312' STEEL UMBRELLA

Covering some 2½ acres, the new Dane County Memorial Coliseum at Madison, Wisconsin is a beautiful umbrella of Fenestra cellular steel folded plate. Equipped to provide "home ice" for University of Wisconsin hockey and already booked for the 1968 American Bowling Congress, the new arena will provide 7600 upholstered, theater-type seats for all kinds of shows, exhibitions and indoor sporting events. The 18" wide flange beams spanning from the compression ring at the center to the exterior columns, serve as valley support for the acoustical 'D' Panel folded plate sectors. The ridge fold line member is a 120° structural angle. For the complete engineering information on cellular steel folded plate, call your Fenestra representative or write Fenestra Incorporated, Lima, Ohio 45802.

FENESTRA
We are singularly fortunate in the Empire State to have among our fellow citizens a particularly brilliant corps of gifted and distinguished architects. Monuments to their talents are to be seen all around us. New York architecture can be compared favorably with the best of the classic periods of this art.

The New York State Association of Architects, a branch of the American Institute of Architects, is preparing an appropriate celebration of Architects Week as a demonstration of its cooperation with a "War on Ugliness." In view of the keen and intensified beautification program planned throughout the Empire State and elsewhere, this is particularly appropriate.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim October 3-9, 1966, as ARCHITECTS WEEK in New York State

GIVEN under my hand and the Privy Seal of the State at the Capitol in the City of Albany this sixteenth day of September in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-six.

BY THE GOVERNOR

Secretary to the Governor
Electric Heat offers the flexibility architects demand for institutional buildings

All Saints Episcopal Church, 2329 Victory Boulevard, Grasmere, S.I.

Interboro Nursing Home, 485 Forbell Street, Brooklyn

Holy Trinity Church, Mill Road & North Avenue, New Rochelle

Yeshiva High School for Girls, 1277 E. 14th Street, Brooklyn

Clean, quiet Electric Heat isn’t merely in homes and apartments. It’s also becoming the choice of institutional buildings all over New York and Westchester. That’s because it offers advantages no other heating system can.

For one thing, Electric Heat will heat anything—even terraces, halls and lobbies. And because there are no boilers, no flues, no fuel-storage problems, it saves space while it does its job.

And Electric Heat offers great flexibility and economy. Just the part of the building in use can be heated—there’s no need to heat it all.

Keep Electric Heat in mind for your next design. We’ll be happy to tell you how it can fit your needs. Call Con Edison, 460-3167.
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New York City's Architectural Competitions

New York City's Mayor John V. Lindsay deserves the praise of the architectural profession for his approach to the design of public buildings. First was the competition for the design of a Kiosk in Central Park, and currently the competition for the design of a combined stable and police station in Central Park—budgeted at $5.7 million.

However, the basic difference between these two competitions is that the first was open to all; the second—limited to five architectural firms. We do not question the outstanding capabilities of the distinguished firms selected to compete for the Police Station, and can understand the motives that impelled this type of competition. We do feel, however, that the Mayor is missing a good bet by not allowing young talented persons an opportunity to gain recognition. We realize it would have been more expensive and time consuming to have held a competition open to all, and then selecting from these winners the competitors for a final competition for the award of the commission to design the building for construction.

BUT —

Is there a better way to encourage talent in the profession of architecture?

Governor Rockefeller's Proclamation

The architectural profession in New York State appreciates the recognition it has achieved by the designation by Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller of October 3rd to October 9th, 1966 as Architect's Week; and accepts with appropriate modesty his reference to its talents and achievements. To maintain this high level of professional status it is important that the education law with respect to the qualifications for and the practice of architecture be strengthened and enforced; that ways be found to eliminate the conflicting and overlapping of reviewing authorities (see article by Mr. Burgin in this issue); and to establish an adequate statute of limitations for the design professions. These are the handicaps and hurdles that unnecessarily burden the practicing architect in New York State today and our good governor could do much to help us get over them.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

Here are some statistics compiled from previous membership issues. It might be of interest to know that:

There are 2,732 members in the N.Y.S.A.A. out of whom 42 are on the distaff side.

There are 81 F.A.I.A., one of them a lady.

Besides representing different cities in New York State, the membership extends to:

- Arizona: 1
- California: 7
- Connecticut: 41
- Florida: 18
- Georgia: 2
- Illinois: 1
- Maine: 1
- Maryland: 2
- Massachusetts: 6
- Missouri: 1
- New Hampshire: 1
- New Jersey: 56
- Ohio: 2
- Pennsylvania: 2
- Puerto Rico: 35
- Virginia: 2
- Virgin Islands: 3
- Washington, D.C.: 3
- West Virginia: 1

And in the following countries:

- Bahamas: 1
- Bermuda: 1
- Canada: 2
- Czechoslovakia: 1
- C.S.R. Europe: 1
- France: 3
- Guam: 1
- Honduras: 1
- Italy: 1
- Japan: 2
- Panama: 1
- Spain: 1
- Sweden: 1
- Switzerland: 2

Vitally yours,

MARTIN S. D'ESSEN

Thanks. We haven't checked your statistics — but they are interesting to say the least.

ED.

NYSAA President Whiteside escorting AIA President Charles M. Nes, Jr., FAIA.
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TREASURER
THE 1966 N.Y.S.A.A. CONVENTION

Those who arrived on Wednesday October 5th were greeted by cold clammy wet weather, which turned into snow flurries at night. This left a snow cap on Whiteface Mountain, which against the palette of colors nature used on the trees was sufficient reward in the few days that followed. These days were ideal in every way, with seasonal temperatures and plenty of sunshine.

The opening session on Thursday, October 6th was well attended. Much of the scheduled business was conducted with efficiency and dispatch by President Whiteside, with items requiring a vote deferred until registration and accreditation of delegates was completed. At noon, a few courageous male members slipped over to take a gander at the Ladies Luncheon from which they were technically excluded. Those who went and stayed were treated to an unusual show of Irish Fashions admirably modeled by wives of members. Irish International Airline’s winsome Anne Tolan, director of the show, was introduced — in a most professional manner — by our own first lady, Mrs. Whiteside. (Georgie Jessel better look to his laurels). The display of knitwear, tweed suits and coats, and rainwear that followed, described in counterpoint with Miss Tolan’s Irish wit, humor, and folk stories were, to use a gourmet term, delectable.

Meanwhile, hardier members of the tribe flocked to the Exhibitors by a NOT surprisingly larger coed attendance.

Thursday evening’s dinner was graced by the presence of Charles M. Nes, Jr. FAIA president of the American Institute of Architects. His address, printed elsewhere in this issue in entirety, was unusual, provocative and refreshing in content and very well delivered.

At this dinner, Mr. Nes presented mementos of Association honor and esteem to past presidents Charles R. Ellis AIA, C. Storrs Barrows FAIA (who came from Sarasota, Florida to be present), Donald Q. Faragher FAIA, Trevor W. Rogers FAIA, Harry M. Prince FAIA, John W. Briggs AIA, Frederick H. Voss AIA, Simeon Heller AIA and Allen Macomber AIA. In this, he was ably assisted by Duke Chambers himself a past president who formally received his token as S. Elmer Chambers. Past president James Wm. Kidney FAIA unfortunately could not attend. Past presidents Henry V. Murphy and Matthew W. Del Gaudio, gone to eternal rest, were honored by a review of their achievements for NYSAA and by a few minutes of silent prayer.
Lest it be forgotten, the new past president Whiteside received a plucked chicken from his own Westchester Chapter as a symbol of having given of his all, and a special medallion from the Association in appreciation of his outstanding services; and President-Elect Fay Evans, Jr. received a special gift on his elevation to the presidency from his home chapter president Albert Brevett’s Eastern N.Y. Chapter.

NYSAA President Whiteside awarded a plucked chicken at past president’s dinner by his colleagues.

President-Elect Fay Evans, Jr. receiving a special gift on his elevation to the presidency from his home chapter president, Albert Brevetti, Eastern New York Chapter.

Friday October 7 was a “free day” as they say in the tour books with everyone on their own so to speak – and what a grand day it was to enjoy the great outdoors of New York State. Many took trips to the top of Whiteface. Others used the time for some boating, fishing – (no luck), and shopping in the charming little stores in Lake Placid. The highlight of the afternoon was the First Annual Architects VS Exhibitors Golf Match – reported elsewhere herein – which the architects won – (sorry exhibitors – nothing was fixed we are assured).

For those who came to learn, this day also featured a mid afternoon seminar on the Responsibilities of the Architect. Moderated by Morris Ketchum, Jr., FAIA Past President of the AIA, speakers included Charles F. Dalton, for building contractors; Thomas J. Langan, Jr. for bankers and financiers; Earl F. Bennett for the Producers Council – Building Materials; Earl Ferguson, for Building Officials; and J. Watson Lynch, on Insurance and the Law. It was most revealing to be told by people closely related to the architect in the building picture, about what they think is and should be the architects area of concern and responsibility. If time allowed, this session could have continued for several days. More detailed coverage is reported by James Peck in this issue.

The evening was topped off by the Awards Dinner and the Host Chapter party. At the Awards Dinner President Whiteside wetting his lips while presenting Certificate of Appreciation to Executive Director Joe Addonizio.

Mr. & Mrs. Fred Liehmann, S. M. Kurtz (ye Editor), Mrs. D’Essen, Mr. D’Essen, Mrs. Kurtz, Bill Modin, & Herman Jessor.

NER, NYSAA citations of Appreciation for distinguished service to the architectural profession and the Association were given to: Joseph F. Addonizio, the first and still Executive Director, for ten years’ of dedicated service; George J. Cavaleri, AIA, in recognition of services as Past Treasurer and as Chairman of the Insurance Committee; Robert C. Gormley, Esq., Counsel of the New York State Association of the Professions, for valued work and counsel on legislation; Morris Ketchum, Jr., FAIA, past president of the AIA and his many contributions to the profession; Albert Melniker AIA, for guidance and direction as Chairman of the Resolutions Committee for many years; and to W. Newell Reynolds AIA, for noteworthy services as a longtime Chairman of the NYSAA Hospitals and Health Committee.

The Architectural Exhibit, strategically located adjacent to the cocktail lounge, was a comprehensive display of varied and notable works of association members. A jury consisting of Charles M. Nes, Jr., Frederick H. Voss, and John W. Briggs selected the following entries for NYSAA CERTIFICATES OF MERIT FOR OUTSTANDING DESIGN:

The firm of Morris Ketchum, Jr., FAIA, and Associates for its work on The World of Darkness, Bronx Zoological Gardens.

The Office of Max O. Urbahn, FAIA, for its work on the Children’s Psychiatric Hospital, Bronx State Hospital.

Perkins and Will, in association with Grandberry, Cash and Associates, for work on the Quinnipiac School, New Haven, Conn.

Morris Ketchum, Jr., FAIA, past president AIA, receiving his Certificate of Award for his winning design “The World of Darkness” from William Heidtman, chairman of the Awards Committee for the Host Westchester Chapter.

Max O. Urbahn, president of the New York Chapter, receiving his Certificate of Merit for his winning design of the Children’s Psychiatric Hospital. Awards chairman William Heidtman is making the presentation.
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SPECIAL COMMENDATIONS were awarded to: Edward Durrel Stone, FAIA for the Ponce Museum of Art, Ponce, Puerto Rico; and to Curtis and Davis, for the Nassau County Jail, East Meadow, L.I.

The Educational Exhibits — unusually well done this year — were all over the place; it was difficult to miss them — were also reviewed by the same jury who selected the Aluminum Company of America (Alcoa), United States Steel Co. and The Mosaic Tile Company, for awards as Outstanding Displays.

Special awards were made to the following companies, which had an unbroken record of exhibits for the past ten years at NYSAA Conventions: The American Olean Tile Company, Lansdale, Pa.; The American Seating Company, Syracuse, New York; The Mosaic Tile Co., Cleveland, Ohio; and the United States Plywood Co., New York.

That same evening the singing of Terry Stevens — soon to be seen and heard at a prominent New York show place — for almost a solid hour, was the highlight of the Westchester Chapter's Party Night. She was something to see and hear. Spirits flowed down freely and were lifted up high; there was group singing and swinging until "way" after one A.M. (Private parties — remain private as far as this reporter is concerned).

Saturday's business meeting was brisk and all business. Resolutions — based on committee reports and other topics presented at the previous business meetings — were discussed; and with some amendments to a few were all approved. By-Law Changes were discussed and passed without change. (Details on these subjects are in this issue). The matter of an increase in NYSSAA dues was given much time and eventually approved. The slate of new officers elected without contest, was introduced to the membership led by Fay A. Evans Jr. — President; Roger G. Spross — Vice President and President-Elect; Seymour A. Goldstone — Second Vice President; Guy H. Baldwin — Secretary; and H. I. Feldman — Treasurer. The only contest was for Third Vice President. This was between Darrell B. Rippeteau — Nominating Committee candidate, who received the majority of votes by secret ballot over the Nominee by Petition — our immediate past treasurer, Irving P. Marks. Irving received a vote of thanks for his services to the association.

Two names were placed in nomination for AIA Regional Director for the New York Region to succeed Donald Q. Fairagher FAIA for the next three year term. Robert Kaplan AIA, President of the Bronx Chapter AIA, named MAX O. URBAN FAIA, President of the N.Y. Chapter; and Trevor W. Rogers FAIA, Past Regional Director and Past President NYSSAA, named HERBERT EPSTEIN AIA, member of the Regional Judiciary Committee AIA, Representative to the Regional Council AIA, Director of the NYSSAA, and Past President Brooklyn Chapter AIA. Corporate members of the AIA will shortly receive mail ballots from the Institute so they can make their choice of nominee to be presented to the AIA Convention to be held in NYC in May 1967.

David F. M. Todd, AIA N.Y. Chapter spoke about the need to support the Institute campaign for funds for the construction of new national headquarters. Max O. Urbahn FAIA N.Y. Chapter urged members to save their shekels so they can attend the spectacular 1967 AIA National Convention which will be hosted by the NY Chapter in May.

The final business meeting closed in an aura of good will, friendliness, and work accomplished, but the convention wasn't over yet!

At luncheon, prizes (you had to be present to be eligible) were drawn from a sealed box containing the names of all those in attendance at the Convention. Martin D'Essen was the winner of a ceramic table donated by the Styloyn Corp. and presented by their Louis Antonucci; Mrs. Marianne Nappi (a lucky gal) received a prize donated by the Jova Brick Works; and Milton Petrides was the recipient of a prize presented by the Spancrete Northeast Co. James W. Peck, AIA Westchester Chapter found himself to be the winner of an AM-FM table radio; Mrs. F. A. Evans, Jr. "the drummer" (inside joke) and wife of our new President, won a Polaroid camera; and J. Murray Hueber was enriched with a portable T.V. set.

The surprise at the Annual Banquet was that there was to be no Main Guest Speaker. Telegrams of regret and messages from Governor Rockefeller, Senator Javits and others were read by President Whiteside. He noted with pardonable pride the proclamation by Governor Rockefeller (printed in this issue) designating October 3-9, 1966 — NYSAA Convention Week — as Architects Week, done only once before some years ago. Whity gave us a rundown of the problems he had with the similarity of his name and that of Whiteface Inn. (Once he was addressed as Mr. Willard Whiteface at Whiteface Inn). On the serious side he paid a magnificent tribute to all those who helped him during his administration — not the least of which was his touching tribute to his charming wife Babs.

They came — Association Members, their wives, guests and friends, exhibitors and their wives and guests — by plane, train, bus and private car from near and far; and they left the same way more or less. There were no problems — at least to our knowledge. Have you ever been on a cruise? Well it wasn’t like that at all. But it was a GOOD SHOW. Next year it will be the Nevele in the Catskills; and someday, maybe, it will be Puerto Rico. How about that?
Are Architects Really Necessary
or
The Anxious Architects

Address by Charles M. Nes, Jr., FAIA

President, The American Institute of Architects before the New York State Association of Architects at Lake Placid, New York, on October 6, 1966.

The hallmark of the age we live in is change. There has always been change, but the most impressive thing about this particular time is not the nature of the things that are changing, but the rate of change itself.

We can predict, I think, that the world’s funds of information, that is accessible information, will double during the next eight to ten years. We can also say that perhaps three-fourths of the people in America today are holding kinds of jobs that within 40 years will probably not exist, and we can speculate on the basis of present evidence that by the end of the century perhaps only 20 per cent of the industrial population will be engaged in what we now call “work.” It is any wonder then that most professions, whether they admit it or not, are being forced by technology and the demands of society into a situation where they must adapt themselves or be left high and dry. This is true of lawyers and doctors and is wholly true of architects.

A great deal of practical rethinking is going on in the AIA. Yet, it is far from clear whether any such animal as a purebred “architect” will survive or what people who call themselves architects will be doing 20 years hence.

The architect is still, in ideal, a da Vinci among lesser mortals: artist, technologist, humanist, scientist, a capitalist in business, a socialist in deference to the public good. Not surprisingly, it can’t be done.

Look at almost any new building or project in America and see how many of these roles the architect has failed to fulfill!

It seems to me that there are two principal criteria for professionals. First, to meet the definition of the term, they have to be dedicated to the service of their communities. Second, as professionals, they have to commit themselves to a process of continuing education to keep themselves informed on new developments in their field and even invent them. Our own profession has always met the first criterion admirably and been backward in measuring up to the second.

Therefore, when we talk about how well a professional is doing his job, we must necessarily talk about the contributions he is making to the problems of his day. We must also estimate the gap between his performance and the tasks that his profession is called upon to perform.

The question facing architects today is a huge one: How can we use our skills to help create order in urban society? If you ask: Do I mean physical order? I answer yes, of course. But if you should also ask whether I also mean political and economic and social order, I say yes to that question, too. Only by making a contribution to all of these problems as citizens and professionals can we provide physical order of any significance. “Design cannot be the frosting,” as Dr. Robert Weaver said recently. “It must be an integral part of the whole process of planning for urban development.”
Design must be employed to restore order to the city and to create it in the vast area of urban fallout around it. You can argue with much logic that the factors which once created cities are no longer present—that in the long run, cities cannot survive as we know them now. I will come back to this point, if I may, observing for the moment only that the old cities are already here and we can't very well walk away and abandon them and the people in them. We haven't quite done that yet.

It is probable that both the terms “city” and “suburbs” are obsolete and meaningless as definitions of the environment we're trying to cope with. A regional planning report made back in 1962 in New York pointed out that most of the growth around the city doesn't fit any convenient description. It isn't a city, because it lacks identifiable centers. It isn't suburbs, because it isn't a satellite to a city. It isn't rural; the land is loosely covered with houses and a sprinkling of urban facilities. It offers neither the benefits of the city nor the pleasures of the countryside.

This great non-community of any kind has become the place where most urban Americans live. It is expensive, wasteful, very often ugly, and devoid of the pattern of diverse human activities that have made urban life stimulating in the past. The newest and most interesting vehicle for its reformation is the new town, conspicuous examples of which are Columbia, Maryland and Reston, Virginia.

There are precedents, of course, for the making of towns and re-making of cities. Paris is probably the largest and most interesting example of urban re-development to happen within the past century. Baron Haussman tore down nearly half the houses of Paris to create parks and grand boulevards lined with full-grown trees. I should add that this major work was created without benefit of architects, economists, behavioral scientists, or entrepreneurs. Here in America we have a rich history of town planning that stretches back over 200 years. One common denominator of all such large-scale planning seems to be the principle of authoritarian control. Haussman was a ruthless man armed with great powers. The rigid Puritan ethic of early American society—particularly in New England—while a self-imposed form of authoritarianism, was effective in controlling the uses to which private land might be put. By custom and regulation, the wishes of the individual were subordinate to the welfare of the community. Later, of course, the large companies which established company towns built them much as they wished.

The principle difference today is not simply that the scale has been greatly expanded, but that large-scale planning can only come about through community consensus plus the acquisition of really large tracts of land. A few entrepreneurial pioneers such as James Rouse, Robert Simon, and perhaps General Electric and Alcoa will build new towns and re-make portions of old cities. But these, I think, will be the exceptions, since there are few Rouses, Simons, GE's, and Alcoa's, and even they must have consensus. Simon avoided one major problem when he started his new town in 7,000 acres of unoccupied timberland held by a single owner. His architects evolved a fine master plan, and this plan, given wide public exposure, obliged a conservative local government to agree with its logic. Jim Rouse, with his usual legerdemain, bought up more than 16,000 acres in small pieces under different names from various people and then informed the county he owned 10 per cent of it. Crucial to success of his venture, however, was a massive public relations campaign he conducted by night and day to win support of a density zoning ordinance.

Both men stuck their necks out, although both were aided financially by large lending institutions. Both were motivated beyond reasons of personal profit. Both situations are, in many respects, atypical of what can be expected in the great majority of instances in the future. But both may be very important to our future in the vision of a better life which both hold up to public view. I am not making any assumptions that the results of these efforts will be outstanding in an aesthetic or economic sense. This is somewhat besides the point. Columbia and Reston cannot help make far better social use of the land through large-scale planning than would have occurred through the usual grab-bag process of speculation.

I will now utter a heresy, if I have not already committed it. I believe—in fact many in our profession now believe—that it is not very important whether the architecture of the buildings in a new town or city is brilliant or not. In a stylistic sense, this is, I believe, quite unimportant. Victor Gruen said rather acutely that, if you asked visitors who had just left Rockefeller Center what kind of architecture it had in it, they wouldn't have the slightest idea. They would remember instead the sense of pedestrian space, the alternate feelings of enclosure and openness, the sense of unity, the flowers, fountains, and ice skating rink. What we value in San Francisco is not a handful of good buildings but the dramatic terrain, the light, the parks and terraces, the sense of bridges and water, the sound of the trolley bell.

There are brilliant urban compositions—part planned, part accidental. What can we, as architects, contribute to the urban design compositions of the future? Very little if we continue to define compositions of the future? Very little if we continue to define “architect” in a narrow sense as the designer of individual buildings. Very little if we believe the nonsensical criticism that we are “trying to run people's lives for them.” When we can't build cheaper homes and give people more open land by building party walls in the face of old codes that demand tiny side-
yards, who is running whose life? When all we can do in many cases is translate into drawings a building whose form and placement have already been established by the tax law, zoning regulation, rental schedule, and highway engineer — who, if anyone, is exercising aesthetic arrogance?

The problem is not that the environmental designer is given too much elbow room but that he has so little. I think we must admit our own great ignorance of the many things we have to know to create a better and more humane environment for our citizens. But I also think we should, at the same time, admit to our knowledge. The two beliefs are not inconsistent.

We know, for instance, that we can add to rather than detract from urban privacy in many cases by increasing rather than decreasing the land density. We know that it is impossible to create a worthwhile environment for our urban citizens if the urban transportation system and community plan continue to be treated as separate problems. The simple fact of the matter is that we have design skills and a building technology which are adequate to create a far better urban environment right now. However, they cannot be brought to bear upon the urban problem in a useful way so long as we give the highway builder top priority over the use of urban land. Rural highways and city streets are two distinct and separate things and failure to distinguish between them will inevitably blight the promise of a better city life.

We know other things, too: That uncontrolled land speculation is as great a hindrance to community design as our lack of a coherent transportation policy; that pedestrian spaces can provide our communities with some of the stimulation and gaiety that Americans find in Europe; and that humans can be awed, depressed, excited, or made to feel comfortable by the manipulation of scale, pattern, and color. We also believe, if we do not know for a certainty, that the increasing lack of human contact and the concomitant impersonality of communication which result from urban sprawl and fallout are destroying the pattern of mixed activity which has always been a characteristic of urban life.

Let me make my premise very clear: I am not suggesting that the architect is some kind of environmental Batman or that he will ever be able to do the job by himself. He never was and there is no reason to believe he possesses the talents of super-renaissance men, but neither can it be done by realtors who are preoccupied with land speculations; by traffic engineers whose science is limited to the efficient movement of automobiles; by municipal planners who are lost in the third dimension; or even by the handful of enlightened entrepreneurs who are becoming today's philosopher-princes.

Many talents are required to handle today's complex tasks. Yet the fact remains that the architect, despite all his shortcomings, flaws, and imperfections, is still the only professional who is trained (often poorly and inadequately, it is true) in the three-dimensional planning of the environment for human use. Because he has this special training, he also has a special responsibility to play a leading role in the remaking of the environment.

What is that role? What should it be? It is self-evident, first, that he must learn his job to the best of his abilities. We are trying to help him through refresher courses and seminars and through articles and research papers (although architects are loath to read.) Our technicians' training program will, we hope, relieve the present desperate personnel shortage and permit the architect to spend more time in thought, design, and management. Improvement in his office practice by the use of the emerging techniques will assist his competitive position. More importantly perhaps, improvement in his basic education will enable the future architect to satisfy the clients' needs 20 years hence. To help us in this, we have planned a series of conferences with business leaders and social scientists to determine what will be required of us.

Part of his and our responsibility lies in the vital matter of creating a public consensus. This has never been done before. We have information to impart to others, not about ourselves but about design, its forms, patterns, and effects, and the factors that shape it. A community which is given the responsibility for making qualitative decisions will make them according to the amount and kind of information it possesses. We have made an important start at educational programs aimed at the press, the business community, and the public schools. Perhaps we can ultimately help a large segment of our population enable itself to distinguish between the good and the bad, or at least between something and nothing. At the very least, we can lead people to react to their environment on a conscious level — to see it, feel it, and question it. Unless we do this, the architect will, like C. P. Snow's scientist, speak an unintelligible language and become entirely estranged from a community which he can only serve effectively if there is mutual understanding.

There is still a further responsibility. All of us must accept the fact that the overwhelming majority of our towns and cities are not and will not be shaped by design but by political and social decisions — and the lack of them.

A recent editorial in the Washington Post made this point very well. It said:

"The American city is in very much the same doleful position as a large industry overburdened
with a massive investment in obsolete facilities... The cities find themselves in an era of brilliant new technology that they are unable to exploit. Just as the steel companies knew twenty years ago how to make steel more quickly, and just as the railroads know today how to make their trains run faster, so the cities know in the abstract how to correct their obsolescence. They know how to build modern schools, how to redesign their traffic patterns, how to clean up their sewer outfalls and their air. But they lack investment capital and worse, they lack the political mechanisms for change. After all, the cities' political systems are also the product of the turn of the century; they are equipped to run the municipal apparatus of 1900, but they are overwhelmed by the managerial demands of sophisticated technology."

Note, please, that the Post says it isn't the talents and tools which are lacking; it is a political process that is inadequate to utilize either. I would add that it is also concensus on a set of public standards and goals. It is difficult to resolve fragmented political authority in large areas needing a unified master plan. The difficulty is compounded so long as we lack a clear-cut policy on the use of land. I do not mean public land; I mean privately-held land. In early America, nearly all land, whether publicly or privately-owned, was held to be a community resource whose use must benefit the community or at least avoid damaging it.

How shall we control anti-community land speculation? How can we evolve a political framework which will allow the metropolitan area to act in concert without wholesale annexation? How can we, as we must, coordinate large-scale urban design with transportation planning? How can we solve the gnawing social problems of the inner cities? If we are to maintain the boundaries of the ghetto and create suburban communities with walls that are patrolled by security police — and we are doing this now — we will have created in the last third of the twentieth century a grotesque form of feudal system reminiscent of medieval times.

Should we, by policy, contrive to limit the size of our larger cities and provide strong incentives for the building of new ones? John Rubel, a former Assistant Secretary of Defense, suggests we go about building new cities much as we have gone about creating the moon program. He point out that there was no space technology until a market was created for it. He suggests that a brilliant new building technology — designed to take the place of our lame and halting building industry — be created by precisely the same means. The government and private sector would get together and agree on a set of standards and objectives, and incentives would be created to make it all happen.

The appearance of new people with fresh ideas that have not been wilted by building industry prejudices or long association with the government is a wonderful thing for all of us. I believe we will need bold measures to restore the vital parts of our old cities and that this will be the hardest job of all. It is not easy to make a bed when someone is sleeping in it or to straighten out the circulation in a house that has already been built.

I believe that new cities created by industrial relocation, a variety of incentives, and the promise of a better life may ultimately be easier to achieve. I also believe that the very large centers which are so created will spawn, in turn, a host of small satellite communities which may yet give us a delightful revival of small-town America.

I think there is a yearning in the American soul for a "sense of place," a community small enough to be comprehensible, where you can get to your trusty car, but where you and your children can also walk and commune with friends, trees, and the barber in the town square.

In my opinion, this is an exciting age for architects or whatever they may be called 20 years from now. We will have to stretch ourselves in every way, immerse ourselves in the social, political, economical lives of our communities; we will have to sharpen our skills and broaden our education. We have realized for sometime that today's projects require an ever-broadening team of experts and that no single professional, no single specialist, indeed no single individual is capable of carrying out an entire project.

All of this is fine, but it does not answer the question of what 20 years from now the super-university-trained architect will be doing. If this question is not satisfactorily answered, the profession will have failed, but it would be wrong to answer it yet. The right course, as most of us realize, lies in the very important changes now beginning in architectural education. These changes will give the student as broad and flexible a training as possible with a wide awareness of the changes in American society and of all that should go into the design of the towns and cities for this society. We might hope that he will then achieve the vision and means of turning it into reality. If this sort of education leads to the breakdown of professional labels, so much the better. Names matter little compared with the importance of training experts who are capable of controlling the relationship of men and their physical man-built environment. If we cannot do this, it will not just be the experts who will have failed — it will be our community and our country.
Architects Win
Golf Trophy
By Bruce Hartwigen

The FIRST ANNUAL N.Y.S.A.A. ARCHITECTS - EXHIBITORS GOLF TOURNAMENT was held on the challenging Whiteface Inn Championship Golf Course this year with the Architects emerging as the victors.

Representing the Architects were Fred Voss, Millard (Whitey) Whiteside, Stanley Klein and Bruce Hartwigen, and insisting that they had not played "customer golf" were Earl Brooks (Georgia Pacific), Bob Current (Alcoa), Charlie Todd (P.P.G.) and Carl Deimling (Stark Ceramics) representing the Exhibitors.

On awards night each member of the winning team was presented with a small replica of the large silver Revere bowl Trophy which will be engraved with the Winners names. The permanent trophy will be awarded to the winning team each successive year for them to retain until the following year's tournament.

Although the individual scores were not released for publication it was a closely fought match which was not decided until the final holes and the Architects were left with the challenge "just wait until next year".

Seminar Report
By James W. Peck

Past President of the AIA Morris Ketchum, Jr. FAIA effectively moderated the interesting panel discussion which gathered increasing numbers of spectators as conflicting activities ended. In fact, the discussion was so lively that the seminar had to be ended an hour late, to permit preparations for the evening activities.


The topic was "Responsibilities of The Architect". Each of the participants spoke about his relationship to architecture and indicated opinions of the responsibilities architects have in relation to his area of concern. A summation of their comment follows.

Mr. Langan indicated that his bank, which underwrites many large construction loans, is often faced with projects where the architect does not provide construction supervision services. This makes it difficult for banks to ascertain the extent of completion each month which is necessary for determining payments. He suggested that the AIA might set up panels of qualified architects who are available to perform such services.

Mr. Lynch, speaking for the Insurance Industry, indicated that most architects understand basic construction insurance policies. However, he believes that many are confused by the newer professional liability policies which are so necessary in the light of the increase in number of claims and the current high jury awards to the injured. He stressed the importance of proper coverage and adequate discussions with knowledgable brokers to determine such coverage. He also indicated that new comprehensive policies are now available which should be investigated.

Mr. Bennett, representing a manufacturer and as National President of the Producers Council, recalled the efforts of the AIA sponsored Producers Council review of methods to improve the quality of sales representation to the architectural profession. He asked several questions. Are we willing to stop using the phrase "or equal"? How can manufacturers best present the proper information to the profession? Perhaps architects have a responsibility to listen to well presented data. Perhaps we should offer constructive criticism to poorly presented data.

Mr. Ferguson, as a building official, chided the profession for the general attitude that his fellow workers are the evil gremlins of the building industry who foster pesky rules and regulations. He suggested that a building official can be a friendly ally offering free review service during the early stages of working drawings. Such reviews can save architects both time and money.

Mr. Dalton, president of a general contracting firm, was the clean-up man for the panel. He urged our profession to assume greater responsibility for the checking of shop drawings. He noted that some firms approve shop drawings with rubber stamps which indicate that any discrepancies are the contractor's fault. It was his opinion that the inclusion of long lists of unit prices in bidding documents are unnecessary and a handicap to the submission of accurate lump sum bids. He also expressed the view that the licensing of General Contractors is not a panacea to the problem of incompetent contractors - a better solution would be the more frequent use of selected bidding lists.
PROFESSIONAL JEALOUSY AND ENVY*

By Louis E. Moossy

To depend upon or to revere a person because of ability, skill, beauty, affection or intellect for survival breeds no jealousy so long as neither of the above attributes are possessed by the needy person, nor desired by the needy person. Jealousy and envy begin when two or more persons either possess the same attribute or think they do, and they try to vie for attention or try to excel one over the other.

The result is excessive pride, and this begins to stifle the intellect, to impair true skill, to overestimate ability, and to distort the proper goals. In effect, when jealousy or envy motivate the person, he begins, like Arachne, to be unreasonable. He begins to compete with the gods by considering himself divinely talented with no limitations, and, of course, this is dangerous. He will similarly transform himself into a spider to glutonously devour and destroy his fellow colleagues by assassinating their characters, deprecating their abilities, and using them as pawns and tools for his own self-gratification and success. He will implant himself in a quasi-hierarchy, and trim his clothes with purple.

As a matter of fact, most architects do possess the same abilities and the same skills. Most architects do have similar educational training and approximately the same intellectual mentality. They use the same medium of art and emotion to seek affection and beauty. They turn to the same standards for judging. A clash is inevitable — it is with most professions. Where is the solution to stamp-out professional jealousy? How is harmony established amongst architects? How can the ego of each architect be calmed? Pacified? Satisfied? Subdued?

Actually, the solution is simple. Each architect knows his limitations, and he must admit these limitations to himself. He must not think of himself as the omniscient image, the mirror of perfection that his public relation committee or institute make him out to be. What is his true stature? What are his limitations as an individual?

On should ask: What individual architect has advanced his profession by his own intellect and ability with the discovery of a new principle? Everyday practice leads the architect to use principles discovered or formulated by others. He lives on what others have discovered, and what others lay before him. What new principle in art has the architect advanced? What new formula in mathematics has he devised? What new compound or formula in chemistry does he put forth? What new law in physics does he expound? What new principle in either the arts or the sciences has he thrust into the world?

Another question to nick the ego: What individual architect has advanced his society by his work properly judged? Unfortunately, the structures that will ultimately be called good architecture will be properly judged by time, and not by contemporary juries and groups with the same opinion. Today, awards for good buildings are sometimes sought not for good work but for the status as an award winner. Pride raises his beastly head to scramble for the next step over his brothers.

As an individual citizen ask this: What individual architect has advanced his community in other fields outside architecture? The broad field of knowledge makes architecture alone a very limited pursuit. How many architects venture beyond the border to live a full community life? How many just laws has the architect helped to make? What is his participation in education, government and community life when no commission is involved?

To live by a moral code or a commercial profit code, one must ask: What individual architect has guided his daily practice by morality rather than profit to insure survival for his fellowman as well as himself? How many commissions will an architect give up so that another needy architect may be commissioned for survival? Does the architect try to “corner the market” with one governing body or board to exclude his colleagues? Too often, profit becomes the goal as the symbol of success and good architecture is relegated solely to the schools.

Finally, what architect is actually a gift to mankind as were Moses, Christ, Mohammed, Leonardo da Vinci, Shakespeare, Newton, Beethoven, Kant, Einstein, and Wright? The truth is, that even though the architect may be his own sun, he will go to his sepulcher in damp darkness, and he will be unnoticed to other generations — from the macroscopic illuminato to the microscopic nonentity.

Little by little, the architect can and ought to reduce himself in stature to realize that he is important as an architect only because his fellow architects exist to make him important. Each with his little contribution make an addition for a group grand total. Each by himself is a nonentity. Can jealousy or envy survive when each has evaluated himself this way?

Here, for the first time,  
a truly competitive stainless steel fenestration system  
(Turn page for the story)
USS ULTIMET Stainless Steel Wall Framing is an entirely new architectural design concept which takes advantage of modern manufacturing methods. ULTIMET components give the architect a completely integrated series of structurally efficient and easily fabricated and erected stainless steel shapes that lend themselves to a great variety of architectural expressions and applications.

All USS ULTIMET shapes are roll-formed, to make the best use of Type 304 stainless steel's remarkable properties. This permits economic achievements in the structural design, fabrication and erection of stainless steel curtain walls never before possible. Roll-forming also results in closer tolerances than possible with conventional custom manufacturing methods. This is one of the reasons why USS ULTIMET components can be erected more simply and quickly than any previous stainless steel wall framing system.

Only seven basic shapes are required to provide a variety of architectural treatments. The abrasion- and dent-resistant components are fabricated and shipped "knocked down" to the job site, ready to erect. Joining costs are minimal because precise part-to-part uniformity assures mate-fitting of all shapes. There are no exposed fasteners—no welding. In fact, most of the members simply lock into place. USS ULTIMET framing allows for normal thermal and building movement. The system controls water infiltration because of its built-in drainage feature. Glass and infill panels can be installed from either the inside or the outside of the building.

USS ULTIMET framing is here now! It is competitive! Components are readily available from inventories maintained by United States Steel.
This mark tells you a product is made of stainless steel.
**Ultimet Doors**

Only four roll-formed shapes are required to frame the USS ULTIMET Narrow-Stile Door. A one-piece channel gasket is fitted around the perimeter of the glass, and the framing members are simply tapped into place. Only one screw in each corner completes the assembly, and a simple adjustment in each corner squares it up. USS ULTIMET Doors accommodate standard locks, hinges and closers and combine maximum visibility with security.

**Horizontally Pivoted Windows**

The USS ULTIMET Horizontally Pivoted Window is attractive and practical. Designed to pivot 360° horizontally for emergency ventilation and ease of cleaning from the interior, it is easy to fabricate and install. Only one basic shape is required for the vent, and the basic grid members provide the frame for the sash. The design presents a flush appearance around its entire perimeter, with neat, narrow sight lines. USS ULTIMET Windows are snug and weather-tight and meet the NAAMM test requirements.

USS ULTIMET components are available now. Send the coupon today for your copy of the book, "USS ULTIMET Stainless Steel Wall Framing," or contact a USS Architectural Products Representative through your nearest USS Construction Marketing or Sales Office. USS and ULTIMET are trademarks.

United States Steel
Architectural Products Section
Room 9297
525 William Penn Place
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230

- Please send my free copy of "USS ULTIMET Stainless Steel Wall Framing."
- Please have a representative call.

Name
Title
Firm
Address
City State Zip Code

United States Steel: where the big idea is innovation
FIRST, THE IDEA

State laws may originate from an individual legislator, a governmental body, a state agency, a legislative committee, a private citizen, or an interested group or organization. Once the idea for a bill has been accepted by a legislator, it must be put into the required form for introduction.

Many bills are prepared by the legislators themselves, or by the persons or groups sponsoring them. Many are drawn up by the Bill Drafting Commission, composed of a group of attorneys whose duties are drafting and assisting in the preparation of legislative bills, resolutions and amendments.

The Legislative Library is open to legislators, their staffs, and others for research on legislative proposals.

When the form of the bill is ready for introduction, three copies of the bill are typed for each house, enclosed in a cover, and signed by the legislator introducing it. Then it is “dropped into the hopper,” or, in other words, “introduced.”

THE SENATE AND THE ASSEMBLY

The New York State Legislature consists of two “houses,” the Senate and the Assembly. All bills must be approved by both houses if they are to become laws. Therefore, most bills are introduced in both houses. This allows an Assemblyman and a Senator to work together for passage; permits simultaneous committee studies in both houses; and speeds up passage.

The legislative process in both houses is similar. The Assembly procedure is as follows:

PRINTING THE BILL

When a bill is introduced, copies are printed. A copy is placed on the desk of each member, and a copy is sent to the standing committee to which it has been referred. When a bill is placed on the calendar, copies are sent to the Revision Committee where the printed bill is checked for errors in printing or conflicts of law. If any are found, an amendment is suggested.

RECORDING THE BILL

The record of each bill is kept by the Journal Clerk and his staff. Each bill is given two numbers by the Index Clerk: (1)—The “Introductory” or “Intro” number, which is a basic number and does not change, no matter how many times a bill is amended; and (2)—The “Print” number, which is assigned in order of the actual bills printed. Each amendment carries a new “Print” number.
THE DOCUMENT ROOM

Extra copies of bills and legislative documents are kept on file in the Document Room. Here, anyone can get a copy of any bill, merely by requesting it by its "Print" number. A copy of the Legislative Index is on hand so that anyone can look up a bill he or she is interested in. When constituents request copies of bills, legislators obtain them here to send to them. Such easy access makes it possible for people, after a study of the bill, to express their views on it.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Each standing committee has a legislator designated as its Chairman who calls and presides over each committee meeting. In addition, each standing committee has a Counsel or Clerk who is responsible for the recording of bills, their processing and the recording of votes. He makes a report of all action and his records go to the Journal Clerk.

Both political parties are represented on the committee. Bills are discussed at meetings of the committee and a vote is taken. Material for or against a bill, received by the committee, is available for inspection and discussion by members. Sometimes the committee, where it feels there is a need, will hold public hearings to permit people to express themselves on legislation.

If the committee votes favorably on a bill, a report is made and it is put on the "Calendar," — it is reported for consideration on the floor of the house. Copies of the report are filed with the Journal Clerk, the Speaker, the Majority Leader, and the Minority Leader.

CONSIDERATION WITHOUT REPORT

When a member seeks to have a bill considered on the floor of the house, but the committee has not reported favorably on it, he may move to "discharge the committee" and have the bill brought to the floor for consideration. However, this is rarely done.

AMENDMENTS

A bill can be amended at any time by the legislator who introduces it. It may also be amended by the Committee considering it or on the floor of the house.

FLOOR DISCUSSION

Each legislative day a "Calendar" is issued listing the bills to be considered that day. The Clerk calls the calendar, reads messages, reads bills and calls the roll of votes. He also records the vote and announces the result.

The Speaker presides and makes all rulings, recognizes members for debate, and performs all presiding functions. If a bill is debated, the debate is generally closed by the Minority Leader, followed by the Majority Leader, each summing up for his party. Then the vote is taken.

VOTING ON BILLS

There are two methods of voting. Under the "Short Roll Call," the Clerk calls the name of the first legislator in alphabetical order, then the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader, and the last legislator in the alphabetical order. Any legislator wishing to vote against the bill then raises his hand and the Clerk records his vote. The "Long Roll Call" requires the Clerk to call the name of every member of the house, who responds and the Clerk records his vote.

When the Clerk reports the result of the vote, he calls the names of those voting in the negative to insure a correct tally. A tally sheet of every roll call is attached to every bill voted upon and is available in the Journal Clerk's office for inspection.

THE SENATE

When a bill has passed in the Assembly, it is sent to the Senate for consideration.

If the Assembly-passed bill had not been introduced as a "companion" in the Senate, it must now be referred to a Senate Committee for study and report.

However, if there was a companion bill in the Senate, a committee of that house can have completed its study and reported the bill out. A bill frequently is held on the calendar of one house to permit its passage in the other. When the bill is passed in one house and is sent to the other house, the bill which "comes over" after passing one house is substituted on the floor of the other house for the companion bill of the house receiving it, if the companion bill is on the calendar.

When the bill which has "come over" is passed by the second house, it is sent to the Governor for his consideration.

GOVERNOR'S ACTION

While the legislature is in session, the Governor may sign a bill into law or veto it. If he vetoes it, he must return it to the legislature, with his objections, and the legislature may override his veto by a vote of two-thirds of the members of each house.

While the legislature is in session, if the Governor fails to sign or veto a bill sent to him within ten days, exclusive of Sundays, it automatically becomes law without his signature.

No bill can become law after the final adjournment of the legislature, unless approved by the Governor within 30 days after such adjournment. All recent Governors have made it a point to sign or veto every "30 day bill."
LEGISLATIVE REPORT

Final Summary — 1966 Session

The Wind-Up

The Governor came back from his European vacation on July 27 and evidently worked feverishly to catch up on the 30-day bills that had been dumped on his desk at the end of the session on July 5th. Midnight August 4 being the deadline, he had disposed of each and every bill before him. Of the 357 bills that reached his desk at the session's end, he signed 240 into law and vetoed 117. Rounding out the statistics, the Governor signed 1025 into law and vetoed 303. A record number of 11,168 bills — a new high — were introduced during the 1966 session, of which less than 12% passed the two houses of the Legislature. Despite popular misconception it is not easy to get a bill passed and even tougher to get the Governor to sign it, particularly if opposed by the legal profession.

Highlights

There were many highlights during the session that might hold some interest for the architectural profession. While our statute of limitations' bill and the Greenberg bill were disapproved, including a third bill on this subject which passed one house on the final day but got "lost" on the Speaker's desk in the closing moments, we achieved a number of gains on the positive side. We did get the bill on the Council on Architecture signed and another that established a much desired City of New York Construction Fund.

Other Pluses

Also on the plus negative side (we were positive in our opposition) we successfully defeated all bills affecting the Education Law that would have permitted 1) "instant engineering" in corporate form by non-practitioners, 2) amendments to the Education Law advocated by the Education Department pertaining to Boards of Examiners, 3) efforts to effect broad changes in the architectural and engineering laws, 4) efforts to establish a new category of "safety engineers" without adequate standards and qualifications, 5) bills that would have allowed joint partnerships of landscape architects, 6) as well as steps to permit landscape architects to design structures. All of this took a lot of doing in view of powerful proponents who favored the above legislation. Thus we call a plus negative operation that was successful in every respect.

M.D.L. and M.R.L.

New York City architects, who have wondered why our legislative reports dwelled so sparingly on the subject of amendments to the M.D.L. and M.R.L. will understand when we report that out of a total of 144 M.D.L. bills introduced, only 7 reached the Governor's desk, 5 of which he signed into law and 2 were vetoed. A total of 14 M.R.L.'s were printed and introduced, of which only 2 received the Governor's attention — he favored one and disapproved the other. Truly the mountain labored and brought forth a rodent.

Resolutions — Of interest to architects.

Two Resolutions were adopted:

REVISION OF THE EDUCATION LAW — Assembly Resolution No. 190 provides for continuance of the Joint Legislative Committee, which started out as the so-called "Brydges Committee," but has been impotent the last two years, now has been reactivated with 6 members from the Senate and 6 from the Assembly. The leaders have appointed the following: Senator D. Clinton Dominick, III of Newburgh, chairman; Assemblyman Daniel Becker of Newburgh, vice chairman; Senator Jack E. Bronston of Nassau County, secretary; Senators Edward J. Speno of Nassau County, Tarky Lombardi, Jr. of Syracuse, James F. Hastings of Allegany County, Basi Patterson of Harlem; Assemblymen Joseph Kottler and Bertrand Baker of Brooklyn, Mrs. Dorothy H. Rose of Erie County, Leonard Stavisky of Queens County and Joseph M. Margiotta of Nassau County. The Governor has still to announce his two appointees. The Committee has an appropriation of $50,000.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT — Assembly Resolution No. 195 continues Joint Legislative Committee to study housing needs of state, possible revisions of the M.D.L. and M.R.L., planning and rehabilitation, construction, limited profit housing (which would include the Mitchell-Lama law), urban development and among other objectives "to conduct seminars with local enforcement officials, fire inspectors, property owners, architects, engineers and other interested groups." Committee is composed of 6 Senators and 6 Assemblymen, who are: Senator H. Douglas Barclay of Pulaski, chairman; Assemblyman S. William Green of Manhattan, vice chairman (he was once counsel to the Mitchell Committee); Senator William Rosenblatt of Brooklyn, secretary; Senators Thomas Laverne of Rochester, Martin Knorr of Queens, Whitley North Seymour of Manhattan, Harrison J. Gold of the Bronx; our own member Alfred A. Lama and Assemblymen Frank G. Rossetti of Manhattan, Victor Waryas of Poughkeepsie, Jerome Kretzman of Manhattan and Francis Boland, Jr. of Binghamton. The Committee has an appropriation of $75,000.
Council on Architecture

S.I. 2908, Pr. 5332, now Chapter 986. Creates Council on Architecture composed of 5 members, 3 of whom must be registered architects, to encourage excellence in design and preservation of historical sites. This bill had our active support.

City University Construction Fund

A.I. 6106, Pr. 7367, now Chapter 999. Creates New York City educational construction fund calling for construction of New York City public schools with apartments or offices above them, financed thru a special fund that would sell tax-exempt bonds outside the city's debt limit. Fund is to be administered by board of trustees consisting of president of education board, 4 appointees by such president and 4 by the mayor. Approved by NYSAA.

Another bill signed by the Governor, Chapter 782, A.I. 6125, Pr. 7336, would permit City University to expand its facilities thru a $400 million bond issue.

Amendments to the Multiple Dwelling Law

S.I. 4686, Pr. 5919, now Chapter 959. Amends sec. 25, to require that owner of multiple dwelling shall install light or lights at or near outside entrance of not less than 50 watts for up to 22 feet in height and 100 watts if over 22 feet, instead of at least 2 lights on each side of such entranceway, with provisions also to apply to buildings erected before April 18, 1929. Supported by NYSAA after bill was amended.

PEEPHOLES, EXEMPT COLLEGES — A.I. 2779, Pr. 2852, now Chapter 745. Amends section 51-a exempting colleges and school dormitories from provisions that multiple dwellings shall have peephole in entrance door of each housing unit.

DOOR, PEEPHOLES, 6-UNIT DWELLINGS — A.I. 5324, Pr. 5486, vetoed by Governor, Amends section 51-a, to exempt from provisions requiring peepholes in entrance doors of housing units in multiple dwellings, dwellings occupied by 6 families or less living independently of each other.

HEATING SYSTEMS, FIREPROOF, 6-UNIT DWELLINGS — A.I. 5325, Pr. 5487, vetoed by Governor. Amends section 65, to provide that requirement as to enclosure of heating systems in multiple dwellings, with fireproof or incombustible materials, shall apply to multiple dwellings occupied by more than 6 families living independently of each other.

HEATING, MINIMUM TEMPERATURE — A.I. 4686, Pr. 4848, now Chapter 485. Amends section 79, to provide that heating of multiple dwellings during hours of between 6 a.m. and 10 p.m., shall be not less than 68 degrees whenever outdoor temperature falls below 55 instead of 50 degrees.

NUISANCES, CERTIFIED, INJURIES — A.I. 4083, Pr. 6887, now Chapter 619. Amends sections 4, 304, 309, 325, to provide that whenever multiple dwelling is declared public nuisance, officers, directors and persons having interest in more than 10 per cent of issued and outstanding stock of owner, as holder or beneficial owner thereof, if owner is corporation shall be jointly and severally liable for injury to person or property sustained by any tenant or other person by reason of such condition, and for all costs and disbursements, subject to certain conditions as to management and notice.

BUILDING DEPARTMENT, ENFORCEMENT — A.I. 3954, Pr. 6579, now Chapter 350. Amends section 303, to provide that department charged with enforcing multiple dwelling law provisions may subpoena witnesses, administer oaths, take testimony, compel production of books and papers and hold hearings.

Amendments to Multiple Residence Law

POWER, AUXILIARY, LIGHTS — A.I. 1395, Pr. 6356, vetoed by Governor. Amends section 15, to require that after September 30, 1966, multiple dwellings 6 stories or more in height and not equipped with auxiliary generating power, shall be equipped with auxiliary generating battery-operated equipment, for use in emergency.

VIOLATIONS, RENT, ABATEMENT — A.I. 3416, Pr. 5745, now Chapter 291. Amend section 305-a, new, fixing provisions relating to abatement of rent in cases of certain violations in cities of less than 50,000 and in all towns and villages, including provision that if rent impairing violation exists and notice of violation is not cancelled or removed within 6 months after notice, then for period that it remains uncorrected, no rent shall be recovered by owner.

Thanks to All

There you have it, finish for 1966, and let's get ready now for 1967. On the whole, we didn't do so badly, probably the best legislative record we have had in years, only a big one got away — the statute bill, but the Governor hasn't heard the last of it yet. Our thanks to all who helped make this fine record possible. It was a privilege to serve in your behalf.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

F. A. EVANS, JR.
Chairman
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Co-chairman

JOSEPH F. ADDONIZIO
Executive Director
KIOSK DESIGN COMPETITION FOR CENTRAL PARK N.Y.C.

SPONSORS:

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS, NEW YORK CITY
  Thomas P. F. Hoving, Commissioner
HORN and HARDART COMPANY
  Williams J. Curtis, President
BRONX CHAPTER A.I.A.
  Robert Kaplan, A.I.A. President
BROOKLYN CHAPTER A.I.A.
  Donald Weston, President
PROFESSIONAL ADVISOR
  Edward Knowles, A.I.A.
  New York Chapter A.I.A.

The first prize winner of the first architectural competition to be held by the Department of Parks of the City of New York since 1907 was awarded to William R. Maurer, a young New York City architect. The first prize of $2000 included a design contract for the construction of the first of such units.

The objective of the competition was to stimulate a greater use of Central Park by the erection of a system of kiosks for the sale of light refreshments along the paths in the park. Techniques of prefabrication and light construction were to be considered and the design character was to be sympathetic with the design of the landscaping and original park architecture.

At the award presentation on July 19, 1966, Commissioner Hoving said that "the primary object of competitions in architecture is to bring to public notice fresh young talent such as Mr. Maurer"; and that "a secondary objective in competition is to create a certain tension or controversy about the elements of design so that the public becomes educated in the finer points of architecture and begins to demand better designs in their public spaces and buildings."

The second prize of $350 was awarded to Wallace J. Toscano and David Specter, AIA, of New York City for their "imaginative plastic domed kiosk design," which was presented by Robert Kaplan, President of the Bronx Chapter AIA which had donated $250 toward the competition.

The third prize of $150 was awarded to Leon J. Haft and Steve Oles of Cambridge, Massachusetts "for their refreshing design of a kiosk with a suspended canopy mounted on four standards" which was presented by Donald Weston, President of the Brooklyn Chapter AIA which donated $250 toward the competition.

The first prize entry is considered to be the "preliminary design" for the kiosk which will actually be built at a cost of approximately $12,000 by the Horn and Hardart Company in Central Park.

The award jury consisted of William J. Conklin, AIA, James Lamantia, AIA, Paul Rudolf, AIA, Henry Hope Reed, Jr., Curator of Central Park, and Edgar Tafel, AIA, Chairman.
1966 NYSAA CONVENTION ACTION
By-Laws, Resolutions and Dues

BY-LAWS

The convention adopted without modifications the proposed by-law changes as printed in full in the September/October 1966 issue ESA.

INCREASE IN DUES

The convention approved an increase in dues for NYSAA members effective in 1967. The increase was from $9.00 to $15.00 for Constituent and Corporate members, and from $3.00 to $5.00 for Associate members.

RESOLUTIONS

The following Resolutions presented by Albert Melniker, Chairman — Resolutions Committee were adopted by the Convention delegates.

RESOLUTION I

TITLE: Appreciation and Thanks to the 1966 Convention Committee

SPONSORED BY: Resolutions Committee

WHEREAS, the success of our annual Conventions is due in the greatest part to the efforts of the Convention Committee and the Host Chapter, and

WHEREAS, the 1966 Convention has been outstanding in this respect and will long be remembered for its hospitality and its interesting features.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that this Convention expresses its thanks to the entire Convention Committee, to Gerson T. Hirsch, Convention Chairman, to Stanley H. Klein, Co-Chairman, to the many hard working members of the Committee, to the ladies under the Chairmanship of Mrs. Millard F. Whiteside who developed an interesting ladies program and to the Host Chapter, Westchester Chapter A.I.A., for making this a memorable occasion.

RESOLUTION II

TITLE: Appreciation and Thanks to the Educational Exhibitors

SPONSORED BY: Resolutions Committee

WHEREAS, the value of our only Conventions are greatly enhanced by the display and building materials, and

WHEREAS, the Educational Exhibits and material displays during this convention have been of outstanding quality and has added immeasurably to the scope of this Convention,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the NYSAA commends the Exhibitors for their excellent displays and expresses the thanks and appreciation of this Convention.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an expression be given Joseph F. Addonizio for his work in coordinating the many phases of this Convention.

RESOLUTION III

TITLE: General Contractor’s Registration Law

SPONSORED BY: New York Chapter A.I.A.

WHEREAS, Architects, in the course of their professional services must recommend to clients General Contractors, whose performance is of the highest standards, and

WHEREAS, in New York State there is no existing registration of General Contractors, who adhere to certain prescribed ethics and business responsibilities, and

WHEREAS, the Architects and citizens of certain other States enjoy the protection of such registration of General Contractors, and

WHEREAS, in 1961 and 1965 the New York Chapter, American Institute of Architects and the New York State Association of Architects declared the desirability of such registration laws,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the New York State Association of Architects in Convention assembled, endorse the desirability of such a registration, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a method be devised to prepare this law in conjunction with responsible general contractor’s associations and that this matter then be referred to the Legislative Committee of this Association for action during the 1967 session of the New York State Legislature.

RESOLUTION IV

TITLE: Evaluation Committee

SPONSORED BY: The Evaluation Committee

WHEREAS, this Committee has conducted a series of meetings during the year 1966, and

WHEREAS, the Committee Co-Chairmen, Trevor Rogers and Robert Kaplan and the Consultant, Albert Melniker have reviewed the findings of the six sub-committees and,

WHEREAS, The Evaluation Committee has done a great deal of research in charting the future course of NYSAA,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the NYSAA extend the life of this Committee for a period of one year in order to have the Committee submit its final report in April of 1967 and authorize the Board of Directors to allocate a sum not to exceed $500. for Committee expenses.

(CONTINUED IN NEXT ISSUE ESA)
THE EFFECTS OF REGULATORY AND NONREGULATORY AGENCIES ON HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS IN NEW YORK STATE

By J. Armand Burgun
Rogers, Butler & Burgun
Chairman, Legislative Committee New York Chapter, The American Institute of Architects

This article consists of an updating of a report prepared by the Hospital and Health Committee of the New York Chapter, American Institute of Architects, entitled "The Effect of Regulatory Agencies on Hospitalization Costs in New York State", by J. Armand Burgun, which appeared in the January/February, 1966 issue of the Empire State Architect. It notes the continuing entanglement of hospital design in the red tape of regulatory practices and its effect on hospital construction.

THE GROWING COST OF hospital care in New York State has been and still remains the persistent concern of many administrators, doctors, legislators, architects, and perhaps most of all, patients. One of the factors contributing to this rising cost is the confusing and often chaotic condition brought about by too many agencies, codes, rules and regulations governing hospital construction. It is the belief of many people in the hospital design field that the codes and agencies are responsible, in a good measure, for increasing construction costs and inhibiting new and perhaps more efficient building designs. A better understanding of the problem may be aided by a brief historical background of hospital regulations in New York State.

New York State has never had a licensure program with the exception of Proprietary institutions located in New York City. Statutory authority for approval of Hospital Charters and construction was vested in the N.Y. State Department of Social Welfare. The State Department of Health had only peripheral jurisdiction in such areas as maternal & child health, environmental sanitation and narcotics control, with the exception of State owned acute-general and tuberculosis hospitals, which were directly under its control. State owned mental & psychiatric hospitals were under the control of the N.Y. State Department of Mental Hygiene. Further, each community had building, zoning, fire, health & sanitation laws with which all hospitals (with the exception of State and Federal) had to comply.

This relatively simple procedure lasted until 1946 when the Hill-Burton Act was passed into law. At that time a new State Agency was established called the New York State Joint Hospital Survey and Planning Commission. To assist this agency to receive “grass roots” planning and cooperation, a State Hospital Council and seven Regional Hospital Planning Councils were established. This Agency and the Planning Councils, however, had authority only over Hill-Burton grants-in-aid, priority tables and minimum construction standards relative to federal grants. The Joint Hospital Commission was headed by a triumvirate comprised of the Commissioners of Health, Social Welfare, and Mental Hygiene, and as such, relative peace was maintained until 1960 when the Joint Hospital Survey and Planning Commission was disbanded by the Governor and its powers given to the New York State Department of Health.

Prior to this point, one other disturbing event took place which was the adoption of the New York State Building Code by the Department of Social Welfare for all hospital construction. This meant that a hospital in any given community with a building code had to comply with two building codes. No mechanism for resolving conflicts was ever developed.

In 1960, the Departments of Health and Social Welfare stopped cooperation, and both insisted on a complete review of architectural drawings and specifications of Hill-Burton construction. The Department of Social Welfare still maintained sole control over non-Hill-Burton work with the exception of the Health Department interest in maternal & child health and environmental sanitation.

Five reasons were advanced by the Health Department in 1963 for the passage of the Metcalf-McClosky Bill in New York. They are as follows:

1. The rapidly rising costs of hospital care.
2. Evidences of construction programs in excess of estimated needs and cases of undesirable duplication of facilities and services.
3. The rapid increase in the demand for hospital admission on the part of the public and emergency room services.
4. The development of hospital utilization committees in hospitals and the results of special studies revealed that hospital patients were not always in high cost hospitals and whose needs could be met by proper home facilities or diagnosis and treatment which might be rendered on an ambulatory basis by the physician's offices.
5. The lack of adequate constitutional or legal contraventions with regard to the development of new hospitals or the expansion of existing hospitals. This was most obvious in the field of proprietary institutions and institutions operated by local governments. Studies have revealed that even when unnecessary beds are developed, they are soon filled with patients. This has a deleterious effect on the medical and hospital economy and provides threats to the stability of the voluntary health insurance plan, primarily Blue Cross.

It is interesting to note that no one even considered the duplica-
tial, the Metcalf-McClosky Act made regional planning mandatory instead of voluntary. It stated that prior to the approval of a hospital or nursing home construction or alteration the applicant must receive approval from the appropriate Regional Council, the State Hospital Council, the State Department of Health, and the Department of Social Welfare. Incredibly, this was required of all institutions, regardless of auspices and the dollar amount of construction. Even more incredibly, it required that the institution hire the services of an architect, prior to telling him whether or not a hospital in a given location would be approved. (A long and unbelievably complicated application form required the attachment of architect drawings, including ¼" scale details.) This led to the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects to moan in an official publication:

...onto this elaborate administrative machine must, of course, be fed information and its was with considerable shock that hospital architects first obtained their application forms from the Area Office of the State Department of Social Welfare. The forms, some fourteen pages in themselves, require much more than a description of the proposed facility; they require complete data on the institution itself, including the financial reliability of its directors, the competence of its staff, and many other details. In addition, demographic information concerning the population within the hospital's catchment area and the kinds and qualities of existing services now provided within that area are required. This kind of information is often not easily available to the institution and may require extensive research to obtain. We are particularly concerned that the submission of complete preliminary plans is required even before approval of the project in principle is given. Not only will much architectural talent be wasted on projects that never proceed but hospitals are loath to spend the time and the money that is really necessary to design these projects properly when the effort is so highly speculative. Unfortunately, once a project is approved, it must proceed without substantial change, no matter how badly its original conception proves to be.

At this point, the system for reviewing and approving architectural drawings had reached an acme of complication. They were reviewed by the Regional Council, the State Department of Health, the State Department of Social Welfare, and, if Hill-Burton was involved, the Regional Office of the U.S. Public Health Service. If a psychiatric or mental unit was involved, the Department of Mental Hygiene had to be added. In addition, the applicant had to submit drawings and specifications to the local Building and Zoning Departments as well as the Departments of Fire, Water Supply, Gas & Electricity, Health; and in some instances, Hospitals.

It should be added that two other events occurred at about this time to further complicate the picture.

(1) New York City promulgated new codes governing the construction of Proprietary Hospitals and Nursing Homes.

(2) New York State created two new agencies to carry out construction programs formerly carried on by the State Architects Office.

(a) The New York State Education Construction Fund; charged with the construction of state owned educational facilities including medical schools and teaching hospitals.

(b) The New York State Mental Hygiene Construction Fund, charged with the construction of state owned mental hospitals and giving grants-in-aid for the construction of psychiatric units in nonprofit, acute general hospitals.

It should be noted that these agencies are in addition to the State Education Department and the Department of Mental Hygiene which are still in existence.

Through the concerted efforts of many interested citizens including the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, but mostly due to its own cumbersome weight, this system collapsed. Typical of the comments is the following quote from a report to the Governors' Committee on Hospital Costs:

"In actual practice, the "Rules and Regulations" (of the Dept. of Social Welfare) are not available and some of the architects have obtained "Plan Check Lists" for the particular type of facility being considered. Although the requirements of the Department of Social Welfare include Public Health Service Regulations, the "Rules" as interpreted by their architects are the items that are actually enforced. In many instances the interpreted rules are in conflict with Public Health Service Regulations."

The result of the Governors' Committee was the passing of the so-called Folsom Amendments to the Metcalf-McClosky Act (Public Health Law 2803). The basic purpose of this amendment was to remove the Department of Social Welfare from the law completely with the exception of approving new charters or amending existing charters, leaving them with no authority over design or construction of hospital facilities. It also prescribed a minimum construction cost which need not be filed ($50,000), made an attempt to list all applicable codes, rules and regulations, and a greatly simplified application form was devised. Unfortunately, however, the State Department of Health has decided that another Hospital Code is necessary, and is now in the process of writing one.

This is where the situation currently stands in New York State. It is, perhaps, no better or worse than any other state. However, many of those concerned with hospital de-
sign believe that this situation is serious enough to warrant concerted action for the reasons outlined below. It is obvious that a hospital that is housed in an obsolete building cannot provide first class medical and nursing services — nor can it operate efficiently. Unless old and obsolete hospitals are constantly being replaced or modernized, no State can provide its citizens with adequate and economical health services. In this regard, it is of interest to note that the N.Y.C. Proprietary Nursing Home Code passed in 1962 was so severe that new home construction has been negligible since its effective date.

Many regulatory & non-regulatory agencies issue periodic "guidelines" or instant rules which have the effect of and are interpreted by reviewing agencies as law. Examples of this are the Sprinkler Guide Lines issued by the New York City Fire Department and the Emergency Lighting and Power Requirements for Existing and New Hospitals in New York City promulgated by the Hospital Review and Planning Council of Southern New York, Inc.

A glance at the required codes and standards previously listed (ESA Jan./Feb. '66) will show that one agency adopts at least eleven national standards as law — in addition to all the local building and zoning codes and sanitation rules and regulations. The result of all these rules, coupled with a plethora of rule makers and interpreters leads one to the conclusion that they will:

1) Discourage needed modernization.
2) Increase the time necessary to complete a project.
3) Reduce the quality of architectural and engineering design.
4) Increase the cost of hospital expansion and improvements.
5) Reduce the efficiency of hospital operations.
6) Postpone advances in medical service.
7) Discourage long range institutional planning.

Some solution to this problem is urgently needed to the end that mere bureaucratic obstruction be ended and in its place be provided the kind of guidance that is needed in the development of the health services of this State.

1) As a first step, it is recommended that a research program be instituted that would develop a comprehensive index of all hospital codes and regulations; that would define areas of jurisdiction; spotlight conflicts and inconsistencies; and lay a factual basis for the development of an effective state-wide or nationwide program of guidance and regulation. To be fully effective, this program should encompass the entire nation, as it is assumed that New York State is not unique with its experience.

2) Promote the use of national standards and discourage the use of individualized, usually inferior local codes, rules and regulations. This includes adopting standardized definitions and terminology.

3) Encourage the preparation of an all-inclusive code covering building construction, safety of occupants, environmental health & sanitation, and other standardized requirements (i.e. Electrical, HVAC). This would negate the need for such special codes as the Life Safety Code NFPA 101.

4) Encourage the hiring of properly trained personnel by reviewing agencies in sufficient number to properly interpret the regulations and the drawings and specifications in a prompt and competent manner. It is especially important that reviewing personnel realize that they are critics and not the designing architect. They should permit as much design freedom and experimentation as is permissible under the law.

news and views

Architectural Competition
Announced by N. Y. C.

The firms of Edward L. Barnes, Marcel Bruere and Associates, Kelly and Gruzen, Philip Johnson Associates, and Whittlesey, Conklin and Rossant have been invited by Mayor John V. Lindsay to participate in an architectural competition for the design of a $5.7 million combined stable and precinct house in New York City's Central Park.

Each entrant will receive $15,000. The first prize winner will receive an additional $10,000, as well as the commission to design the police-stable facility. Second prize will receive an additional $8,000; third prize an additional $5,000.

The announcement was made on September 30, 1966 by the Mayor and Parks Commissioner Thomas P. F. Hoving. The Mayor said that this was the single most important architectural competition held in New York City since Olmstead & Vaux won the competition for the design of Central Park in 1858.

The competition contains cost-control provisions to enable the facility to be built within the $5.7 million limit. Each architect will be assigned a professional estimator to review all budget items. Entries which, in the opinion of the estimators exceed the cost limit, will not be considered in the judging. Mayor Lindsay said that assigning estimators to each architect is a landmark in the history of municipal architectural competitions, which should prevent the competition from being merely an "architectural exercise" so common in the past because the cost control factor was absent.

Program requirements for the facility have been researched by Bentel & Bentel, Architects, of Locust Valley, New York. Fred Bentel will serve as professional

(Continued on next page)
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advisor to the competition. The judges will be Parks Commissioner Hoving; Police Commissioner Howard R. Leary; Stephen Currier, President of Urban America, Inc.; Arthur Rosenblatt, member of the American Institute of Architects, design consultant to Commissioner Hoving; William Breger, AIA; Lewis Davis, AIA; Paul Rudolph, AIA; and M. Paul Friedberg, landscape architect.

The stable facilities will provide 150 stalls for the mounted police, 150 stalls divided between privately-boarded and hack horses, as well as space for Polo Association horses. There will be a multi-purpose indoor ring for horse shows and polo matches, which will be designed so as to permit division for horse training and public and private classes.

Funds for the competition will be provided by Stephen Currier, a private philanthropist, amounting to $15,000, for each entrant. The funds for the construction of the combined facility will be divided equally between the capital budgets of the Police and Parks Departments.

The competition will close in late December, 1966, and the judging will take place in January, 1967.

N.Y. Chapter AIA Announces $6000 Arnold W. Brunner Scholarship

Proposals are invited for an advanced study contributing to the practice, teaching or knowledge of the art and science of Architecture. The winner will be awarded $6000 to finance the completion of his study.

Application forms available to January 1, 1961. Proposals may be submitted to January 15, 1967. Announcement of the award will be made June 1, 1967.


C. S. Barrows Firm Changes Name

The architectural partnership of Barrows, Parks, Morin, Hall and Brennan of Rochester, N.Y. announced a change in the firm name effective October 1, 1966. The new partnership of Parks, Morin, Hall, Brennan and Sattelberg includes the names of the five remaining partners following the retirement of the firm's founder C. Storrs Barrows.

C. Storrs Barrows began his practice in 1911 after education at the University of Rochester. He continually worked to improve the Rochester community by participation in the Board of Trustees of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce, Mayor's Housing Committee, Civic Development Council, and the Federation of Churches. He is a past president of the Rochester Society of Architects, the Central New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects and the New York State Association of Architects; and for his contributions to his profession, the community and the country, Mr. Barrows was elected a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects in 1952.

N. Y. Society of Architects Holds Exhibition

The New York Society of Architects in cooperation with the U.S. Plywood Corporation staged a public exhibition for one month during October/November in New York City entitled ENVIRONMENT: BY ARCHITECTS.

The theme expressed by N.Y.S.A. President Fred L. Liebmann was: “Our buildings, their surroundings, the neighborhood, the atmosphere and backgrounds are the visual expression of our culture and our life. To our architects we appeal to create an environment that will be a true setting for our civilization.” Forty-four architects participated showing examples of their work in which environment was a significant criteria in their designs. An average of 200 persons per day attended the exhibit.

The James Stewardson Travelling Fellowship For 1967 Announced

James Stewardson, Architect, a citizen of England, spent most of his professional life in New York City. He had a high regard for his fellow workers in this country which is evidenced by his generous bequest to the New York Chapter The American Institute of Architects to endow a travelling fellowship which, he specified, "shall be awarded each year to a worthy architectural draftsman."

Both men and women are eligible. Candidates must be between the ages of 30 and 50 years, and must not previously have had a travelling fellowship. They may be married or single. They must have been continuously employed—not as a principal—for at least one year immediately prior to the application in an architectural office in the territory of the New York Chapter, which includes the Borough of Manhattan, southern half of Ulster and Dutchess Counties, all of Sullivan, Putnam and Rockland Counties, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands and the Canal Zone.

The successful candidate will be requested to submit an oral or written illustrated report at the conclusion of the travel. The amount of the Fellowship to be awarded annually is $2,000.

The Committee entrusted with the selection of the sixth James Stewardson Travelling Fellow will receive applications up to December 1, 1966. Following a review of these applications, the most promising candidates will be interviewed before recommendations are made to the Executive Committee of the New York Chapter, A.I.A., which will make the final selection. Announcement of award will be made on or before February 1, 1967. The Fellow will begin his trip within eight months of receiving the award and spend at least four months in foreign travel.

The application form can be obtained from the office of the New York Chapter, A.I.A., 115 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y. 10016.
SEEN AND SNAPPED AT CONVENTION '66

Harry Silverman comnunts

Mr. and Mrs. Gershon Hirsch surrounding John Briggs

Mr. Melniker, Mike Radostulich, Mrs. Urbahn, Al Macomber

Bill Modin, lower left, lends an ear to Max Urbahn

Al Melniker talks things over with Dave Todd

Mr. Schiller, Mrs. Diesen, Mr. Schiller, Mrs. Kurtz

Ai Brevitti, President ENY Chapter

Westchester and N.Y. Chapters get together

Mr. and Mrs. Duke Chambers and Friend

Guertino Nalenti Pres. Architecture Council NYC

Mrs. Sam Kurtz and Mr. Sam Hertz

Struggling golfers Fred Voss and Stanley Klein
SPECIFY RUGGED REFRESHMENT

Nothing says permanence like Haws rugged concrete fountains... whether you want pedestal units such as Model 30 shown above, or a wall-mounted fountain like Model 50-C below. Both are precast reinforced concrete to assure everlasting beauty despite outdoor exposure or indoor abuse. And you can specify in exposed aggregate or light sandblast finish... in the color of your choice! Haws pedestal Model 30 comes in 30", 36" and 42" heights, for the tall and small. Indoors or out, Haws concrete fountains will meet your specs. (A freeze-proof valve system is available, too.) For details, write HAWS DRINKING FAUCET COMPANY, 1441 Fourth Street, Berkeley, California 94710.

Since 1909

BO O K R E V I E W
A Majority of One

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT: A study in architectural content.
By Morris Kelly Smith. 192 pages Prentice-Hall $5.95 cl./$2.45 paper

Another book about Frank Lloyd Wright? Well this isn’t ‘just another book’. Of the many written, including the subject’s own literary efforts, hardly any have achieved a more realistic understanding of the man and his architecture. Art historian Norris Kelly Smith accomplishes this by placing the details of F.L.W.’s personal life, his philosophy, his written and spoken words, his teachings and his works—in the several periods of his career—into sharp focus, highly magnified.

Smith finds Wright’s source of power lay in his essentially conservative nature which permitted him to keep alive a rich and poetic conception of architecture at a time when architectural theory was being reduced to a functional rather than a symbolic art. In Wright he finds an artist who proclaims the traditional Biblical and Romantic faith in the dignity and integrity of man, and one who took an isolated stand in defense of some of the oldest and best ideas of civilized man.

Smith examines Wright’s frustrations, failures, and uncertainties in trying to embody his philosophical principles in architectural metaphors. He finds him to have been deeply concerned with a continuing quest for perfection and harmony. In these efforts Smith believes that Wright “perhaps more than any other artist of our time suffered from being overpraised and underestimated” and that he had been accorded a vast amount of admulatory publicity most of which hardly touched upon the issues and ideas with which he wrestled throughout his life.

With a well written, easy to read style, Professor Smith supports his analysis with photographs and illustrations of appropriate examples of some of Wright’s best known works. It might just be possible that F.L.W. was a “little more right than his neighbors”.

— shamoku.
TO GET THE BEST RESULTS —
YOU MUST BEGIN WITH THE BEST

**Autoclave Curing** (Hi-Pressure Steam)
Preshrinks for Stability

**Haydite** (Rotary Kiln Expanded Shale)
A Manufactured Lightweight Aggregate, not a By-Product

**Good Concrete Mix Design** — For Strength and Durability

**Quality Control** — For a Uniform Product
From a Producer Who Cares

**SPECIFY — ANCHORLITE AUTOCLAVED HAYDITE BLOCKS**

ANCHOR CONCRETE PRODUCTS, Inc.
P.O. BOX 869
AREA CODE 716 — 892-3152
BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14240

---

at your service . . .

**MR. ARCHITECT**

**PHOTO COPIES**
**BLUEPRINTS**

BUFFALO
SULLIVAN-McKEEGAN CO., INC.
Albert T. Merrick 739 Main Street
COMMERCIAL BLUEPRINT CO.
Geo. G. Merry 5208
MA. 5208 208 Lower Terrace’ WA. 6722
ROCHESTER
CITY BLUEPRINT CO.
William Fay 187 Delaware Avenue
H. H. SULLIVAN, INC.
Anthony Sulkowski Phone 232-6440
87 South Avenue

DO YOU KNOW why welded structures reduce steel costs to compete with reinforced concrete.


**SAXE WELDED CONNECTIONS**
1701 ST. PAUL ST. BALTIMORE, MD. 21202

Price $1.00
Solite Prestressed Members Reduce Erection, Transportation and Supporting Member Costs

Progressive engineers and prestress producers have long been aware of the substantial advantages that prestressed products obtain through the use of high strength Solite aggregate. These advantages principally include:

1. Superior fire resistance.
2. Reduced loads to supports and foundations.
3. Lower erection and transportation costs.

Evaluation of an aggregate for prestress use, however, requires long time studies of creep and shrinkage to assure maintenance of effective prestress at high levels. Numerous studies (VPI test shown below for example) have revealed that Solite creep and shrinkage behavior is comparable to conventional aggregates.

The modern Hamilton Standard Electronics Division project, composed of Solite prestressed concrete demonstrates the clean, modern structure achieved by imaginative architects and engineers combining efforts with a progressive prestress producer.
Since 1818

HOPE'S WEATHERSTRIPPED STEEL WINDOWS

Today's increased interest in creating pleasant, attractive quarters to stimulate productivity is exemplified in this new office building. Beauty of line joins the consideration of occupant comfort in a modern design for business living. Hope's Weatherstripped Steel Windows contribute to the symmetry of the overall design, and to environmental comfort while providing unsurpassed weather protection. Air infiltration is reduced by more than 60% with Hope's exclusive Neoprene-weatherstripped steel windows (confirmed by independent laboratory tests).

HOPE'S WINDOWS, INC.
Jamestown, N.Y.
STARKUSTIC

ACOUSTICAL CERAMIC TILE

PERMANENT NOISE CONTROL

STARKUSTIC offers, for the first time, an acoustical control wall product with a permanent glazed finish unaffected by moisture. Starkustic offers structural strength, fire resistance, scratch resistance and a wide choice of permanent colors. Available in 6T and 8W series with random or symmetrical pattern perforations.

All these characteristics make Starkustic ideal for noise control where heat, humidity, steam or sanitation are factors...

GYMNASIUMS • AUDITORIUMS • INDOOR SWIMMING POOLS • POWER PLANTS • SCHOOLS • LOBBYS • MUSIC ROOMS

FULL SERVICE

We will be most happy to be of service at any time during your planning, specifying, bidding or building. Full information including sizes, colors, samples and prices are available... You'll find us convenient to write or call.

*B Sound Absorption Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>125 CPS</th>
<th>250 CPS</th>
<th>500 CPS</th>
<th>1000 CPS</th>
<th>2000 CPS</th>
<th>4000 CPS</th>
<th>NOISE LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Ceramic Glazed Tile</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Ceramic Glazed Tile</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Factors based on tests of 6T unit (6½” x 12” x 4”) with 207-⅛” diameter holes in symmetrical pattern.
(b) Factors based on tests of 8w unit 4” x 8” x 16” with 322 holes of random size & pattern.

BELDEN-STARK BRICK CORP.
386 Park Avenue South
New York, N. Y. 10016 • Telephone: MU 6-3939

JOHN H. BLACK CO.
113 Gillette Avenue
Buffalo, New York 14214 • Telephone: 884-2306