displays. These would show, in ample series of juxtaposed specimens at uniform scale, the evolution of the various types of buildings found in the United States. Conceivably these could start with the European prototypes familiar to the early colonists and show, for instance, the relationships between England and New England, France and Louisiana, Holland and New York, Spain, Mexico and California, Germany and Pennsylvania, and several others. The series could be carried down to modern times showing some American innovations which have influenced European work and then come back to us in the "International" style.

Before any model is constructed, accurate and detailed measurements would be taken from the original structure and the complete records prepared for the Historic American Buildings Survey with detailed monographs on each. Models would be precisely constructed under the direction of recognized archaeological specialists.

Jefferson himself sent an architectural model from France to present the design used for the Virginia Capitol in Richmond—said to be the first important revival of the Classical temple form in the world. It might be possible to obtain this very model (it still exists) for the Museum.

At the present time there seems to be no public agency which is making an organized effort to collect old drawings by architects and builders. The earliest of these are rather rare, but they can be represented in facsimile where there would otherwise be gaps in a complete series of specimens. The Museum might act as a repository for the drawings of national architectural competitions. Had such a facility been available sooner the Federal Government would have today the original drawings for the United State Capitol and the White House from the competition of 1792.

A good collection of photographic enlargements of architectural subjects would be a valuable supplement to the other exhibits. With photographs it will be possible to cover a vast range of material hardly possible in any other way. The Pictorial Archives of Early American Architecture in the Library of Congress have a fine collection of negatives from which enlargements can be made. There would be a large number of new photographs acquired in the course of the general research program. The publication of picture books of American Architecture on a large-edition, low-retail price basis could become a valuable factor in the field of general education.

The exhibitions of early craftsmen plying their

trade would be popular points of interest for the general visitor. The making of handmade brick, the blowing of window glass, the working of iron and wood—of which the original methods are all but forgotten—could be carried on with the old tools and in the old backgrounds. The operations themselves might be let out by concession so that the products could be sold to pay for the work.

The nature of the exhibits is such that many builders' supply concerns might be more than willing to contribute important material. For the new "Building Materials Gallery" in the Supervising Architect's office in Washington, manufacturers and building supply houses are said to have donated \$100,000 worth of material. In the case, however, of the Museum of American Architecture great care would need to be taken to exclude items of only commercial interest.

It would be quite possible to expand the activities of the Museum to include the related fields of city planning, landscape design and interior furnishing.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE MUSEUM

The Museum would constitute a unit of the National Park Service. It would be administered by a Director who would report directly to the Director of the bureau, and thus indirectly to the Secretary of the Interior. He would be an architect with special experience in the field of historic architecture, as would most of the staff. All would pursue original lines of research for publication by the Museum.

The Director of the Museum would be guided in general policy and in the acceptance of donations by an Advisory Council appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, of persons of recognized standing in the field of historic architecture or specially related museum activities.

The activities of the Museum would be financed by Congressional appropriation and by private gift.

Notice of Meeting of The Board of Directors

THE next meeting of The Board of Directors of The Institute will be held at The Octagon, in Washington, D. C., on December 10, 11, and 12.

Members and Chapters having matters for the

attention of The Board should address communications to The Secretary of The Institute, at The Octagon, for delivery there not later than December 5—as the agenda will be closed as of that date.

CHARLES T. INGHAM, *Secretary.*

Highlights of the Gulf States Conference

BY RALPH BRYAN, A. I. A.

WITH the Texas Centennial Central Exposition as the meeting place, the President of The Institute and two Regional Directors as drawing cards, and the North Texas Chapter as hosts, sixty or more of the profession met at Dallas on October 16 and 17 for an entirely successful Regional Conference of the Gulf States District. The invitations advertised the conference as an informal one. "The main purpose is to get together, discuss conditions and future prospects of the profession, have a good time and see the Texas Centennial." And so it was.

The conference was the joint idea of President Voorhees, and Walter C. Sharp, president of the North Texas Chapter, with Moise Goldstein, director of the Gulf States District seconding the plan. It was felt by these officers that the occasion would offer a fine opportunity to feel the pulse of the profession in the district at the close of the "Dark Ages," and also might serve to stimulate the members to better and closer cooperation and understanding as they prepare for better times. In his final words to the meeting, President Voorhees stated that in his opinion the conference had more than fulfilled these hopes.

The first morning's meeting began with the registration of members, the South Texas Chapter showing the largest delegation of out-of-Dallas architects.

Mr. Sharp presided and introduced Mr. Otto H. Lang, "dean of Dallas architects," who welcomed the visitors. This was followed by introductions of the National, Regional and Chapter officers present.

Mr. Goldstein, Regional Director of the Gulf States District, then addressed the meeting. He pointed out that Texas and Arkansas, two of the District's states, were among the ten remaining states in the country which did not have registration laws. He urged that future efforts be made to enact registration laws in these states, pointing out the need of educating the public as a step towards gaining such legislation. He stressed the value of the architect's active participation in the public and civic affairs of his community. Such

work, he said, would very definitely impress the public with the function of the architect in the development of the community.

Mr. Goldstein and Mr. Voorhees outlined the "open forum" discussion that was the program for the following day's business and asked for suggested subjects. Mr. Voorhees urged in this respect that the members be frank in their criticisms, if any, of Institute policies, so that he might take back to the Executive Committee an honest cross section of membership opinion from the region.

The first morning's session was closed by Mr. Roy E. Lane with a paper on the "Architecture and the Architects of the Centennial Buildings," ending with the introductions of the architects themselves.

The final morning session which was, in the main, an open forum discussion, was presided over by Mr. Goldstein. The following subjects were introduced by the speakers named and discussed freely from the floor:

"Membership" - - - - -	Goldwin Goldsmith
"Place of Meetings" - - - - -	Joseph W. Holman
"The H. O. L. C." - - - - -	Pierre Blouke
"Small Housing" - - - - -	Richmond H. Shreve
"State Registrations Laws" - -	Joseph W. Holman

On the subject of membership, Professor Goldsmith introduced a resolution, which was unanimously passed, that the several chapters represented amend their by-laws to establish the class of "Junior Associate" membership.

Mr. Holman urged that it be the sense of the meeting to hold as many conventions away from Washington as the funds of The Institute would allow, at least that alternate meetings be so held.

Mr. Pierre Blouke, Architectural Advisor to the Home Owners Loan Corporation gave a most illuminating discussion of the work of the H.O.L.C. and the Federal Home Loan Bank System in the field of Small Housing. He pointed out that it was not only an opportunity, but practically the duty of the profession as well, to work out a program for the large scale solution of the small house problem. He pointed out the large increase in small house construction that has been prophesied

for the coming year and the opportunity it presented to the younger architects of the country. He said further that his organization stood ready to work with any group of architects that would develop or make available small house plans suitable for their respective localities.

Mr. Richmond H. Shreve, director of the New York District and former Chairman of The Institute's Housing Committee, continued the discussion of small houses. He stated that the lending agencies and even the speculative builders were becoming more and more cognizant of the value of the services of architects, which meant better planning and better construction. He admitted that small house planning was the orphan child of the architect's work, earnestly courted in hard times, only to be put aside when work improved. He urged that the architect take advantage of his present favorable position by placing himself definitely in the picture along with the owner, the lender and the builder.

Mr. Voorhees pointed out that while The Institute had withdrawn its endorsement of the Small House Service Bureau, it stood ready to enthusiastically endorse any pattern that might be developed based on architectural service rather than the selling of plans.

The discussion on State Registration Laws was begun by Mr. Holman, who urged passage of laws in Texas and Arkansas, and described the process by which such a bill was finally passed in Tennessee. The floor was soon given over to Mr. Lester N. Flint, who as chairman of the Registration Committee of the combined Texas Chapters, has for a number of years been an aggressive leader of the cause. In his usual inimitable manner, Mr. Flint told of the work he and his committee had done and the reasons for the repeated failure of the bill in the Texas legislature. He believed that the ultimate passage of the bill rested solely upon the influence the individual members could bring to bear upon their respective legislators. Mr. Ollie Lorehn of Houston, past Regional Director, spoke of having worked for the passage of registration laws as early as 1897. Free discussion of the subject from the floor developed.

President Voorhees then was given the floor and in his well-known manner gave a delightful and authoritative discussion of The Institute's

position regarding the many points raised during the meeting. Space allows only some quotations from the talk, which was, to say the least, inspirational, and most enthusiastically received. His talk was, in general, in answer to the question "What does The Institute do for its members?" but happily covered far more ground.

Answering the question, Mr. Voorhees said:

"The Institute, as I see it, is a group of men who are concerned professionally with rendering services—men who have set up certain ideals surrounding the practice of architecture—men who uphold the standards, who make the name 'architect' a title of honor and integrity. Let us hope these ideals will always be beyond what we can attain at the moment. If this is the case, we will always be moving forward."

On the question of private versus bureau architects on public work:

"The Public Works Committee of The Institute has been directed to endeavor to work out a mutually satisfactory plan for providing architectural services on federal buildings. This committee has been in conference with representatives of the Treasury Department almost a year and a half. Certain principles have been arrived at. We recognize that there is a place for the official, as well as the private architect. We must find some means for the selection of architects. One of the complaints of the Bureau chiefs in Washington is that, due to political pressure, it is often difficult to determine which architects should be selected."

About the small house:

"Similarly, in this matter of the small house—we may be able to work out a general pattern, but the application is a local undertaking. We are reversing the process in this case. We are hoping that the various groups throughout the country will indicate a plan which may be officially set out for the information and support of state and local activities."

Back to the first question again:

"So—answering the question that Mr. Sharp raised: 'What does The Institute do for its members?' What The Institute does for its members is to improve the field in which they practice, secure the enactment of registration laws—another is the work that we are doing on the small house

question; another is the effort and intensive support given to the matter of standards—standard laws—standard rules—recommended standards that are issued by the Department of Commerce.

"These are only a few ways in which The Institute improves the field of architectural practice. It seems to me that the higher the standards are raised in the field of architecture—and the more development that is made in the profession—the better chance the competent architect has.

"What we need is men who believe in The Institute. Men who will do their part in the job of advancing the practice of architecture."

And finally:

"I am going to take back to New York with me, a lot of valuable suggestions which have been made here—and certainly a clearer picture of the practice of architecture as it exists here in the Gulf States. You will, I am sure, see some results of your suggestions which will be taken before The Board."

The conference ended with a luncheon at the Centennial Club.

The Centennial Architects.

The permanent buildings, which are probably the most impressive part of the great Texas Centennial Exposition at Dallas, stand not only as most creditable architecture in themselves but as monuments to the coordination possible between individual architects and groups of architects.

In the building of the Exposition, which because of the time element was carried on under tremendous pressure, a large number of agencies were involved. The permanent buildings were built by the Exposition Commission itself, the City of Dallas, and the State of Texas, while semi-permanent buildings were built by the Federal Government and certain private enterprises. In addition to these, of course, there were the many temporary buildings built by private exhibitors and concessionaires.

It was necessary of course to correlate these numerous projects to the ground plan of the Exposition as well as to a general architectural motif. This work was done by the Exposition's own architectural staff under the guidance of Mr. George L. Dahl. The work of designing the eight City of Dallas structures was distributed by the Park Board among a wide and representative selection

of local architects who were appointed to work in groups on the buildings for which they were chosen.

And finally as to the State Building, a structure costing \$1,200,000.00 and dominating the main esplanade, eleven architectural firms worked together on its design and construction with, we must add, a surprising amount of harmony.

Mr. Roy E. Lane of the North Texas Chapter addressed the Conference on the subject of the Centennial architecture. The substance of his remarks, which give proper credit to the architects of Texas, is reported as follows:

"The subject I am going to speak upon briefly is the architecture of the Centennial and its architects.

"Now I imagine you all feel that you are as well, or perhaps better, qualified to judge the merits or demerits of the architecture and design of the Exposition as I am. So I will leave you to draw your own conclusions as to the quality of design and will confine my talk principally to the architects rather than the architecture of the Centennial.

"First, a brief statement as to the Texas Centennial itself. It is a fact, whether the boys from the east will admit it or not, that we have in Texas architects and designers who can hold their own with the best in the country. The Centennial celebration has given them a chance to 'strut their stuff.' Their accomplishments speak for themselves but I want to impress upon the meeting the fact that the Centennial buildings not only here at the Central Exposition in Dallas, but at the several other celebrations in other localities in Texas, were handled by Texas architects. When the State decided to celebrate its centennial with an exposition, different Texas cities were considered for the central exposition and Dallas was selected. Other cities are holding different forms of celebrations and entertainments commemorating the one hundred years of Texas independence, all of which are exceedingly interesting and exemplify the historic incidents and natural resources peculiar to their own localities.

"Here in Dallas at the Central Exposition the construction work was handled by three correlated groups or agencies: The Texas Centennial Central Exposition Commission, the State of Texas through

its Board of Control, and the City of Dallas by its Park Board.

"The Texas Centennial Central Exposition through its staff of experts handled the general layout of the grounds and buildings, and on the preliminary exposition plan Mr. Paul P. Cret was called in as Consultant. The architectural staff of the Texas Centennial was headed by Mr. George L. Dahl, one of the architects of Dallas, who as head of a large staff was responsible for the final development of the plan, the design of the exhibit buildings and the remodeling of the existing State Fair structures. Mr. Dahl and his assistants did a tremendous job, working day and night for months in preparation, and in spite of almost universal predictions to the contrary the Exposition was opened on the date scheduled, less than one year from the starting of construction. Assisting Mr. Dahl were Mr. D. F. Coburn, H. A. Overbeck, and Roy K. Hamberlin of Dallas, as well as the talented young designer, Donald Nelson, to mention only a few of his enormous staff.

"The Dallas Park Board, acting for the City of Dallas, was another agency through which those permanent buildings which make Dallas' future Community Center, were designed and executed. In handling their volume of work Mr. W. Brown Fowler of Dallas, acting as the architect for the Park Board, coordinated the \$3,500,000.00 construction program of this agency. These different buildings were designed entirely by Dallas architects. The architects were selected first by personal interviews with the Park Board members, followed by a very careful consideration of the ability and experience of each, the commissions for the separate buildings then being allotted to those groups or firms considered most fit to handle it. The buildings in this group, with their cost and their designers, are as follows:

"The Museum of Fine Arts, costing \$455,000 was designed by DeWitt & Washburn, H. M. Greene, LaRoche & Dahl, Ralph Bryan and Henry Coke Knight with Paul P. Cret as Consultant. The Museum of Natural History, costing \$250,000 was designed by Mark Lemmon, Clyde Griesenbeck and John Dana and Frank Keen. The Museum of Horticulture, costing \$89,000 was designed by Arthur E. Thomas and M. C. Kleuser. The Museum of Domestic Arts, costing \$80,000 was

designed by Anton F. Korn and Joe Pitzinger. The Aquarium, costing \$350,000 was designed by H. B. Thompson, Fooshee & Cheek and Flint & Broad. The Band Shell, costing \$130,000 was designed by W. Scott Dunne and George Christensen. The Municipal Fire and Police Station was designed by Bertram C. Hill. The Pools and Fountains, costing \$100,000, were handled by Clarence C. Bulger, T. J. Galbraith and F. J. Woerner. The entrance gates were designed by Lang & Wittchell.

"The Texas State Building, in which this meeting is now being held, was built by the State of Texas through its Board of Control and designed by a group of Texas architects, organized under the title of 'Texas Centennial Architects, Inc.' The personnel of this group was as follows: Ralph Bryan, Adams & Adams, DeWitt & Washburn, Flint & Broad, Fooshee & Cheek, T. J. Galbraith, Anton F. Korn, Mark Lemmon, Walter C. Sharp, Arthur E. Thomas, and H. B. Thomson. This building was started in the summer of 1935 and was opened to the public on Sept. 5, 1936.

"Now you can readily see that the harmonious cooperation of all these architects was necessary to complete such a gigantic project in such a short time, and the successful fulfillment of so many diverse ideas speaks wonders for the adaptability, as well as the ability of Texas architects.

"One thought I want to reiterate is the fact that the buildings of the Texas Centennial celebrations, wherever held, were designed by Texas architects and built by Texas contractors. Look it over—compare it with Chicago's Century of Progress—Cleveland's Great Lakes Exposition and all the others of this last decade. Bear in mind that other Expositions have drawn what was considered the best architectural talent from the entire country. Personally, I had no part in the building of this Exposition, having been in government employ since before it was started, so I feel that I can consistently voice my personal opinion.

"My honest opinion is that the Texas State Building is the equal in beauty and effectiveness of any monumental building in the country. And the view at night from the west end of the Lagoon, down the Esplanade with the fountains, the color effects and the State Building in the distance is beautiful beyond description. Be sure to view the

Centennial at night and, remember, it is all the handiwork of Texas Architects.

"The Texas Centennial is a state-wide celebration and other cities have their own especial attractions—all of them interesting. San Antonio with its old world atmosphere and its historic old missions—Fort Worth with its Frontier Centennial—

Houston with its San Jacinto Battlefield—the celebrations at Gonzales, Fort Parker and many others—all awaiting your pleasure and entertainment. You should see them all, and after you have seen them all, or at least all that you have time to see—just remember that it is a show put on for the entire country by Texas and by Texans."

Art Exhibition in Washington

Through the courtesy of Edward Bruce, Honorary Member of The Institute and Chief of the Section of Painting and Sculpture in the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, the following notice is printed. It is also intended as an invitation cordially extended to all members of the profession who may be in Washington during the period of the Exhibition.

THE Treasury Department Art Program is opening an exhibition of mural designs, a large number of completed murals, sculpture models and completed sculpture, and scale models of rooms showing completed mural schemes, at the Corcoran Gallery of Art on November 17. This exhibition will continue until December 17.

It represents the results of two years of effort and extensive cooperation on the part of the Supervising Architect's Office with the painters and sculptors of America, for the purpose of securing the best American art for the decoration of public buildings.

A purpose of almost equal importance which the Government has in mind, is the encouragement, support and the securing of jobs for capable, professional American artists. Architects can help in this, not only because their opportunities are so wide-spread in the employment of painters and sculptors, but also on account of their professional

understanding and sympathy with the problems involved.

The success of art in this country depends largely on the amount of private work which can be given to artists. A number of artists have already obtained private commissions as a result of work done under the various government projects.

This exhibition represents many artistic schools and points-of-view. It is hoped that architects, in sympathy with the aims of this exhibition, will be instrumental in assisting other artists now in government employ in obtaining private commissions.

It is hoped that all architects in the vicinity of Washington will take advantage of the opportunity to view this exhibition. Suggestions, questions, criticisms and requests for details concerning the exhibit and the names of individual artists, should be addressed to Mr. Edward Bruce, Room 411, Procurement Division, 7th and D Streets, Southwest, Washington, D. C.

