THE OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects

The President's Message
The National Technological Civil Protection Committee
The Education of The Modern Architect
Scholarships—With the Chapters

Volume 13 MARCH 1941 Number 3

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

THE OCTAGON, WASHINGTON, D. C.

OFFICERS, 1940-1941

President ..... EDWIN BERGSTROM, 3757 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Cal.
Vice-President ..... WALTER R. MACCORNACK, Cambridge, Mass.
Secretary ..... CHARLES T. INGHAM, 1211 Empire Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Treasurer ..... JOHN R. FUGARD, 520 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

REGIONAL DIRECTORS

For One Year (1940-1941)

CLAIR WILLIAM DITCHY, 333 State Street, Detroit, Mich. (Great Lakes Dist.)
ROBERT K. FULLER, 503 Insurance Building, Denver, Colo. (Western Mountain Dist.)
EDMUND RANDOLPH PURVES, Architects' Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (Middle Atlantic Dist.)

For Two Years (1940-1942)

BENEDICT FARRAR, 1367 Arcade Building, St. Louis, Mo. (Central States Dist.)
GORDON B. KAUFMANN, 627 S. Carondelet Street, Los Angeles, Cal. (Sierra Nevada Dist.)
J. FRAZER SMITH, 404 Goodwin Institute, Memphis, Tenn. (Gulf States Dist.)
RUDOLPH WEAVER, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla. (South Atlantic Dist.)

For Three Years (1940-1943)

PETER BRUST, 135 W. Wells Street, Milwaukee, Wisc. (Illinois-Wisconsin Dist.)
H. DALAND CHANDLER, 75 Newbury Street, Boston, Mass. (New England Dist.)
CLEMENT R. NEWKIRK, 258 Genesee Street, Utica, N. Y. (New York Dist.)

State Association Director

For One Year (1940-1941)

LEIGH HUNT, 152 W. Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wisc.

THE OCTAGON, A Journal of The American Institute of Architects. Published Monthly by The American Institute of Architects. Executive and Publication Offices, The Octagon, 1741 New York Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. Twenty-five Cents the Copy. $1 per year. (Foreign $2.) Checks or Money Orders should be made payable to The American Institute of Architects. All communications should be sent to The Secretary. Entered as second-class matter, February 9, 1929, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C.

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.

The President's Message

DURING this month of March this nation has moved swiftly in its defense program. The transparent film that hitherto has veiled our intentions has been cast aside, and the course we intend to take now stands frankly revealed. Our passive defense has become boldly belligerent, and whatever defense measures we take from now on must embitter those who are not favored.

If at last our intentions have been so clearly defined, we are still being dulled by the soft words of those who mold our destinies. We are completely unaroused as to the seriousness of our undertaking. It seems to be but another adventure. We do not comprehend there can be no quick ending of this world-wide clash of ideologies, and that many long devastating years must elapse before the issue is decided.

We are presently furnishing those whom we favor with money, ships, planes, and food, wanting to believe that kind of support will decide the struggle. We are not yet told that these products of our abundance will be insufficient, and that those who are now marching into our defense camps and those who follow them will be marching on other shores before the struggle is ended. Do not be misled into fears that continental United States will be invaded.

What a pity we do not realize what we are facing, the sacrifices we will have to make, the suffering we will have to undergo before we have finished our undertaking! What a pity we do not heed the lessons of Poland, Norway, France, and the Balkans, and what led to their swift undoing and absorption by a form of government we do not believe in!

What a pity that we continue to look upon our defense measures as means of making profits!

Until we change that attitude of mind and make sacrifices and endure suffering for the principles of living we believe in, we will not have done our part in the defense of our nation.

The Seventy-third convention of The Institute to be held in Yosemite Valley, California on May 17, 18 and 19, with the concluding dinner session at the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles on May 21 is an assured success.

At this early date reservations have been made by architects of the east to fill the special train which will leave Chicago at 10 A.M. on Monday, May 12.

The Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway officials have assured us of modern equipment and of ample accommodations. It is essential to have all reservations in hand *by April 30* at the latest.

It will be of great assistance to those in charge of the arrangements, and to the Santa Fe, if members of The Institute and of the profession at large who plan to make this trip to attend the convention will act now by sending their reservations to the Secretary at The Octagon.

Give the names of the members of your party and indicate the type of accommodation desired on the convention train, as described on page 9 of the January Octagon. Please keep in mind that your round trip railroad ticket must be purchased from your local railroad agent.

A form of reservation blank was included in the January number of The Octagon. If you are going, fill it out in detail and forward to Washington. Additional copies are obtainable if needed.

EDWIN BERGSTROM,
President

The National Technological Civil Protection Committee

THIS committee sprang into being as the result of conferences between the War Department and W. D. Binger, Civil Engineer. The Secretary of War agreed to appoint to this committee a member from all branches of engineering and architectural practice. The committee consists of the following:

H. E. Jordan, American Water Works Association

J. L. Walsh, American Society of Mechanical Engineers

Scott Turner, American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.

W. H. Carrier, American Society of Heating and Ventilating Engineers.

Abel Wolman, American Public Health Association

A. B. Ray, American Institute of Chemical Engineers

F. G. Frost, American Institute of Architects

E. M. Hastings, American Railway Engineering Association

W. Cullen Morris, American Gas Association

J. C. Parker, American Institute of Electrical Engineers

W. D. Binger, American Society of Civil Engineers, Chairman

This committee has now been completely organized and has had a number of meetings.

The National Technological Civil Protection Committee has adopted a set of objectives of which No. 1 is a direct quotation from the Secretary of War's statement when the Committee was created.

1. The performance of the functions granted to the Committee by the Secretary of War, specifically as follows:

(a) "Assist the War Department in technical matters relating to the collection, evaluation and dissemination of information of value in the protection of civilians and vital civilian installations in time of war.

(b) "Furnish to the War Department technical information that the Committee deems of value to the War Department and to the Nation in matters concerning the protection of the civilian population from air and other attack in time of war.

(c) "Receive from the War Department pertinent information of the very latest successful methods employed abroad to safeguard civilian communities against air and other attack."

2. The determination of the experience for carrying on civil life under the stress of war and the studying of facilities required by others.
3. The dissemination by the Committee to the War Department and to its parent organizations of the probable results of such experience in terms of American engineering practice and civil life and activities.
4. The orderly listing of the most important problems still unsolved with respect to civilian protection.
5. The selection of those problems most pressing and the stimulation of the machinery required for their solution.

The War Department is now preparing pamphlets in draft stage referring to protective construction, chemical warfare, fire protection, etc. These drafts will be presented to this committee for minute examination and criticism. After revisions, the War Department will see to the publication of these pamphlets, which will be given wide circulation. They must be considered as tentative, for as better information is received from the War Department's representatives abroad, it will be promptly reflected in other editions.

Many questions which the committee has received have been referred to the War Department and we expect the answers to them very shortly.

In order to understand the background of this work it is necessary to realize that until late last Autumn the General Staff Organization included nothing on civilian defense. In previous military operations this was not a problem except where the Army was operating. In October the War Department organized a Civil Defense Section as part of the General Staff's G-3 (Plans and Operations) Branch. It is with them that this committee is in direct and constant communication. Representatives of General Staff's G-3 are also present at the committee's sessions.

The civil engineers are well organized for the reception and dissemination of information pertinent

to Civil Protection. The other societies represented on the committee are following lines similar to those of the civil engineers.

President Bergstrom believes The Institute should use our existing machinery for this dissemination of material and has notified the Regional Directors that they would be the personnel through which such information concerning civilian defense would be communicated to the profession. Inquiry concerning civilian defense may be made through the Regional Directors, who in turn will obtain from me the best answers possible.

FREDERICK G. FROST,
The National Technological Civil
Protection Committee.

The Education of the Modern Architect

BY DONALD DREW EGBERT

The following article is an interesting discussion of the philosophies that underlie the current teaching of architecture in our schools. See the symposium in the February OCTAGON.

ANY discussion of the problems of modern architecture inevitably centers around eclecticism—around the contemporary use, for the first time in history, of an almost infinite number of old or new architectural styles side by side. And this eclecticism of architectural style is both reflected in, and abetted by, the present-day existence of many conflicting varieties of architectural education, each with its own vociferous supporters. While the continued survival of all these competing points of view certainly shows that each of them must answer some contemporary human need, each must also represent only a limited answer to the problems of modern architecture. For if any one point of view offered a sufficiently broad and acceptable modern standard of architecture, it would be able to absorb the others to form a much more universally accepted criterion for modern architectural education than any that now exists.

Before investigating the possibility of bringing greater order into this contemporary chaos of eclecticism, it is necessary to understand why such eclecticism ever arose. In the first place, it arose because, in modern times, the two historically fundamental methods for training the architect—the apprentice system and the academic system—have come into direct opposition much more than ever before. In the second place, this opposition has been complicated and intensified by the rise, since the eighteenth century, of additional conflicting points of view largely peculiar to the present age. The conflict between many of the ideals of the Industrial Revolution and those of the Romantic Movement has often been pointed out. For since the eighteenth century, the utilitarian and scientific interest in the material world of nature fostered by the Industrial Revolution has always contrasted sharply with the very different emotional approach to nature so characteristic of the Romantic Movement. Furthermore, while our industrial civilization has tended to subordinate the individual to a society dominated by the machine, Romanticism has simultaneously continued to insist on the unique importance of the individual, whether from a democratic or a socialistic standpoint. And side by side with the utilitarian tendency to neglect the past in favor of the material gains of the present, there has persisted the Romantic tendency to deny the present and to idealize the past in a highly subjective and emotional way. As all these conflicting points of view will be found to have affected the training of the architect in various ways, it is not surprising that a chaotic eclecticism is prevalent in architectural education today.

In general, the types of architectural education can still be divided into groups on the basis of their attitude to the traditonal methods of training. First of all, there are those founded primarily on the apprentice system; secondly, those that are basically academic in method; and finally, those that seek to combine the advantages of both of these traditional approaches to architectural education. Within each of these three groups, however, there are smaller groups whose methods differ considerably one from

---

Note: Donald Drew Egbert is Assistant Professor, Department of Architecture, Princeton University.

another, largely because they have been variously affected by the conflicting modern attitudes toward nature, toward the individual, and toward the past, suggested above.

Under the apprentice system, as the name implies, the would-be architect serves as an apprentice to an architect, a builder, or a craftsman of experience. For the western world this system perhaps reached its peak when it produced the builders of the medieval castles and cathedrals. The apprentice system always tends to stress the importance of craftsmanship—that is to say, of the practical handling of the medium of the art. Now the medium of architecture consists of the solids and the voids which the architect can organize into useful sheltered space; consequently, the architect trained under the apprentice system is much more likely to be interested in the practical problem of enclosing useful space, than in arriving at any abstract canon of formal design, or in expressing some kind of content in architecture.[1]

Both form and content are likely to be neglected under the apprentice system unless standards for them are imposed by a strong traditional program of requirements, such as that which medieval Christianity imposed upon the mason builders of the Gothic cathedrals. Otherwise, as in the early medieval castles, the main interest of the craftsman architect is likely to be devoted to the practical use of materials and of the building—a primarily utilitarian approach to architecture that tends to ignore both artistic form and artistic content.

Until well into the nineteenth century the apprentice system remained almost the only method for training the architect in many countries, including England and the United States. In the United States, for example, the apprentice system was the only kind of professional architectural education readily available until after the Civil War, though since that time it has been almost completely supplanted by formal academic training. Because of the medieval heritage of the apprentice system, it is not surprising that a Romanticized version of it was adopted in the last century by the architects of the Gothic Revival, and it is worth noting that such recent or contemporary representatives of that Revival as Bertram Goodhue (the architect of the Chapel at the University of Chicago and of the Chapel at West Point), Ralph Adams Cram (architect of the Chapel and Graduate College at Princeton), and Charles Z. Klauder (architect of the "Cathedral of Learning" at the University of Pittsburgh), were all products of the apprentice system.

However, perhaps the most influential contributor to the survival and revival of apprentice methods was William Morris, the well-known and versatile designer, craftsman, poet, medievalist, and socialist. Morris, who played an important part in the work of the Arts and Crafts Exhibition Society which held its first exhibition in London in 1888, became the leading figure in the entire "arts and crafts" movement. This was largely a deliberate Romantic attempt to return to the principles of medieval art and medieval handicraft, but soon showed the influence of the academic point of view, for those principles shortly began to be taught in schools. Furthermore, to the love for things medieval, Morris and the arts and crafts movement added a new socialistic interest in the welfare of the craftsman, as well as a modern practical attitude toward the world of nature. Thus, while the ornament which Morris designed for book decoration, wall-paper, tapestries, etc., was basically inspired by Gothic foliate details and, like the original Gothic ornament, was produced by handicraft, it imitated to a much greater degree the specific foliate forms, etc., of the natural world. This modern interest of Morris in the physical facts of nature was further visible in his desire to express directly the specific nature of materials by means of their functional use, as exemplified by the definite expression of wood in the well-known Morris chair, named after him though actually found before his day. While Morris was not himself an architect, his own house—Red House,

[1] By the expression of content is meant merely what architects call "character"—i.e., the expression of the highest human function of a given building. Thus, if the building is to be a church, the architect will seek to express in it his interpretation of the spiritual values of religion in general, as well as those of the particular sect for which the building is erected. In a house, the universal significance of family life will be expressed as far as possible in relation to the character and needs of the specific family, or families, that are to live there. And if a factory is to be architecture, and not just building, it will express something of the architect's interpretation of the dignity of labor in general, and of the specific kind of labor in particular. A thoroughgoing discussion of medium, form, and content in architecture is contained in Theodore Greene's recent book, *The Arts and the Art of Criticism* (1940).

at Bexley Heath in Kent—was designed for him by his friend and associate, Philip Webb, in accord with his principles. This building vaguely recalls the informal picturesqueness of the medieval-revival architecture of the time, but with a frankly functional expression of brick and other materials that is strikingly modern in its utilitarian simplicity and directness.

The influence of Morris and the arts and crafts movement has persisted strongly—as for example, in the Wiener Werkstatte, that Viennese arts and crafts school which first acquired world-wide notice in the late nineteen-twenties. But the great importance of Morris' point of view has resulted mainly from his desire to express the use of materials directly, and also from his insistence upon the interrelation of art and society, because Morris took a humanitarian and socialistic point of view regarding work and art and their significance for human happiness. Though these ideas are still "modern," in some other respects Morris turned his back on modernity. The medieval handicraft methods, which he advocated largely as a means of restoring the human dignity so largely destroyed in the nineteenth century by the cruel dominance of industrial machinery over the worker, blinded him to the potentialities of the machine when properly controlled in the hands of an artist. For the machine, employed as a sort of super-tool, offers extraordinarily wide possibilities for new kinds of artistic expression.

These possibilities have been clearly recognized by Frank Lloyd Wright, who believes in a combination of the apprentice system with machine craft, rather than handicraft, and thus seeks to make artistic use of the practical and scientific methods introduced by the Industrial Revolution. It is worth noting that Wright himself had some education as an engineer, and that later his architectural training was of the apprentice variety, secured mostly in the office of a great rebel against the academic tradition, Louis Sullivan. At present Wright has what he terms a "Fellowship" of students at his home, Taliesin, Spring Green, Wisconsin, whom he trains as apprentices. However, instead of acquiring knowledge of mere handicraft, the students acquire first-hand understanding of modern machine-produced materials and of the practical solution of modern architectural problems through actual work in the field on Wright's own buildings. The elements of Wright's architecture, the forms which his students learn, are essentially the product of modern design arising from the use of strictly modern materials. "Form," says Wright, "is made by function but qualified by use." [2] At the same time, he never fails to subordinate formal design, the intellectual and aesthetic part of architecture, to the imagination of the architect; or, as he himself puts it, "Intellect is the tool of the imagination." [3] And Wright does not forget that the expression of content by means of architectural media and forms is the chief end of architecture, for one of his favorite sayings is that "architecture is the scientific art of making structure express ideas." [4]

The tremendous contemporary influence of Wright may undoubtedly be attributed to the fact that, in an age of narrow specialization, he himself has a broad standard of architecture, and one which gives due attention to all the aspects of a work of art—medium, form, and content—with the expression of content always as the chief end of architecture. Unlike the devotees of the arts and crafts movement and unlike the "Functionalists" of the so-called International Style, he never forgets that the architect is more than a craftsman, more than an engineer, and more than just a designer; consequently he never fails to make use of medium and form to seek an expressive end.

His great limitation, if so great an artist can be called limited, would seem to lie in his Romantic emphasis on the extreme individuality of the architect. He constantly repeats, "'Individuality is sacred." [5] And this confidence in the supreme importance of expressing artistic personality, a confidence that enabled him to survive years of comparative neglect in his own country, has sometimes led him to subordinate the adequate expression of social use in architecture to affirmation of his own personality; so that at times he has made self-expression an end in itself, rather than only a significant factor in true architectural expression.

Thus, the arts and crafts movement and the more truly modern point of view of Frank Lloyd Wright both show the influence of the apprentice system.

---

[2] F. L. Wright, *Modern Architecture* (Princeton, 1931), front end-paper.
[3] *Ibid.*, rear end-paper.
[4] *Ibid.*, rear end-paper.
[5] *Ibid.*, rear end-paper.

But in sharp contrast to the effect of the apprentice system on architecture today has been the influence of the other great traditional approach to architecture, the academic point of view. [6] In this, which is primarily Renaissance in origin though derived from a Roman-Classic heritage, the would-be architect is taught abstract and more-or-less rigid principles of formal design as the most important part of architectural education, rather than the practical craftsmanship emphasized by the apprentice system. These principles are not learned so much from an individual master who is served as an apprentice, as from books, or still better, at schools or academies where the principles contained in all the books have supposedly been digested by the professors in charge. Thus, under the academic system the student is not so restricted to the style of only a single master, as under the apprentice system. Nevertheless, the traditional academic rules of design are likely to become ends in themselves at the expense either of practical and economical shelter or of the architect's own creative expression of content. The academic architect too often becomes subordinate to rules unless he is an exceedingly strong and imaginative artistic personality—a Michelangelo, for example—who can adapt the canons of design to his own expressive ends.

Classic antiquity had always tended to rely upon principles of design in art, principles clearly expressed for us by Vitruvius, the one Roman architect whose writings have survived. These principles were carried further and made into a still more rigid canon by such authorities of the Renaissance as Alberti, Vignola, and Palladio. The historic fact that Alberti, the first well-known architectural writer of the Renaissance, was a humanist of considerable social position and not a horny-handed craftsman of medieval type, set a new precedent for the social standing of the architect, and for the decline of the architect as craftsman. Since his day, architects have been more and more often gentlemen who only designed on paper the edifices which were actually to be erected by practical contractors and builders.

[6] The word *academic* as here used is not intended to be derogatory, but mainly to suggest organized group training under several teachers, as opposed to the single master of the apprentice system.

The principles expounded by these Roman and Renaissance authors formed the basic doctrine of the first great architectural school still influential today —the French Academy School, founded under Louis XIV in the late seventeenth century. Like those authors, the Academy School combined a certain amount of interest in the practical and scientific use of materials and of space in architecture with an ever-increasing emphasis on formal design. Like them, too, it at first looked upon academic training, not as replacing the apprentice system, but as supplementing and culminating it.

However, the tendency toward specialization which began with the Industrial Revolution had a pronounced effect on the academic tradition in France, and consequently, throughout the rest of the world, for gradually the school training became so highly specialized that it required all of a student's time. Gradually, also, there began to split off from the Academy School various specialized educational units devoted to limited aspects of practical and scientific training, so that the parent School became more and more restricted in the scope of its teaching. Thus as early as 1747 the foundation of the Ecole des Ponts-et-Chaussées took away from the architect, for the first time in history, the design and building of bridges, highways, canals, etc., which were now turned over to a new kind of highly-trained specialist.

In 1793 at the end of the French Revolution, the royal Academies were all closed. However, the architectural school was re-founded in 1795 under the direction of the Institute at Paris which replaced the Academies, and in 1807 was combined with the official schools of painting and sculpture to form the Ecole des Beaux-Arts as we know it today. But before its refounding in 1795 the architectural school had been shorn of still more of its former functions, for the Ecole Polytechnique, the first important modern engineering school, was established in Paris in 1794 and assumed most of the study of structural problems formerly carried on at the Old Academy of Architecture. And not only the field of structure, but even that of design was soon to become increasingly circumscribed for the architects of France, by

the foundation in 1829 of the Ecole des Arts-et-Métiers, which removed from the hands of the architects those works that are today included under the name of "industrial design," and gave them over to yet another kind of specialist.

As a result of the founding of such new and specialized schools as these, the French academic tradition of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was able to continue only a comparatively small part of the functions and traditions of the original royal Academy School. The Ecole des Beaux-Arts retained and increasingly emphasized the old principle that the architect must always design his building with direct reference to the specific architectural program, or practical list of activities to be housed in the particular building. However, it also inherited the Louis XIV tradition that formal architectural composition must always be in accord with a rigid canon of Classic and Renaissance masonry forms—a canon which was to result in an inevitable decline in the influence of the French official tradition when the modern materials of steel and concrete began at last to receive architectural expression particularly in the years after the World War.

Despite the comparatively narrow limits of its French academic heritage, the Beaux-Arts did adopt enough of the utilitarian point of view of the nineteenth century to give additional importance to the practical use of enclosed space, while still seeking to make that space artistically expressive of the specific social purpose of the given building. The fact that the Ecole des Beaux-Arts thus developed for itself much additional practical convenience in planning, was sufficient to enable it to maintain the dominant place in architectural education throughout the practical-minded nineteenth century, despite its own comparative lack of interest in the use of new materials and new methods of construction.

Nearly all American schools today, as well as many of them elsewhere, show clearly the influence of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts. The period of its greatest dominance in the United States lasted from about the end of the Civil War until shortly after the World War. Richard Morris Hunt and Henry Hobson Richardson, the first Americans known to have studied at the Ecole, were students there shortly before, and during, the Civil War, and in the years immediately following they both achieved very large practices. During the same period the first architectural schools were founded in the United States and were based directly on the precedents offered by the Ecole des Beaux-Arts itself. The earliest of these was the architectural school at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a school established in 1865 with a French graduate of the Beaux-Arts to help teach architectural design. After M. I. T., additional schools of architecture and of fine arts more or less modelled on the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, were rapidly founded. The first American university to open a separate school of fine arts was Yale, in 1869. Meanwhile, in 1868 professional courses in architecture had already been established at the University of Illinois, shortly followed by those at Cornell in 1871, Syracuse in 1873, and Columbia in 1881. During the decade after 1890 the schools of the University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State College, George Washington University, Tulane, Harvard, Armour Institute, Notre Dame, and Ohio State University were all founded, and at present there are more than fifty institutions in this country giving professional architectural courses.

The great influence of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts on American ideals of architectural education can be attributed to the fact that it offered a definite standard for architecture at a time when standards were almost non-existent. And in a period when artistic standards tended to be engulfed by mere utility, the schools under the influence of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts never failed to maintain that architecture is an art.

However, the firm traditionalism which was the strength of the Beaux-Arts system was also its weakness. Not only were new materials and new programs still largely sacrificed to maintaining the increasingly outmoded Louis XIV traditions of Masonry design, but ever-growing emphasis was placed on the architectural drawing as an end in itself, rather than as a means to the end of erecting a building. That architectural drawing has a practical purpose tended to be forgotten in the process of making elaborately pretty pictures, with ever-widening divergence from the realities of actual building. Furthermore, the rigidity of the Beaux-Arts canon, which often tends to promulgate rules of design at the expense of the individuality of the

architect, became increasingly irksome in an age of individual specialization and Romantic self-expression. And finally, the circumscribed Classic-Renaissance tradition of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts prevented it from taking advantage of modern historical knowledge of the non-Classic past. For at the Ecole, study of architecture other than the Classic was included only incidentally as part of that general cultural training of the architect insisted on by Vitruvius and his Renaissance followers.

Because the Ecole failed to encourage much use of modern materials and of the forms that derive from them, its influence has tremendously decreased since the World War, a decrease that closely parallels the development of reinforced concrete, steel, and plate glass as favorite modern architectural materials. More and more of its leadership in architectural education has been lost to certain schools which are trying to reintegrate architecture into a really modern style. These new schools, of which the most influential has been the Bauhaus, seek to make use of modern media to achieve modern forms, and at the same time, to combine the advantages of the apprentice system with the school method of training.

The Bauhaus was founded by Walter Gropius at Weimar, Germany, in 1919 and moved to Dessau in 1925. It rapidly increased in fame and influence until the advent of the National Socialist party to power, when the ideas of the Bauhaus were proscribed as degenerate or Bolshevistic. Gropius had been a member of the Deutsche Werkbund, an association founded in 1907 in an effort to achieve a synthesis of the arts and crafts movement and machine production by means of effecting cooperation between artists and craftsmen on the one hand and industry on the other. "Let us," said Gropius in the first proclamation of the Weimar Bauhaus, "create a new guild of craftsmen."[7] At the Bauhaus the apprentice was to be taught not only handicraft, as in the arts and crafts schools, but machine-craft as well, for as Gropius clearly stated, "the Bauhaus believes the machine to be our modern medium of design and seeks to come to terms with it."[8] Like Frank Lloyd Wright, Gropius placed emphasis on machine design, but unlike Wright, he also gave direct importance to training in handicraft as a foundation from which the most promising students alone proceed to the study of architecture. In its modern version of the apprentice system, the Bauhaus stressed the practical and scientific treatment of both materials and space in architecture and hence was very definitely "Functionalistic" in its approach to architecture. "We want," said Gropius, "to create . . . an architecture whose function is clearly recognizable in the relation of its forms."[9] Thus, somewhat like the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, the Bauhaus always started from a very specific program of functional requirements for each particular building, but in solving the given program the Bauhas has not been restricted, as has the Beaux-Arts, to a narrow canon of traditional academic forms.

Nevertheless, design at the Bauhaus was not based on function alone. A new kind of formal composition, though very different from the Renaissance version predominant at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, grew out of that particular kind of formal design which in painting and sculpture is known as Cubism. The Bauhaus was led to Cubism partly by its love for simple forms inherited from the arts and crafts movement of William Morris and partly by the direct influence of the Dutch Cubist painter, Van Doesburg, who came to Weimar in 1922 and spent some time there. A further tendency toward Cubism resulted from the favorite architectural material of the Bauhaus, reinforced concrete, which, because of its poured and cast nature, is most easily treated in simplified cubistic shapes.

As the Bauhaus fell more and more under the influence of Cubism, a cubistic tradition of formal design was set up which tended to produce a new kind of traditional academicism of its own. Though Gropius himself has sought to deny this fact, nevertheless the catalogue which he helped edit for the Bauhaus exhibition in 1938 at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, mentions "the genuine unity of form which all Bauhaus products achieved in later years."[10] And in the same catalogue Gropius' former assistant, Joseph Albers—who now teaches at Black Mountain College in North Carolina—

[7] *Bauhaus, 1919-1928.* (The Museum of Modern Art, New York, 1938), p. 18.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 27.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 29.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

refers quite academically to the "basic laws of form." [11]

During the last few years since the closing of the Bauhaus by the Nazi government, the chief protagonists of its principles have exerted widespread influence, particularly in the United States. Gropius himself, who had withdrawn from the Bauhaus in 1928 to return to private practice, was appointed Senior Professor of Architecture at Harvard University in 1937.

The Bauhaus group of architects and designers has grown increasingly influential outside of Germany because it offers not only a standard of architecture which combines many of the advantages of the apprentice system with those of the academic approach to architecture, but a modern standard as well—one that uses modern materials in modern practical and scientific ways for the solution of modern programs. However, in spite of its many contributions to modern architecture, the work of the Bauhaus is not without its limitations. The tendency of the group to deny the validity of traditional materials and forms has often resulted in a self-conscious straining after novelty. By restricting themselves very often to the newly-developed structural materials of steel and reinforced concrete, the architects of the group have frequently narrowed their architectural range, a limitation further increased by their adherence to the baldly geometrical shapes of Cubism. While all architecture is, of course, based more-or-less on geometrically abstract forms, the Bauhaus group tends to use the stripped forms of Cubism for their own sake, rather than as a means to the real end of architectural expression.

Thus, in sharp contrast to the extremely personal style which, in the architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright, controls both medium and design, the Bauhaus, in practice if not in theory, frequently goes to the other extreme of subordinating the personal interpretation of the architect to mere structure, mere utility, and mere cubistic form. The result is that buildings designed on Bauhaus principles often seem very much alike, even when built for entirely different purposes by different architects. Hence it is not surprising that the buildings produced by the Bauhaus group are usually typical examples of the kind of architecture which is often known as the International Style, a term which itself implies that the architecture lacks individual, regional, and national character, and that the personality of the architect, the mode of life and the personality of his client or clients, and the geographical zone in which the building is to be built, have probably not been taken into adequate artistic account.

It becomes clear, then, that each of the chief contemporary influences in architectural education—the apprentice system, the arts and crafts movement, Frank Lloyd Wright, the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, the Bauhaus and the International Style—has made its own special contributions toward the formation of a new, but as yet unrealized modern style. At the same time, however, it is evident that each possesses its own specific limitations. The one limitation that all of them have in common is their failure to make significant use of modern knowledge of the history and tradition of past architecture, whether as a storehouse of the experience of the race or as a spur to the imagination of the architect for achieving a broadly acceptable modern style.

On the one hand, the more progressive architects such as those of the Bauhaus group, while rightly scorning that other contemporary tendency to copy the buildings and styles of the past, have themselves tended to deny the past. They have sought to deal with present-day architectural problems *in vacuo,* forgetting that the solution of any architectural problem, however modern, must inevitably show considerable indebtedness to previous solutions of similar problems and to previous treatments of similar materials and compositional forms. In failing to consider carefully the suggestive contributions which these already existing solutions can offer to the architect today, they have merely limited their architectural vocabularies.

The less progressive architects today, on the other hand, do make some use of the past. Many of the more individualistic and Romantically-minded architects range freely through the monuments of architectural history, using for their own whatever may strike their individual fancies. But the fundamental nature of architecture as a social art, and one that that should therefore express the life of its own particular age, is implicitly denied in the imitative and subjective work of such men. As for the academically-trained architects, it has been pointed out that too often they tend to neglect the past out-

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 118.

side of their own narrow version of the Classic and Renaissance tradition, so that their use of the past is at best a limited one.

It is true that most of the schools under the influence of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts do have some courses in the history of architecture as part of the tradition, inherited from Vitruvius and from the Renaissance, that the architect must be a man of liberal education. However, little real importance is attached to these courses, and actually the training in architectural design follows the limited principles of the French academic tradition, so that the lessons that could be learned from the remainder of historic architecture are neglected. This is true even in those schools which have unusually close connections with college or university departments of art history, such as the architectural school at Princeton, for example, which originated as an offshoot from a department of the history of art. For these schools, too, have been under strong influence from the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and are only beginning to take some advantage of the training in the history and evolution of architecture so easily available to them, even though a more fundamental synthesis of the academic approach with the historical approach would offer new advantages of its own. For in such a synthesis the emphasis placed on the importance of general principles of design for significant architectural expression could continue somewhat in the manner of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, but much broader principles could be arrived at through careful study of the historic prototypes from which even the most modern architectural problems have in some degree evolved.

Certainly this sort of coordination of different contemporary approaches to architecture seems to offer possibilities for the future. The growing success of such differing methods for architectural education as those of Frank Lloyd Wright and of the Bauhaus, for example, clearly suggests that the most successful kinds of architectural training today are those that attempt at least a partial integration of various modern points of view. And the fact that these partial syntheses have already become so influential in spite of their own limitations, further suggests that in a still more complete syntheses lie greater possibilities for achieving a truly modern architecture.

In such a synthesis, for example, the insistence of the Functionalist that the modern architect must be able to make practical use of modern materials and scientific methods might be combined with the academic point of view that architecture is an art as well as a craft and science. To these elements there might be added something of the Romantic glorification of the creative imagination of the individual architect, but given more social expression through emphasis on the importance of general principles derived from the past experience of the human race. And today our scientific knowledge of the historic evolution of architecture can enable us to achieve modern principles of much more universal validity than those of any previous age.

While it certainly would be undesirable to seek to arrive at any academically rigid combination of these different points of view, nevertheless there already exist indications that in some relative mean between all these extreme and specialized approaches to contemporary architecture—a mean which takes them all into account—lies the hope for a really modern architectural education. Undoubtedly, in the search for it, results must be slow and hybrid at first. Progress toward a greater unity can only be achieved by long trial and error, because the process of coordinating the complex elements which, uncoordinated, have produced eclecticism, is necessarily a difficult one. Yet in this way all the significant and unavoidable points of view of our own day, the very ones which have given rise to eclecticism itself, can be put to use in resolving the immense disorder of eclecticism into an organic and expressive modern style and into a thoroughly modern system of architectural education.

Annual Meeting of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture

THE annual meeting of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture has been scheduled for Chicago, May 10 and 11. The executive committee of the Association will meet May 9. The convention headquarters will be at the Stevens Hotel. Delegates and visitors to the Association meetings are urged to make their hotel reservations at an early date.

The A.I.A. Convention Special train will leave Chicago May 12. This will permit those attending the Association meetings to continue with The Institute convention delegates to the A.I.A. Convention in Yosemite Valley.

In order to assure train accommodations for those wishing to leave Chicago on the A.I.A. Convention Special, reservations should be made at once with Charles T. Ingham, Secretary, A.I.A., 1741 New York Avenue, Washington, D. C.

PAUL WEIGEL, *Secretary*

A Communication from the Society of Greek Professional Architects

TO THE ARCHITECTS OF ALL FREE NATIONS,

HONORED COLLEAGUES:

The situation in which Greece finds herself prompts us to address to you, the creators of the beautiful and the true, these lines, expressing the sentiments of your colleagues who live and build on the classic soil of Greece.

The liberty of thought which reigned in the Republic of Athens was the most propitious atmosphere in antiquity for the florescence and evolution of the arts and sciences, and most particularly of architecture, which attained its highest perfection in Greece. The King and the government of our country, having these attainments in mind, jealously defended our peace and our liberty, which they fostered for the progress and the well-being of the fatherland.

Under these conditions we lived in peace, going about our daily business, when, suddenly, by brutal aggression a treacherous tyrant attempted to crush our nation and deprive its people of their liberty, that cherished liberty restored to us through the undaunted struggle and heroic sacrifices of our forefathers.

It is, then, in the defense of Liberty, sole Protectress of the products of human thought, that we have taken up arms.

Fortunately, the consciousness of being in the right increases the power of the weak, and thus Greece, with its 9,000,000 inhabitants, gained the initiative soon after the outbreak of the war, against an adversary of upwards of 45,000,000 people.

In spite of our successes, however, we do not consider it unnecessary, honored Colleagues, to lay before you our protest against this unjust attack; and at the same time we ask you, in the name of Liberty, to champion our cause, in your intimate circles as well as with your professional colleagues, in the full knowledge that our struggle is only to preserve our independence.

Feeling certain that you will raise your voices in support of the liberty of a small nation, we address to you, honored Colleagues, our most distinguished salutations.

ANDREW KRIEZIS,
Vice President.

JOHN ANTONIADES,
Secretary.

Scholarships

The Kate Neal Kinley Memorial Fellowship—1941-1942.

By authority of the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois the Committee in charge announces the tenth annual consideration of candidates for the Kate Neal Kinley Memorial Fellowship.

The Fellowship yields the sum of one thousand

dollars which is to be used by the recipient toward defraying the expenses of a year's advanced study of the Fine Arts in America or abroad.

Requests for application blanks should be addressed to Dean Rexford Newcomb, College of Fine and Applied Arts, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, not later than May 15.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

A scholarship of six hundred dollars is offered in the academic year 1941-42 for a *special student* in the fourth or the fifth year of the course in Architecture at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. This will be awarded as the result of a competition in design under the direction of the Committee on Design of the School of Architecture.

The competition is open to citizens of the United States of good character, who are between twenty-one and twenty-eight years of age, and who have had at least three years of office experience.

The competition will be held May 3-12.

For information address Dean Walter R. MacCornack, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Members Elected, Effective March 7, 1941

Chapter and Name	*Chapter and Name*	*Chapter and Name*	*Chapter and Name*
ALBANY	CENTRAL NEW YORK	NORTH CAROLINA	ST. LOUIS
Turpin Chambers Bannister	Leo Edward Considine	Roger Carolton McCarl	Roy O. Chaffee
BOSTON	CHICAGO	NORTH TEXAS	William Arnold Grolock
Gustav Adolf Hagen	Richard James Barr, Jr.	C. O. Chromaster	Paul Opher Klingensmith
BUFFALO	Harford Field	NORTHWESTERN PENNA.	SOUTH TEXAS
Charles Irwin Thiele	Noel Leslie Flint	Edward Stuart Phillips	Clarence Alfred Johnson
CENTRAL ILLINOIS	DAYTON	Joseph Anton Schmid	WASHINGTON, D. C.
Carl Eduard Bretscher	Freeman A. Pretzinger	OKLAHOMA	Marion Leroy Bagley
Philip Trutter	Harry I. Schenck	Herschel Elarth	Dan Kirkhuff
CENTRAL TEXAS	Ellasson Smith	PITTSBURGH	WASHINGTON STATE
Harold Everett Jessen	DETROIT	Edwin Howard, Jr.	Lester P. Fey
Charles Augustus Millhouse	Roger Bailey	Marshall Gardner Lindsay	
	Louis Rossetti	Kenneth Howard Saylor	

Summer Program in City and Regional Planning

The School of Architecture of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the American Planning and Civic Association are again sponsoring a short summer course in City and Regional Planning. The course is arranged to meet the requirements of students and teachers of planning or related professions, technicians in practice and members of planning boards or housing authorities. The following are details of courses to be offered this summer:

The Program will be divided into four sections as follows: *City and Regional Planning, Planning Legislation, Planning Administration,* and *Techniques of Planning.* Each section will consist of a series of lectures and discussions, arranged in such a way that those wishing to participate may register in one or more without duplication of subject matter or loss of continuity. The seminars will cover such subjects as, zoning, subdivision control, traffic problems, master plans for communities and regions, housing, recreation, roadside improvement, the powers and duties of planning and zoning agencies. Recognition will be given to the new demands made on the planning profession by the requirements of the Defense Program. Opportunities will be provided for the study of design or research problems under supervision.

Applications for participation in the Program should be sent to Professor Frederick J. Adams, M. I. T. School of Architecture, Cambridge, Mass., not later than July 1, 1941.

A Correction

FEBRUARY NUMBER OF THE OCTAGON, PAGE 18

ON that page appears the statement of Professor Weigel, Head of the Department of Architecture of the Kansas State College, concerning the philosophy of teaching which governs the architectural school of that College.

In printing the February OCTAGON—in the transition from galley proof to page proof—two lines were omitted from the statement at the beginning of the second paragraph. The resulting break in continuity is self-evident. Those who keep a permanent file of THE OCTAGON are requested to make a correction by inserting the following words at the beginning of the second paragraph.

"He will learn to face realities; develop a consciousness of contemporary social and economic . . ."

The corrected paragraph will then read in full as follows:

"He will learn to face realities; develop a consciousness of contemporary social and economic needs; become acquainted with materials, old and new, and with their uses; develop a sense ot structure; and eagerly acquire a ready facility to express his thoughts graphically."

The surplus and file copies of THE OCTAGON have been corrected. It is requested that the above be used as an erratum slip for all outstanding copies.

With the Chapters

NEWS NOTES FROM CHAPTER SECRETARIES

Buffalo.

A combination dinner and meeting was held in the University Club on February 25. It was well attended and lively discussion took place on publicity, legislation and defense programs. Guest speakers were Mr. Redmond and Mr. Sturges, president and secretary, respectively, of the Building Trades Council, who appealed for better cooperation between labor, contractors and architects to result in better, more efficient and economical construction. The Buffalo Chapter is to appoint two members to meet with representatives of the above group to formulate a program to aid in the defense program and set up a post-war program.

A. H. Hopkins was appointed chairman of the newly founded Architects' Committee on Civilian Defense of Buffalo and Western New York with P. Harbach, M. A. Wolfe, M. J. Murphy, and W. A. Cannon acting with him. The group will study proposed civilian and workers air-raid shelter housing to meet increased national defense demand and camouflaging of industrial plants.

Chairman Kideney of the Legislative Committee is doing a fine job and presented a resume of bills now before the State Assembly affecting the welfare of the profession.

Chairman Harbach is preparing a program of publicity for the year and contemplated raido programs to explain the need for professional services. An active year is in store for the chapter.

GEORGE DICK SMITH, JR., *Secretary*

New York.

The Hon. Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Mayor of the City of New York, was the guest of honor of the New York Chapter on February 25, when the Chapter celebrated the 84th Anniversary of its founding. Dinner at the Architectural League, preceded by a reception was attended by 130 members and friends. The occasion for the Mayor's presence was his induction into Honorary Associate Membership in the Chapter. William Adams Delano, F.A.I.A., cited the Mayor as "architect of the City's destinies." Mr. LaGuardia, thanking his "fellow architects," said that in contrast to the many honors given him as chief executive of the city, he considered this one as peculiarly and personally his own, from "those who create to one who wants to create." A certificate of membership was presented to him by Chapter President Frost.

Clarence S. Stein, F.A.I.A., and former chairman of the New York State Commission on Housing

and Planning, was awarded the Chapter's Medal of Honor, for his contribution to the field of low-cost housing. Philip L. Goodwin, F.A.I.A., member of the Medal Jury, cited the profound studies carried on by Mr. Stein over the past 20 years, of the sociological as well as architectural aspects of housing as a valuable and influential contribution to this important civic problem. This medal is given by the Chapter for distinguished work and high professional standing.

The U. S. Architects' Fund for R.I.B.A., initiated by the Chapter, reports receipts at this writing of $1,779.00. The committee had hoped, perhaps optimistically, to be able to report a much larger amount by now. The worthiness of the cause needs no stressing, and contributions are of course allowable tax deductions. Donations of from $1 to $5 or more were invited, and the great majority of contributions so far have been for $1 and $2. Expenses of the Fund have been kept at a minimum and are being absorbed by the members of the committee in order that the entire amount collected may be sent to our British colleagues and their families. Thus the usual practice of sending out letters of acknowledgement has been abandoned. The committee would like to express, through the pages of THE OCTAGON, its acknowledgement of all amounts received, and particularly its appreciation for the cooperation of the State Associations and the other Chapters, and the many kind letters of approval and encouragement which have come from all parts of the country. The Fund will close in a few weeks.

FREDERICK J. WOODBRIDGE, *Secretary*

Southern California.

The dinner meeting at the Clark Hotel on February 11 was a lively gathering and well attended. George Meredith, who has spoken to us before, brought a clear and interesting picture of "Public Relations." He defined the subject in a manner that made it understandable and human. The tremendous possibilities of a broad, well planned program and the opportunities open to the profession were cited. Public Relations is the aristocrat of the publicity family and is concerned with policies, ideas and trends. It is the planning of a program and employs the radio, press, and the other members of the publicity family to carry out the ideas it has hatched.

Allan Herrick, advertising director of the Security-First National Bank and his assistant Mr. George Knight were guests of the Chapter. They were thanked for their efforts to publicize the Architect in the booklet on homes, soon to be published by the Bank. Mr. Herrick told of the bankers' decision to improve the public's opinion of the banker through a public relations program. Incidentally they embarked on this radical course some twenty-five years ago.

Dean Arthur C. Weatherhead, of U.S.C. Architectural School, introduced his guest, Dr. Kaufmann of Vienna. Dr. Kaufmann is a noted European Architect and scholar who has studied and written much on the development of Architecture from the time of the French Revolution to Corbussier. He addressed the meeting briefly and gave a bird's eye view of this period of growth. Dr. Kaufmann is now lecturing and teaching in this country.

DONALD B. KIRBY, *Secretary*

Washington, D. C.

At the February meeting the Chapter was happy to welcome our colleague from the main stem, Bill Lescaze, who tore a steak with us and then tendered (he should have done that to the steak, growled Tom Locraft, an old growler) an address on "Architecture by Architects, for a Change". Working up a lather on this give-Manhattan-back-to-the-Indians theme, Mr. Lescaze suggested the creation of a "Federal department of Architecture" to supplant the many and conflicting agencies now engaged in the building work of the national government. That is the way to speed up defense construction, says Mr. Lescaze.

The Chapter is proud to report on the success of a Defense Housing Exhibit prepared by a group of associate members under the leadership of Lewis E. Stevens. Shown for the first time at a luncheon arranged by the Central Housing Committee, the exhibit was praised by Defense Housing Co-ordinator Charles Palmer, and it will travel under the sponsorship of Mr. Palmer's division. Requests for the loan of the exhibit have been coming in from all parts of the country. Photographs of it were printed in the February *Pencil Points* and a limited number of reprints are available on request.

JULIAN E. BERLA, *Secretary*

New Books

White Pillars.

By J. Frazer Smith, A.I.A.
William Helburn, Inc., 15 East 55th Street, New York, N. Y.—$6.00

White Pillars is the story of early life and architecture of the Old South (the lower Mississippi Valley country) written and illustrated by J. Frazer Smith, A.I.A. of Memphis, and with foreword by Leicester B. Holland, F.A.I.A., Chief of Fine Arts, Library of Congress.

This books is especially recommended for those who are interested in the early domestic architecture and other art culture of our American civilization. This is the first time that the domestic architectural development of the Far South has been fully analyzed, classified and published for either professional or public interest.

• • • •

Contrary to most books on architecture, *White Pillars* is written for the public. It attempts to disprove the popular conception that architecture is a technical conglomeration of mysterious rules and historic styles interpreted only by skilled practitioners. On the contrary, it seeks to show that architecture is the natural result of a sincere people striving to create shelter out of the materials at hand for the sole purpose of getting the most out of living.

The book is 8½" x 11", approximately 300 pages. Contains 107 illustrations—80 of which are full page.

(*From a Prospectus*)

The Curse of Modern Taxation.

By W. R. B. Willcox, F.A.I.A.
Fortuny's Publishers, Inc., 87 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.—$2.00

Taxes, like death, have so long been considered inevitable, that any challenge of this force is indeed startling. With our financial structure burdened to the point of collapse by traditional, orthodox economics, and with conflicting doctrines and confused theories obscuring the future horizon, *The Curse of Modern Taxation,* by W. R. B. Willcox irradiates the economic heavens with the piercing rays of keen inquiry and logical, forceful thought.

Praised by the American Institute for Economic Research as a contribution to the "further clarification of the subject," Mr. Willcox protests "against what seems to be a settled policy of those who direct and influence the affairs of government."

Is taxation a financial necessity or merely a habit of thought? What could replace it? Which of our existing taxes is the most vicious? Which wage group does taxation hit hardest? *The Curse of Modern Taxation* answers these and many more vital questions, based on careful research and penetrating analysis.

Every sentence is an investigation into the causes of our economic ills. Every paragraph is a stimulating and thought-provoking protest against modern methods of taxation. Mr. Willcox's treatise will give you a broad, intelligent conception of the causes and solution of one of our most widespread economic blights—the blight of modern taxation.

(*From a Prospectus*)

Defense Housing in Our Town.

The Twentieth Century Fund—330 W. 42nd St., New York, N. Y.

This pamphlet was developed by *The Twentieth Century Fund* to set forth the community's problem in providing homes for workers in defense industries, and touches on repair and modernization programs, observation of rent levels, transportation facilities, the part to be played by private individuals, where the money will come from, Government participation, etc.

The cost of the pamphlet has been purposely kept very low so that individuals, as well as organizations, can distribute it freely.

The rates for the bulletin are 2c each in quantities up to 500, and 1½c each in quantities over 500.

Address inquiries and orders direct to The Twentieth Century Fund.

Chapters of The American Institute of Architects

Officers Listed As Per Secretary's Records of April 10, 1941

ALABAMA (1916)
President: E. Walter Burkhardt, School of Architecture, Alabama Polytechnic Inst., Auburn, Ala.
Secretary: Clyde C. Pearson, State Bd. of Educ., Montgomery, Ala.

ALBANY (1930)
President: Ralph E. Winslow, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y.
Secretary: Turpin C. Bannister, 8 Grand View Ave., Troy, N. Y.

ARIZONA (1927)
President: Frederick W. Whittlesey, 900 Security Bldg., Phoenix, Ariz.
Secretary: Charles J. Gilmore, 807 Security Bldg., Phoenix, Ariz.

ARKANSAS (1921)
President: H. Ray Burks, 702 Wallace Bldg., Little Rock, Ark.
Secretary: Lawson L. Delony, 2407 Louisiana St., Little Rock, Ark.

BALTIMORE (1870)
President: Clyde N. Friz, 1309 Lexington Bldg., Baltimore, Md.
Secretary: Carroll R. Williams, Jr., 1020 St. Paul St., Baltimore, Md.

BOSTON (1870)
President: Wm. Emerson, 107 Mass. Ave., Boston, Mass.
Secretary: Edwin B. Goodell, Jr., 234 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.

BROOKLYN (1894)
President: Robert F. Schirmer, 9432 85th Ave., Woodhaven, N. Y.
Secretary: Adolph Goldberg, 164 Montague St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

BUFFALO (1890)
President: R. Maxwell James, 1 Niagara Square, Buffalo, N. Y.
Secretary: George Dick Smith, Jr., 920 Amherst St., Apt. 16, Buffalo, N. Y.

CENTRAL ILLINOIS (1921)
President: Leo H. Pleins, 527 W. Monroe St., Springfield, Ill.
Secretary: A. N. Schaeffer, 710 Peoples Bank Bldg., Bloomington, Ill.

CENTRAL NEW YORK (1887)
President: Paul Hueber, 200 Syracuse Bldg., Syracuse, N. Y.
Secretary: L. C. Dillenback, Dept. of Architecture, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.

CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA (1909)
President: Carlisle D. Hasness, 222 Market St., Harrisburg, Pa.
Secretary: Joseph L. Steele, 23 No. 3rd St., Harrisburg, Pa.

CENTRAL TEXAS (1913-1924)
President: Walter T. Rolfe, Dept. of Arch., University of Texas, Austin, Texas
Secretary: Dan J. Driscoll, 723 Park Place, Austin, Texas

CHICAGO (1869)
President: Jerrold Loebl, 333 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Secretary: W. Lindsay Suter, 189 W. Madison St., Chicago, Ill.

CINCINNATI (1870)
President: George F. Roth, Jr., Univ. of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.
Secretary: David Maxfield, 322 East Withrow Ave., Oxford, Ohio

CLEVELAND (1890)
President: Walter Harrison Smith, 2400 Lee Road, Cleveland, Ohio
Secretary: Maxwell A. Norcross, 7016 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio

COLORADO (1892)
President: Roland L. Linder, 507 Insurance Bldg., Denver, Colo.
Secretary: Gordon D. White, 615 Columbine St., Denver, Colo.

COLUMBUS (1913)
President: John Quincy Adams, 55 Lexington Ave., Columbus, Ohio
Secretary: Ralph Chas. Kempton, 50 W. Broad St., Columbus, Ohio.

CONNECTICUT (1902)
President: Philip N. Sunderland, 81 West St., Danbury, Conn.
Secretary: Lawrence Moore, Wilton, Conn.

DAYTON (1899)
President: J. Douglas Lorenz, 336 West First St., Dayton, Ohio
Secretary: Wm. G. Ward, 316 Mutual Home Bldg., Dayton, Ohio

DELAWARE (1931)
President: Albert Kruse, 806 Equitable Bldg., Wilmington, Del.
Secretary: Joseph Holton Jones, du Pont Bldg., Wilmington, Del.

DETROIT (1887)
President: Emil Lorch, 1023 Forest Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich.
Secretary: Malcolm R. Stirton, 18668 Littlefield Ave., Detroit, Mich.

EASTERN OHIO (1930)
President: J. Davis Wilson, 118 Fair Ave., N. W., New Phila., Ohio.
Secretary: Frank F. Smith, 2514 Market Street, Youngstown, Ohio.

FLORIDA CENTRAL (1929)
President: Norman F. Six, 212 Franklin St., Tampa, Fla.
Secretary: Carl N. Atkinson, 211 Taylor Arcade, St. Petersburg, Fla.

FLORIDA NORTH (1929)
President: S. Ralph Fetner, 501 Rogers Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.
Secretary: O. E. Segerberg, Barnett Nat'l Bk. Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.

FLORIDA SOUTH (1929)
President: Miss Marion I. Manley, 1299 N. W. 22nd Ave., Miami, Fla.
Secretary: Henry P. Whitworth, 1299 N. W. 22nd Ave., Miami, Fla.

GEORGIA (1906)
President: Geo. Harwell Bond, 1712 Candler Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.
Secretary: Harold Bush-Brown, Dept. of Arch., Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.

GRAND RAPIDS (1923)
President: John P. Baker, 756 Bristol Ave., N. W., Grand Rapids, Mich.
Secretary: Paul E. Flanagan, 634 Lake Drive, S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich.

HAWAII (1926)
President: Vladimir Ossipoff, Dillingham Bldg. Annex, Honolulu, T. H.
Secretary: Guy N. Rothwell, 409 S. M. Damon Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.

INDIANA (1921)
President: Edward D. Pierre, Architects Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind.
Secretary: John R. Kelley, Architects Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind.

IOWA (1903)
President: John Normile, 511 Hubbell Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa.
Secretary: Amos B. Emery, 820 Locust St., Des Moines, Iowa

KANSAS CITY (1890)
President: Albert S. Owen, Law Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.
Secretary: Robert S. Everett, 107 E. South Side Blvd., Independence, Mo.

KANSAS (1921)
President: Lorents Schmidt, 1832 E. 2nd St., Wichita, Kansas
Secretary: Paul Wiegel, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kansas.

KENTUCKY (1908)
President: Ossian P. Ward, Washington Bldg., Louisville, Ky.
Secretary: Bergman Letzler, 626 South Fifth St., Louisville, Ky.

LOUISIANA (1910)
President: Joseph Bernard, 801 Baronne Bldg., New Orleans, La.
Secretary: Douglass V. Freret, 1311 Union Bldg., New Orleans, La.

MAINE (1934)
President: Philip S. Wadsworth, 193 Middle St., Portland, Me.
Secretary: John Howard Stevens, 187 Middle St., Portland, Me.

MINNESOTA (1892)
President: Edwin W. Krafft, 2320 Rand Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.
Secretary: Roy N. Thorshov, Midland Bank Bldg., Minneapolis.

MISSISSIPPI (1929)
President: R. W. Naef, 411½ East Capital St., Jackson, Miss.
Secretary: Dudley H. White, Guaranty Bank Bldg., Jackson, Miss.

MONTANA (1921)
President: A. V. McIver, 512 Strain Bldg., Great Falls, Mont.
Secretary: W. R. Plew, Bozeman, Mont.

NEBRASKA (1919)
President: Walter P. Wilson, 754 Stuart Bldg., Lincoln, Nebr.
Secretary: William L. Younkin, Box 91, State House Station, Lincoln, Nebr.

NEW JERSEY (1900)
President: Neil J. Convery, 32 Walnut St., Newark, N. J.
Secretary: Clement W. Fairweather, Metuchen, N. J.

NEW YORK (1867)
President: Frederick G. Frost, 144 E. 30th St., New York, N. Y.
Secretary: Frederick J. Woodbridge, 101 Park Ave., New York, N. Y.
Chapter Headquarters: 115 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
Executive Secretary: Miss Dorothea Waters.

NORTH CAROLINA (1913)
President: Anthony Lord, 17½ Church St., Asheville, N. C.
Secretary: Charles C. Hartmann, 120 Jefferson Standard Bldg., Greensboro, N. C.

NORTH LOUISIANA (1925)
President: Dewey A. Somdal, 801 Monrovia St., Shreveport, La.
Secretary: T. A. Flaxman, Ricou-Brewster Bldg., Shreveport, La.

NORTH TEXAS (1913-1924)
President: Arthur E. Thomas, Construction Bldg., Dallas, Texas
Secretary: Robert Johnson Perry, 2918 Bookhout St., Dallas, Texas

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA (1881)
President: A. Appleton, 68 Post St., San Francisco, Calif.
Secretary: John D. Young, 2002 Calif. St., San Francisco, Calif.

NORTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA (1913)
President: G. W. Stickle, 227 Commerce Bldg., Erie, Pa.
Secretary: J. Howard Hicks, 124 West 7th Street, Erie, Pa.

OKLAHOMA (1927)
President: R. W. Shaw, 734 Bass Bldg., Enid, Okla.
Secretary: Leonard H. Bailey, Colcord Bldg., Oklahoma City, Okla.

OREGON (1911)
President: Roi L. Morin, 1601 Public Service Bldg., Portland, Ore.
Secretary: Kenneth Legge, 7505 S. E. 36th Ave., Portland, Ore.

PHILADELPHIA (1869)
President: Sydney E. Martin, Architects Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.
Secretary: Richard W. Mecaskey, Architects Bldg., Phila., Pa.
Chapter Headquarters: Architects Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
Executive Secretary: Miss Frances C. Cannon.

PITTSBURGH (1891)
President: Charles M. Stotz, Bessemer Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Secretary: Allan H. Neal, 324 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

RHODE ISLAND (1875)
President: Edwin E. Cull, 58 Weybosset St., Providence, R. I.
Secretary: Samuel M. Morino, 25 Fenner St., Providence, R. I.

SAN DIEGO (1929)
President: Richard S. Requa, Spreckels Theatre Bldg., San Diego, Calif.
Secretary: Louis J. Gill, 203 Granger Bldg., San Diego, Calif.

SANTA BARBARA (1929)
President: John Frederic Murphy, 707 Moreno Road, Santa Barbara, Calif.
Secretary: Ralph W. Armitage, 235 W. Victoria St., Santa Barbara, Calif.

SCRANTON-WILKES-BARRE (1922)
President: James A. Barnett, 341 Jefferson Ave., Scranton, Pa.
Secretary: Emerson C. Willson, 1010 Mears Bldg., Scranton, Pa.

SOUTH CAROLINA (1913)
President: G. Thomas Harmon, III, Valley Rd., Hartsville, S. C.
Secretary: Heyward S. Singley, 1512 Marion St., Columbia, S. C.

SOUTH GEORGIA (1922)
President: Morton H. Levy, Levy Store Bldg., Savannah, Ga.
Secretary: Walter P. Marshall, 228 E. 51st St., Savannah, Ga.

SOUTH TEXAS (1913-1924)
President: Milton B. McGinty, 2017 West Gray St., Houston, Texas
Secretary: F. J. MacKie, Jr., 2017 West Gray St., Houston, Texas

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA (1894)
President: Sylvanus B. Marston, 25 S. Euclid St., Pasadena, Calif.
Secretary: Donald B. Kirby, 313 Marine Ave., Balboa Island, Calif.
Chapter Headquarters: 816 W. Fifth St., Los Angeles, Calif.

SPOKANE (1940)
President: Harold C. Whitehouse, 621 Hutton Bldg., Spokane, Wash.
Secretary: Edwin J. Peterson, 710 Sherwood Bldg., Spokane, Wash.
Corresponding Secretary: Ogden F. Beeman, 608 Seventeenth Ave., Spokane, Wash.

ST. LOUIS (1890)
President: Wm. B. Ittner, Jr., 911 Locust St., St. Louis, Mo.
Secretary: Chas. E. Peterson, 815 Olive St., St. Louis, Mo.

ST. PAUL (1921)
President: Paul M. Havens, 1st Nat. Bank Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.
Secretary: E. Richard Cone, 342 Endicott Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.

TENNESSEE (1919)
President: Ben F. Hunt, Chattanooga, Tenn.
Secretary: Selmon T. Franklin, 829 Chattanooga Bank Bldg., Chattanooga, Tenn.

TOLEDO (1914)
President: Harold H. Munger, 1025 Nichols Bldg., Toledo, Ohio
Secretary: Mark B. Stophlet, Security Bank Bldg., Toledo Ohio

UTAH (1921)
President: Fred L. Markham, 440 No. 5th St., W., Provo, Utah
Secretary: Paul K. Evans, 809 McIntyre Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah

VIRGINIA (1914)
President: Louis P. Smithey, 112 Kirk Ave., Roanoke, Va.
Secretary: Milton L. Grigg, 910 W. Main St., Charlottesville, Va.

WASHINGTON, D. C. (1887)
President: Leon Chatelain, Jr., 1727 K Street, N. W., Wash., D. C.
Secretary: Julian E. Berla, 2 Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C.

WASHINGTON STATE (1894)
President: William J. Bain, 1002 Textile Tower, Seattle, Wash.
Secretary: John T. Jacobsen, 1414 Textile Tower, Seattle, Wash.

WEST TEXAS (1913-1924)
President: Dahl Dewees, 1515 Majestic Bldg., San Antonio, Texas
Secretary: Peyton G. Cooper, Morris Plan Bldg., San Antonio, Tex.

WEST VIRGINIA (1922)
President: C. E. Silling, Box 861, Charleston, W. Va.
Secretary: Francis George Davidson, 44 Capitol City Bldg., 303 Ruffner Ave., Charleston, W. Va.

WESTCHESTER (1936)
President: Paul B. La Velle, 25 Tibbits Ave., White Plains, N. Y.
Secretary: J. Bart. Walther, 103 E. 125th St., N. Y. C.

WISCONSIN (1911)
President: Alexander H. Bauer, 606 West Wisconsin Ave., Milwaukee, Wisc.
Secretary: Leigh Hunt, 152 W. Wisconsin Ave., Milwaukee, Wisc.

State Association Members of The American Institute of Architects

THE ALABAMA ASSOCIATION OF ARCHITECTS 1941
President: Raymond C. Sizemore, 115 S. Union St., Montgomery, Ala.
Secretary: Clyde C. Pearson, 7 Mooreland Rd., Montgomery, Ala.

STATE ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA ARCHITECTS . . 1933
President: Walter R. Hagedohm, 3316 San Marino, Los Angeles, Cal.
Secretary: Vincent G. Raney, 233 Post St., San Francisco, Cal.
President, Northern Section: Frederick H. Reimers, 233 Post St., San Francisco, Cal.
Secretary, Northern Section: Vincent G. Raney, 233 Post St., San Francisco, Cal.
Official Headquarters: 557 Market St., San Francisco, Cal.
President, Southern Section: Walter R. Hagedohm, 3316 San Marino, Los Angeles, Cal.
Secretary, Southern Section: Winsor Soule, 116 East Sola St., Santa Barbara, Cal.
Official Headquarters: 3757 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Cal.

FLORIDA ASSOCIATION OF ARCHITECTS 1940
President: Elliott B. Hadley, 211 Taylor Arcade, St. Petersburg, Fla.
Secretary: E. F. De La Haye, Box 3747, Daytona, Fla.

ILLINOIS SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS 1941
President: Paul Gerhardt, Jr., 1012 City Hall, Chicago, Ill.
Secretary: Stanley D. Fairclough, 809 Exchange Street, Chicago, Ill.

INDIANA SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS 1940
President: Richard C. Lennox, 833 Architects' Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind.
Secretary: David Burns, 333 North Pennsylvania St., Indianapolis, Ind.

KANSAS SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS 1940
President: Glen H. Thomas, 125½ North Topeka St., Wichita, Kans.
Secretary: Paul Weigel, Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kan.

ASSOCIATION OF KENTUCKY ARCHITECTS 1938
President: J. M. Ingram, 919 Park St., Bowling Green, Ky.
Secretary: John L. McDermott, 65 Blue Grass Ave., Ft. Thomas, Ky.

MARYLAND SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS 1940
President: Lucien E. D. Gaudreau, 527 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Md.
Secretary: Charles T. McClure, 3708 Barrington Rd., Baltimore, Md.

MICHIGAN SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS 1933
President: C. William Palmer, 243 Congress St., W., Detroit, Mich.
Secretary: Cornelius L. T. Gabler, 17481 Alwyne Lane, Detroit, Mich.

MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF ARCHITECTS 1940
President: W. H. Tusler, 202 Foshay Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.
Secretary: H. W. Fridlund, 1593 University Ave., St. Paul, Minn.

MISSISSIPPI ASSOCIATION OF ARCHITECTS 1940
President: Frank Fort, 1305 Deposit Guaranty Bldg., Jackson, Miss.
Secretary: Frank P. Gates, Millsaps Bldg., Jackson, Miss.

NEW HAMPSHIRE SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS 1940
President: Eric T. Huddleston, University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H.
Secretary: Harry G. Forrest, 20 Pleasant Street, Concord, N. H.

THE NORTH CAROLINA ASSOCIATION OF ARCHITECTS . 1940
President: S. Grant Alexander, Asheville, N. C.
Secretary: Luther Lashmit, 602 Reynolds Bldg., Winston-Salem, N. C.

ARCHITECTS SOCIETY OF OHIO 1935
President: George B. Mayer, 1030 Schofield Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio
Secretary: Ralph Chas. Kempton, A.I.U. Bldg., Columbus, Ohio

THE OKLAHOMA ASSOCIATION OF ARCHITECTS 1940
President: Lee Sorey, 2602 First Nat'l Bldg., Oklahoma City, Okla.
Secretary: Wm. Martin Lawrence, 3316 N. W. 22nd St., Oklahoma City, Okla.

THE TEXAS SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS 1940
President: George Dahl, Dallas, Texas
Secretary: R. Max Brooks, Scarbrough Bldg., Austin, Texas

THE VIRGINIA SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTS 1941
President: W. Leigh Carneal, 1000 Atlantic Life Bldg., Richmond, Va.
Secretary: Richard F. Taylor, American Bldg., Richmond, Va.

THE STATE ASSOCIATION OF WISCONSIN ARCHITECTS . 1935
President: William Mickelsen, 2519 Washington Ave., Racine, Wis.
Secretary: Leigh Hunt, 152 West Wisconsin Ave., Milwaukee, Wis.