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CHAPEL OF THE UNITED STATES
MILITARY ACADEMY AT WEST POINT

"... a most original building ... bearing scant kinship ... to any recognized ecclesiastical work of the past."
CHAPEL OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AT WEST POINT
In these days of inquiry and investigation into administrative economics, it is not surprising to learn that there are those who have come to believe that wise building is a serious business,—a business demanding the highest order of competence, integrity and executive ability, as well as an appreciation of the refinements of the art of architecture. In state and municipal building, there have been so many examples of incompetent administration of the public funds, by politically appointed officers, that there has developed an earnest desire to establish a new order of things, and to endeavor, if possible, to insure that the great responsibility of planning and erecting public buildings shall be borne by those only who have been proved fully qualified, and whose selection shall be a guarantee that the convenience, health, and safety of the public will be properly safeguarded, and that the public funds will be disbursed with a minimum of extravagance and waste.

A bill has been prepared for presentation to the legislature of the state of California, looking to the establishing of a State Architectural Commission, consisting of qualified architects and engineers, and providing for the employment of a Supervising Architect under the control of the Commission. It is intended that the Commission shall be a substitute for the present office of State Architect, and it has been recommended by the Southern California Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, which is urging this legislation, that the members of the Commission shall serve without compensation.

This would seem to be a timely suggestion for consideration by the legislators and executives of other states, particularly by Governor Sulzer of New York. It has been represented to the Governor that, as the office of State Architect is one of great responsibility, involving the expenditure of millions of dollars of the public funds, the incumbent should be the sort of man whom any individual or corporation would feel justified in employing to conduct important operations and disburse large sums. The Governor has expressed his entire sympathy with this view, and has initiated an investigation to the end that the afore-stated ideal may be realized. He is to be congratulated upon his broad
and public-spirited attitude toward this important problem, and the legislators of the State of California should immediately see the force of the example before them, and weigh its importance as bearing upon the matter which they are about to consider.

After all, the theorem is so simple that it is almost axiomatic. Wise leaders in every phase of industrial or commercial life would refuse to trust their invested capital and the health and happiness of their employees in the hands of the incompetent, and the ordinary business principles which should govern the executive management of a great state differ only in degree from those of commercial life. Every state has its responsibilities for the care of helpless humanity,—the deaf and the blind, the mentally deficient and the criminal classes. The proper housing of these, each class presenting a different problem from the others, requires and should receive the thoughtful consideration of those specially trained minds which are possessed only by architects of wide experience. It is not enough that the unfortunate wards of the state be given sufficient nourishment and protection from the elements. Their environment should be such as to make for their physical and mental gain and, where possible, for their ultimate restoration to health and happiness.

Is this a task for the incompetent?

THE LINCOLN MEMORIAL

The passage of the joint resolution on the Lincoln Memorial by the House of Representatives, January 29, 1913, and the signing of the resolution by the President, February 1, secures a most fitting Memorial to Abraham Lincoln, fixes a most important element in the development of the capital city in accordance with the Park Commission Plans for which the Institute has stood sponsor, and ends ten years’ continuous struggle to secure the proper location and design for this great monument.

It is not to be assumed that all the many excellent gentlemen, in Congress and out, who have engaged in the proposition to divert the appropriation from its proper intent, have done so through selfish motives. Misconception of the facts has been a prime factor, and as the understanding grows of what the summation of the plans of the Park Commission means to the whole nation, it is certain that general satisfaction will be felt.

There is encouragement, now, for renewed persistence in holding to the Park Commission’s ideals for the development of the City of Washington. That city must be kept worthy and made more worthy to bear the name of the Father of his Country, the immortal First President.
THE GYMNASIUM

THE NEW UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY
AT WEST POINT

I
T IS, of course, too early to make any definitive estimate of the work at West Point by Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson, architects; too early, perhaps, to pass judgment on what the architects have done or tried to do. A third of the entire scheme still remains to be worked out—estimating this on the importance rather than the number of buildings—and the lacunæ are conspicuous and inevitably derogatory to the work that already exists. The general scheme is one of enormous comprehensiveness, comprising some ten major buildings and some twenty-five minor structures. The greater part of the latter (composed of residences for married officers, schools, etc.) have been erected; but amongst the major buildings there still remain many of prime importance for which no appropriation has been made available. These include the Cadet Headquarters, which will occupy the space originally given to the old Gymnasium, and will form the basis for the Chapel; the Quartermaster’s Stores, a huge aggregation of quadrangles which ultimately will rise on the northerly slope; the Hotel on the steep cliffs above the railway station; the Second Battalion Barracks, which will balance those already constructed, and which will occupy the space now given to the group of Officers’ Quarters on the right of the Gymnasium; the Railway Station, with its elevator tower connecting the water-level with the main plateau; and, finally, the great group of Staff Headquarters, comprising the residences
of the Superintendent, the Commandant, the Adjutant, the Quartermaster, and the Surgeon, together with the great reception-rooms, etc., for official guests.

Lacking these great structures, all of which are intimately associated with the work already built and form an essential portion of the composition, the work already accomplished becomes not a consistent organic unit, but more or less a series of isolated structures, each of which suffers from the lack of those neighbors that were originally contemplated, and that will undoubtedly serve to tie the whole thing together, and reveal in convincing fashion the fundamental ideal of the architects.

It is important that this fact should be borne in mind. If we look at the Academy from the other side of the river, from the river itself, or from points within the walls, we get, to a certain extent, an impression that is lacking in unity. It only needs, however, a glance at the general plan to show that this condition is temporary. When Congress sees fit to make the necessary appropriation, and the entire scheme can be carried out in its integrity, an impression of unity will take the place of the present effect of incompleteness.

At present, each building must be considered by itself; and, so considered, there seems to have been a certain lack of impartiality as between one building and another; that is, some of them are powerfully conceived, carefully considered in details, and worked out with fine attention to their component parts, others are more casual and unstudied; while one building will show extraordinary and loving interest, others seem to indicate hurry and lack of thought. For example, the Chapel and the Post Headquarters will come in the first category, and it is quite difficult to criticise them, either in their conception or in their working out. On the other hand, the Bachelor Officers' Quarters is distinctly disappointing from almost every standpoint; though it must be admitted that the task appointed the architects was no easy one, since this particular building
FRONT BAYS OF CHAPEL
NEW UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AT WEST POINT

had to be constructed balancing the Officers’ Mess, which is as far as possible from the type of architecture chosen for the new work. Evidently here the architects had three alternatives: (1) They might duplicate this Officers’ Mess on the other side of Cullom Hall; (2) or they might disregard it entirely, and hold to their preconceived Gothic ideas, and construct the building so that it would have no relation to the corresponding building; (3) or they might try to effect a compromise by conceding certain points in the matter of color and mass, while holding more or less to their own ideas of stylistic expression. It would appear that they tried to follow the third course, but that they have been successful in this, few would claim—probably not even they themselves. But it is only fair to the architects, in estimating this building, to hold well in mind the particularly pointed horns of the dilemma that stared them in the face.

There is, again, considerable diversity of impulse evinced even among those buildings which we have referred to as being expressive of profound study. Different hands are to be seen at work in different places. There is no harm in this; in fact, there is probably something gained in the way of variety and the avoidance of the mechanical uniformity. And here, again, the completion of the scheme will undoubtedly result in minimizing these present diversities between, for example, the Gymnasium and the First Battalion Barracks, Post Headquarters, and the New Academic Building.

It may be said at once that nowhere does the style verge on archeology or copying of any sort. The work is, of course, Gothic (whatever that may mean) in that it has no affiliations with any other historic style; its composition and details are based very solidly on the medieval work of England and the continent. If it is Gothic, it is Gothic used with extreme flexibility; the Gothic idea and method, rather than the assembling of traditionally Gothic forms. There
was never a medieval building very much like the Barracks, the Academic Building, or the Cavalry and Artillery group. Even the Post Headquarters and the Riding Hall would have to look far to find their medieval forebears. The Chapel comes nearest, perhaps, as would naturally be the case; but even here a trained architect will see at once that, except in its general impulse, it is practically a most original building, but bearing scant kinship both in its setting out and in its details to any recognized ecclesiastical work of the past. In spite of these facts, to the casual observer, and even to the careful student, the general effect is unquestionably and convincingly Gothic, and in the very fact that the work diverges so pointedly from precedent lies—it may be—the justification of the return to a style created under impulses and to sufficient ends. Whether or not one is disposed to criticise this work from any standpoint, there is one point on which the architects may be admitted to have acquitted themselves beyond cavil, and that is in the placing of the several buildings. Some of these placings, it may be supposed, were inevitable, from the military and scholastic requirements; in fact, it is generally understood that the award of the competition to Messrs. Cram, Goodhue & Ferguson was quite as much on the strength of the disposition of the buildings as it was on the designs of the several, or the style in which they were expressed. However this may be, whether the architects or manifest destiny are responsible, the buildings thus far erected have been placed with a result that is striking to a degree. Take, for example, the Riding Hall and the Post Headquarters. These adapt themselves with notable intimacy to the rough cliffs and enormously varied grades of the easterly slope; and either from the opposite side of the river, the river itself, or the approach from the Railway Station, the great mass of masonry rises in a most
THE CHAPEL AND THE CHAPLAIN'S QUARTERS FROM THE SOUTH
THE CHAPEL FROM THE NORTHEAST
striking fashion without any artificiality or dramatic effect. The same is true of the Chapel, which dominates the entire group. (This, except from the standpoint of the foot-sore cadet of a Sunday morning, is one of these inevitable things that so often offer themselves to architects, but are so seldom taken advantage of.)

Again, the Cavalry and Artillery Barracks and Stables circling around the Cavalry plain and at different levels of the foot-hills, backed up, as they are, with great masses of forested mountain, are amongst the most effective compositions at the Academy; even though architecturally—or rather perhaps “financially” considered—they are the simplest and most severely practical buildings, at the best. Study of the general plan and the sites picked out for the buildings not thus far constructed indicates that the same success will attend these other units when Congress makes them possible. The Quartermaster’s Stores can only prove to be an architectural mass of great impressiveness, rising, as it does, on the slope toward the north, with the Staff Headquarters occupying the site of the old hotel and forming the local point of the main axis and becoming the most emphatic portion of the entire composition. It is, in itself, almost essential in the construction of the general scheme.

Study of the buildings, so far as their interiors are concerned, reveals the fact that they are at least as interesting within as without. The interiors of the Post Headquarters, including the Military Museum, the Court and the Academic Board Room, are varied and interesting; while the Military Museum, with its great vaulted ceilings, is an impressive and fitting receptacle for the collections it contains. In the Barracks one finds unexpected and surprisingly effective apartments. This is true also of the great Riding Hall, where the huge areas
are entirely successful in their effect of splendid space and practical simplicity. In no building is the interior more beautiful than the Chapel, where the details have been worked out with a fineness of thought and devotion to details that are rare in modern ecclesiastical work. When the temporary glass in the clerestory windows is eliminated, and these receive a filling-in of the same nature as the very noble east window, the Chapel may well become one of the most successful ecclesiastical interiors in the United States.

Whether the architects have been uniformly successful in their use of material is perhaps an open question. It was all right to use local stone quarried from the reservation itself. Although this is unpleasantly cold when first quarried, it tones with time to a much more acceptable color, as has been demonstrated in the past. That the surface of the ashlar is in many cases too rough and cyclopean is apparent, as for example, in the courtyard of the Post Headquarters. There are grounds for belief that this rough ashlar was not originally chosen by the architects, but that in some cases, in its excessive coarseness, at least, it was imposed upon them contrary to their judgment. Whether this is true or not, it is greatly to be hoped that years hence, when the group is entirely complete, the surfaces, here and there, may be palliated by a drastic, though judicious, use of the chisel. That the yellowish gray brick used in the Gymnasium and other places is
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only in a measure successful is also true. It harmonizes well with the “developed style” of the former, but, in the case of the latter, it can only be considered unfortunate; though certain changes might be made in this building to bring it more into harmony with the rest of the work.

We have perhaps indulged more in criticism than in approval, but the buildings speak for themselves. Their excellences, which are manifest, are evident to everyone. Their defects, though equally evident, are less easily expressed; therefore these criticisms are not a stricture on the work, but a warning of dangers to be avoided in the future, which undoubtedly have manifested themselves quite as much to the architects as they have to the general public.

In spite of these criticisms, therefore, and in spite also of its present unfinished and truncated state, the new United States Military Academy is one of the greatest architectural monuments of the country, and it is greatly to be hoped, not only in justice to the architects, but for the credit of the nation, that Congress will, at the earliest moment, make possible the completion of this great undertaking, which at present can only indicate in a small degree the ideals of its creators, and the present status of possibilities which are inherent in their original conception.
HISTORY OF THE COMMITTEE ON CITY DEPARTMENTS OF THE NEW YORK CHAPTER

BY ROBERT D. KOHN

The Joint Committee on City Departments was constituted in 1909. It consisted originally only of representatives of the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, and delegates from the Building Trades Employers' Association, which the New York Chapter had asked to join it for action on such public questions as might affect the building interests of the city. At the time of its formation, it was far from the intention of the committee to undertake the practical preparation of a Building Code. The committee's programme was mainly confined to a consideration of adjustments in minor points of city administration, in which the various building interests had long been working at haphazard. Concerted action had rarely been taken by builders, architects, and engineers in such matters, though they were frequently of great importance. Their unorganized efforts had consequently been in vain.

From time to time other organizations have accepted the committee's invitation to appoint representatives to join in the work. These delegates included, first, the representatives on the New York and National Board of Fire Underwriters; then, representatives of the American Institute of Consulting Engineers; then, representatives from the Brooklyn Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, and, finally, representatives from the New York Society of Architects. In all, this constituted an energetic committee of twenty-seven members. They represented organizations having a total membership of between two and three thousand persons engaged in directing building constructions in one form or another.

The first connection of this joint committee with the Building Code was brought about through a request to the committee by one of the borough presidents some six months after the committee's formation. The committee was asked to prepare amendments to one section of the Building Code which was apparently defective. It was during the preliminary work on this section that the disastrous fire occurred in the Triangle Waist Company's lofts, which called attention to the need of very radical reforms in our Building Code. The joint committee immediately started its consideration of the question of exit facilities as applied to lofts and factories, basing the study on data previously collected for use in studying the exits from theaters. Then followed the introduction of the so-called Kenneally Building Code of the Board of Aldermen; a code which was considered by the joint committee as failing to meet the needs of the situation. Three or four months were spent by the committee in the preparation of amendments to this so-called Kenneally Code, in an attempt to bring it into
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line with good practice. The history of that code and its failure of passage are
good known to the public. The joint committee’s attempts to represent the
architectural and engineering profession, the building trades, and the under-
writers, throughout the long negotiations and arguments over this code, naturally
brought forward prominently the question: What would be a proper code for
the City of New York?

In the summer of 1911 the committee realized that it had long been merely
in the position of a critic of codes proposed by others. It could no longer avoid
its evident duty, namely, the preparation of a Building Code to meet the press-
ing needs of the greater city for better protection of life and property in the
great mass of new-type buildings being constructed. The work done indirectly
in the previous two years had paved the way for this programme. Much material
was already in hand. A series of sessions of the committee was inaugurated,
which included two or three meetings a week, ranging in length from three to
five hours each. These resulted in the preparation of a code, which was pre-
sented to the Board of Aldermen in April, 1912, and was sent out at the same
time to professional societies and civic organizations for criticism.

Early in May, 1912, it was discovered that the Board of Aldermen was not
in a position to pass a Building Code, no matter what that code might be. There-
upon the members of the committee felt that any further effort would be prac-
tically wasted. An immense amount of material had been accumulated, which
material has been left on file for future reference. The situation at the present
time seems unpropitious. State legislation is probable along some of the lines
that affect building work in New York. There is no immediate likelihood that
the Building Code matter will come up again this year.

The Committee on City Departments has been called in consultation recently
in the matter of fire-prevention legislation, and may be able to exercise impor-
tant influence in this direction during this coming winter. Despite the apparent
record of failure in the committee’s work during the year, it is important to note
that the entire committee is in accord on this point; that through the Com-
mittee on City Departments of the New York Chapter much more has actually
been accomplished than would appear on the surface. The New York Chapter
is responsible for the establishment in New York City of a forceful committee,
in which architects, engineers, underwriters, and builders work together in a
fine civic spirit. Moreover the agitation on the subject has had an educational
effect on the profession as well as the public. One concrete result of the investi-
gations and discussions of the joint committee is that many parts of its pro-
posed code have already been put into effect in the form of rulings issued by
the Bureau of Buildings.

During the past year the committee has held twenty-five meetings, with an
average attendance of 90 per cent of its membership. As the meetings of the
committee varied from one to five hours in length, it will be evident how earnestly the members of the Committee on City Departments worked in their efforts to carry out the program entrusted to their care. The New York Chapter contributed about $250 a year to the expense of this particular committee, and the balance of its needs were supplied by proportionate appropriations from the Building Trades organization, the Brooklyn Chapter of the Institute, the Consulting Engineers, etc.

This brief report of its work in the main mentions only the matter of the Building Code; but, as an actual fact, the committee has done valuable work in introducing certain reforms in various city departments. It suggested some years ago to the Superintendent of Buildings that all variations from the existing Building Code or interpretations of that code and all rulings of the provisions of the code should be made public. The scheme was heartily welcomed by a number of city departments and, with the coöperation of certain trade journals, there is now a weekly statement issued from the Building and Tenement House Departments, giving in full the rulings of these departments, so that all professional men may be familiar with the latest decision. The committee, through some of its members, has arranged for distribution among the members of the New York Chapter of all the important reports of the Board of Fire Underwriters. It has also coöperated with the Fire Department in the establishing of standards of fire-protective equipment, and is even now engaged in the preparation of similar work for the Bureau of Fire Prevention.

As the organization of this joint committee is representative of all the important societies interested in building legislation in New York, it has been possible for the committee to make itself felt as a power for good in these matters. The committee is recognized by the public officials and by the press as speaking with authority on questions within its field, and it has achieved one other end of great importance; it has made the architects, engineers, builders, and underwriters understand each other's point of view. Indeed, it may be said with truth that, instead of working at cross purposes in the City of New York, these organizations are now coöperating in a fine spirit in the interests of the public at large.
The delegates to the next convention of the Institute will no doubt be interested in whatever discussion takes place relative to the repeal of the Tarsney Act, and what steps the Institute may feel disposed to take to secure some legislation to take the place of that law. It is unfortunate that the question of the cost of architectural service to the Government has received so much prominence in previous discussions, but this was the natural result of various statements, which apparently emanated from members of Congress, that the chief reason for the repeal was the high comparative cost of service by private architects under the Tarsney Act. Whatever difference there may be in the cost of such service is infinitesimal, in any event, compared with the cost of the buildings; and the controlling consideration in reaching a conclusion as to the method to be followed by the Government in the designing of its buildings should be its efficiency, even if it shall cost one or two per cent more than a less effective system. The issue of cost was raised by a statement prepared some time ago by the Supervising Architect’s office (H. R. Document No. 845, 61st Congress, 2nd Session), in which the specific statement was made that it cost 2.78 per cent to perform in that office the same service rendered by the private architect at a cost of 6 per cent, the inference being that Tarsney Act work cost the Government 3.22 per cent more for architectural service than work done by the Supervising Architect’s office. The figures in this statement were very much involved, but it required only a slight examination to disclose the fact that they were not correctly used. This led to its analysis and the challenging of its conclusions by one of the Institute committees. The result was that the present Supervising Architect prepared a statement, which was submitted to Congress (Senate Document No. 916, 62nd Congress, 2nd Session), in which he gives the average cost of preparing drawings and specifications alone, exclusive of supervision or any other field expenses, for the years 1905 to 1911 inclusive, to be 6.2 per cent, which is practically the result reached by the Institute committee. It is not probable that the 2.78 per cent rate was accepted as correct by the House Committee on Appropriations, although some of the minor committees of the House were misled by it and made some foolish reports in consequence. It is true, however, that Mr. Fitzgerald, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, stated on the floor of the House that the American Institute of Architects required its members to demand from the Government for service a fee greater by one per cent on the cost of the building than was demanded from the private owner; and the impression conveyed by his remarks was that this was the controlling reason why his committee demanded the
Mr. Fitzgerald was of course mistaken, and it would seem that the Institute should demand a hearing from the Committee on Appropriations to show that the statement is without foundation. Mr. Fitzgerald, although a very positive man, is said to be fair; consequently, if the information which led him to insist upon the repeal is shown to be incorrect, he should lend his aid to place matters where they were before the act was repealed.

Although a refutation of these erroneous statements as to cost was necessary, their discussion has caused some of the main benefits of the Tarsney Act to be lost sight of. It is unquestionably a fact that the actual drawings of the first Tarsney Act buildings were so far superior to the work the Supervising Architect's office was then turning out that they were an inspiration to that office, both as to draughtsmanship and design, and the standards of the office continued to improve for some time as the drawings of successive Tarsney Act buildings went into its files. An important factor in this improvement was the bringing of the office into closer touch with the architectural world, whereby it gained the sympathy of men of ability in the profession, and also made it possible to induce a better class of men to accept employment on its draughting force. A very important consideration, not generally appreciated, is the fact that, while the Supervising Architect is nominally the head of the office, the actual control of the establishment rests with an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury acting for the Secretary. The amount of control exercised by this official varies with the individual; but it frequently happened that an Assistant Secretary, to whom the value of Government building contracts as a political asset made a strong appeal, assumed absolute direction and control of the architect's office, except in purely technical matters, and sometimes interfered even in those, to the injury of the service; thereby reducing the Supervising Architect to the position of a superior head draughtsman. It is easy to see how this policy would impair the discipline and efficiency of the office. The Tarsney Act work brought prominent architects from various parts of the country into touch with the Department and, by virtue of their relations as professional advisors, they were able to discuss this phase of the question with the Secretary, not only where it affected their own work but in its general aspect, in a more effective way than was possible for the Supervising Architect to do as a subordinate official. The result was that this evil practically disappeared, causing a great improvement in the tone of the office and a corresponding advance in the work it produced. The fact that there was a regular system by which architects in private practice were brought into intimate relations with the office has had a very stimulating effect, the absence of which is sure to be felt.

It is earnestly to be hoped that some substitute for the Tarsney Act will be enacted that will continue the good influence exerted by that law, and which will be satisfactory alike to Congress and the profession.
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BRIEF OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

JANUARY 15, 1913, AT THE CENTURY CLUB, NEW YORK, N. Y.

MORNING SESSION

The President, after consultation with the Board, announced the appointment of the following Committees for the year 1913.

STANDING COMMITTEES, 1913

Committee on Practice.
Wainwright Parish . . . New York, N. Y.
John L. Maura . . . St. Louis, Mo.
D. E. Waid . . . New York, N. Y.
A. L. Brockway . . . Syracuse, N. Y.
Henry Bacon . . . New York, N. Y.

Committee on Finance.
Robert D. Kohn . . . New York, N. Y.
Glenn Brown . . . Washington, D. C.

Committee on Contracts and Specifications.
Grosvenor Atterbury . . . New York, N. Y.
William A. Boring . . . New York, N. Y.
Frank C. Baldwin . . . Washington, D. C.
Allen B. Pond . . . Chicago, Ill.

Committee on Allied Arts.
Thomas R. Kimball . . . Omaha, Neb.
E. H. Blashfield . . . New York, N. Y.
Lorado Taft . . . Chicago, Ill.
Charles A. Platt . . . New York, N. Y.

Committee on Government Architecture.
Egerton Swartwout . . . New York, N. Y.
Breck Trowbridge . . . New York, N. Y.
J. L. Maura . . . St. Louis, Mo.

House Committee.
Leon E. Dessez . . . Washington, D. C.
Glenn Brown . . . Washington, D. C.
Douglas H. Thomas, Jr. . . . Baltimore, Md.

Committee on Education.
Lloyd Warren . . . New York, N. Y.
Wm. S. Parker . . . Boston, Mass.
James Otis Post . . . New York, N. Y.

Committee on Competitions.
C. Grant LaFarge . . . New York, N. Y.
Thomas R. Kimball . . . Omaha, Neb.
Robert D. Kohn . . . New York, N. Y.
Elmer C. Jensen . . . Chicago, Ill.

The President, after consultation with the Board, announced the appointment of the following Committees for the year 1913.

STANDING COMMITTEES, 1913

Committee on Practice.
Wainwright Parish . . . New York, N. Y.
John L. Maura . . . St. Louis, Mo.
D. E. Waid . . . New York, N. Y.
A. L. Brockway . . . Syracuse, N. Y.
Henry Bacon . . . New York, N. Y.

Committee on Finance.
Robert D. Kohn . . . New York, N. Y.
Glenn Brown . . . Washington, D. C.

Committee on Contracts and Specifications.
Grosvenor Atterbury . . . New York, N. Y.
William A. Boring . . . New York, N. Y.
Frank C. Baldwin . . . Washington, D. C.
Allen B. Pond . . . Chicago, Ill.

Committee on Allied Arts.
Thomas R. Kimball . . . Omaha, Neb.
E. H. Blashfield . . . New York, N. Y.
Lorado Taft . . . Chicago, Ill.
Charles A. Platt . . . New York, N. Y.

Committee on Government Architecture.
Egerton Swartwout . . . New York, N. Y.
Breck Trowbridge . . . New York, N. Y.
J. L. Maura . . . St. Louis, Mo.

House Committee.
Leon E. Dessez . . . Washington, D. C.
Glenn Brown . . . Washington, D. C.
Douglas H. Thomas, Jr. . . . Baltimore, Md.

Committee on Education.
Lloyd Warren . . . New York, N. Y.
Wm. S. Parker . . . Boston, Mass.
James Otis Post . . . New York, N. Y.

Committee on Competitions.
C. Grant LaFarge . . . New York, N. Y.
Thomas R. Kimball . . . Omaha, Neb.
Robert D. Kohn . . . New York, N. Y.
Elmer C. Jensen . . . Chicago, Ill.
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Special Committees, 1913

Committee to Consider Relations to Chapters.
Irving K. Pond . . . . Chicago, Ill.
D. Everett Waid . . . New York, N. Y.
J. L. Mauran . . . . St. Louis, Mo.
John G. Howard . . . San Francisco, Cal.

Delegates to National Fire Protection Association.
Julius Franke . . . . New York, N. Y.
J. Foster Warner . . Rochester, N. Y.

Delegates to the Advisory Board for Testing Materials.
A. O. Elzner . . . . Cincinnati, Ohio

Committee on the Conservation of Natural Resources.
Cass Gilbert . . . . New York, N. Y.
Wm. M. Ellicott . . Baltimore, Md.

Committee on the International Congress of Architects.
Walter Cook . . . . New York, N. Y.
Irving K. Pond . . . . Chicago, Ill.
Glenn Brown . . . . Washington, D. C.
George B. Post . . . . New York, N. Y.
Wm. S. Eames . . . . St. Louis, Mo.
Cass Gilbert . . . . New York, N. Y.

Committee on Civic Improvement.
H. V. B. Magonigle . . New York, N. Y.
George B. Ford . . . . New York, N. Y.
Walter Burley Griffin . . Chicago, Ill.
Glenn Brown . . . . Washington, D. C.

Committee on Legislation.
L. C. Holden . . . . New York, N. Y.
Harry B. Wheedock . . Chicago, Ill.
Octavius Morgan . . . Los Angeles, Cal.

Committee on Schedule of Charges.
Irving K. Pond . . . . Chicago, Ill.

Committee on Public Information.
Glenn Brown . . . . Washington, D. C.
Frank C. Baldwin . . . Washington, D. C.

Institute Membership.

Committee on Institute Publications.
Frank C. Baldwin . . . Washington, D. C.
H. V. B. Magonigle . . New York, N. Y.
Glenn Brown . . . . Washington, D. C.
Thomas R. Kimball . . . Omaha, Neb.

Committee on Greek Cruise.

Afternoon Session

The President stated that he had succeeded in getting accepted a program for new Court Buildings in New York City, which included a contract with the architects, giving six per cent of the cost of the work, which would approximate $10,000,000. Under this contract, the architect was to assume the expenses of expert service.

This modification of the code for the Court Buildings in New York was approved by the Board.

Mr. Medary presented correspondence between the Committee on Competitions and Mr. Roland Adelsperger, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Competitions for the Indiana Chapter, which was in the nature of an appeal to the Board by Mr. Adelsperger for permission to hold a competition for the Citizens' National Bank, South Bend, Indiana, in which the compensation was fixed at 5 per cent. Mr. Medary was instructed to write, giving the reasons why the Board declined to approve such a programme.

The Board delegated its powers to the Executive Committee for the year during the interim between Board meetings.

Mr. D. K. Boyd appeared before the Board, to explain the important work done by the Committee on Public Information, and to make an appeal for a larger appropriation for the work of this committee.

Mr. Sturgis brought to the attention of the Board the action of the Boston Chapter, following a suggestion made by a resolution at the Convention, selecting Chapter members for advancement to Institute membership; this selection making it a distinct honor for a Chapter member to become an Institute member.

Mr. Baldwin presented, for the consideration of the Board, certain problems relating to the Committee on Publications. He stated that it was necessary to secure an editor of experience and ability, who would give his whole time to the publication. It was determined that the Proceedings and Annual should be published, not as numbers of the "Journal," but as separate documents, uniform with the former issues of these documents. It was also thought best that the "Minutes" of the Board should be brief and presented in a narrative form.

Mr. Baldwin requested the opinion of the Board on the question of employing additional clerical service for the editorial office. He asked for and received definite instruction from the Board to employ the editor and additional clerical service.
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He was authorized to purchase furniture for the editorial room.

The Board authorized Mr. Magonigle to secure certain models for the new seal.

Mr. Magonigle was appointed chairman of the committee to advise with the American Academy in Rome in reference to a definite plan for awarding the medal for the best collaborative work in the Academy.

Chapters were requested so to arrange their affairs that the Canons of Ethics would be binding upon Chapter members.

The resolution repudiating the charge that the Government was charged more than other clients was referred to the Committee on Public Information.

The following applicants were declared elected members of the American Institute of Architects by final vote of the Board of Directors, December 9, 1912, and January 15, 1913:

Teague, James C. . . . Calgary, Alberta, Canada
Griffin, Walter Burley . Chicago, Ill.
Harfst, D. J. . . . Davenport, Iowa
Ratcliff, H. E. . . . Keokuk, Iowa
Jackson, Jerome Paul . Minneapolis, Minn.
Stone, Jr., Jacob . . . Minneapolis, Minn.
Linthicum, Hill C. . . . Durham, N. C.
Northup, Willard C. . . . Winston-Salem, N. C.
Rose, Garland R. . . . Durham, N. C.
Smith, R. S. . . . . Asheville, N. C.
Sheblessy, John F. . . . Cincinnati, Ohio
Kedian, W. M. . . . Muskogee, Okla.
Barbot, D. C. . . . Charleston, S. C.
Benson, James D. . . . Charleston, S. C.
Richards, Ernest V. . . . Bennettsville, S. C.
Fountain, S. J. . . . College Station, Texas
Herrmann, Arthur J. . . . San Antonio, Texas
CHAPTER NOTES

WISCONSIN CHAPTER

Regular meeting held at Milwaukee, October 8, 1912. Eleven members were present.

The Sub-Committee on Competitions reported that it had been unable to learn the names of the seventeen competitors in the unapproved Sheboygan Competition. Mr. Schuchardt read a letter from a Racine publication pertaining to the Sheboygan Competition, showing an utter lack of information on the part of this publication with respect to the Institute. Mr. Schuchardt's letter in reply was well received by the Chapter.

The Committees on Publicity and on Competitions were instructed to work conjointly and diplomatically in approaching the Building Committee of the Supervisors regarding the Court House Competition.

A Committee was appointed to consider the practicability of holding an Architectural Exhibit in the Milwaukee Art Society's Building, and to report at the next meeting of the Chapter.

Regular meeting held at Milwaukee, November 12, 1912. Fourteen members were present. Communications from Michigan Chapter, urging cooperation in securing a standard size for manufacturers' catalogues were considered, and the following resolution was adopted: "That a committee of the American Institute of Architects, at the next Annual Convention at Washington, D.C., December 10-12, 1912, take up the standardization of commercial catalogues and confer with kindred associations on this matter."

Messrs. Koch and Schuchardt were elected delegates, and the sum of one hundred dollars of the Chapter funds was appropriated toward their traveling expenses.

The Committee on Architectural Exhibit reported that it was in correspondence with Illinois Chapter with a view to enlarging the scope of the Exhibit, and would report later. It was also suggested that a State Convention of Architects be held coincidently with the Exhibit.

It was resolved to employ the services of a Press Clipping Bureau to aid the Committee on Public Information in its work.

Regular meeting held at Milwaukee, December 10, 1912. Twelve members were present.

The Committee on Architectural Exhibit submitted correspondence with the Illinois Chapter and the American Federation of Arts, relative to their cooperation. It was instructed to obtain an option upon the Milwaukee Art Society's room for some date in May, and to report to the Chapter at the January meeting, giving an estimate of the probable cost of this exhibit.

With reference to the Lincoln Memorial, the Secretary was instructed to obtain the record of each Senator and Representative in Congress on this project, and to send to all those who voted in favor of the Memorial at Washington a letter expressing the Chapter's appreciation.

The Secretary was also instructed to present at the January meeting a list of Milwaukee architects, not members of the Wisconsin Chapter, with a view to enlarging the membership.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA CHAPTER

The fifty-sixth meeting of the Chapter was held in Los Angeles, December 10, 1912, with an attendance of nineteen members. Messrs. H. A. Pearis, F. E. Woodley, Frank W. Mouser, H. Stanley Benedict, Howard F. Fish, W. A. Roberts and Freeman Bloodgood, members of the California State Legislature, also Mr. Harry Illes, of the "Builder and Contractor," and Mr. W. E. Prine, of the "Southwest Contractor," were present as guests of the Chapter.

The members of the Legislature present commented upon the proposed amendments to the Burnett Tenement House Act, and unanimously promised their support to the measures.

Mr. J. E. Allison discussed the matter of creating a State Department of Architecture, to take the place of the present office of State Architect. He stated that the San Francisco Chapter has caused a bill to be prepared for presentation to the Legislature, looking to the establishment of a commission for this purpose.

The Committee on Ethics and Practice reported its findings in the investigation relative to the alleged participation of one of the Chapter members in an irregular competition. The report exonerated the member.

The Committee on Legislation was instructed to consult Mr. W. I. Morrison, attorney, and frame drafts for a substitute for the law of 1872, to be presented at a special meeting of the Chapter, to be called on December 17.

The fifty-seventh meeting of the Chapter was held December 17, 1912, twenty-two members being present.
CHAPTER NOTES

Messrs. Woodley, Roberts, Ambrose, Kuck, Johnstone, Mouser, Fish, and Benedict, of the State Legislature, and Messrs. Mooser and Mathews, of the San Francisco Chapter, and Messrs. Iles and Bowler, of the "Builder and Contractor," were the guests of the Chapter.

Mr. J. E. Allison reported for the Committee on Legislation, and read an outline of the proposed substitute for the law of 1872. In the discussion which followed the members of the Legislature present participated, and the report of the Committee was adopted, subject to proper legal phrasing of the measure before its presentation to the Legislature.

Mr. Lyman Farwell then presented suggestions for the amendments to the Burnett Tenement House Act. After discussion, the Chapter endorsed the suggestions and the Committee on Legislation was instructed to cooperate with the San Francisco Chapter with regard to this matter.

The business of the meeting was concluded by a discussion of the proposed Act to establish a State Architectural Commission.

The fifty-eighth meeting of the Chapter was held in Los Angeles, January 14, 1913, with twenty-seven members present. The guests of the Chapter were Col. J. B. Lankershim, Dr. Elbert Wing, of the Los Angeles City Housing Commission, Mr. Harry Iles, of the "Builder and Contractor," and Mr. H. K. Hensley, of the "Southwest Contractor."

A report from the Committee on Legislation was followed by a discussion upon the proposed amendments to the Burnett Tenement House Act, and upon the Act to provide a State Department of Architecture.

It was resolved that it was "the sense of this Chapter's meeting to create a State Commission of Architecture, to serve without compensation."

Doctor Wing addressed the meeting and spoke in detail upon the subject of the single rooms in tenement houses, pointing out the serious objections to such, from the moral viewpoint. It was resolved that Mr. J. J. Backus be instructed to strike out the clause permitting single rooms in tenement houses in the proposed amendment to the Burnett Tenement House Act, which he is to present to the State Legislature.

The Chapter voted to pay the expenses of Mr. Backus upon his mission to the State Legislature in the interests of the amendments proposed by the Chapter.

Col. J. B. Lankershim entertained the meeting with an interesting account of his recent European travels, and the members expressed their appreciation by electing him an honorary member of the Chapter.

Mr. John W. Mitchell addressed the Chapter on "A Layman's Comparison of the Progress of European and American Architecture."

SAN FRANCISCO CHAPTER

The regular monthly meeting was held in San Francisco, November 21, 1912, with twenty-four members present.

Mr. J. J. Backus, Chief Building Inspector of Los Angeles, and a member of the Southern California Chapter, was present as a guest of the Chapter.

The meeting was devoted to discussion of the Tenement House Law and a State Architectural Commission, and Messrs. Alden W. Campbell, P. J. Herold, Edward T. Osborn, George C. Sellen, and Frank H. Schardin were elected to Chapter membership.

The Chairman was instructed to consider the advisability of appointing a Committee on Professional Practice.

The Chapter decided to take membership in the Chamber of Commerce and in the Civic League.

A regular meeting of the Chapter was held on December 19, 1912, at which twenty-three members were present.

A report from the Sub-Committee on Competitions stated that the programs for the competitions for the Sacramento School and the Alameda County Infirmary had been brought into compliance with the code, and were about to receive the approval of the committee.

The Chairman of the Committee on Legislation reported that the committee had been cooperating with the Southern California Chapter relative to the Tenement House Law and the proposed State Architectural Commission.

The committee asked the Chapter to endorse an Act suggested by the Pacific Association of Engineers, providing for the appointment of expert witnesses by the courts. The Chapter took this action.

Mr. Mooser gave notice of his intention to offer certain amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws, in effect changing the name of the society to "The Northern California Chapter, American Institute of Architects," and changing the method of making nominations for the election of officers.

A committee was appointed to investigate and report to the Chapter concerning the designing of buildings for the Civic Center and the position of the Board of Consulting Architects relative thereto; the Chapter also decided that a resolution should be formulated and sent to the Mayor upon this subject.
ILLINOIS CHAPTER

The meeting of the Illinois Chapter, American Institute of Architects, which should regularly have been called for December 10, was postponed to December 17 on account of the absence of so many of the members who were in attendance upon the Convention in Washington. At this meeting the delegates presented their reports, which were supplemented by a statement from non-delegates present at the Convention, with a review of the work of the Convention by Mr. Irving K. Pond, of the Board of Directors. The amount of business and the celerity with which it had been dispatched seemed to impress the delegates, and it was their unanimous opinion, concurred in by the Chapter, that better means should obtain of acquainting the members in advance with the nature and details of the work to be done at Conventions. The publishing of reports in advance will aid in this; and there was a feeling that a résumé of the work of the Board and of the Executive Committee should be presented to the members of the Institute in ample time and in manner and form for ready comprehension and digestion.

There was an expressed feeling in the Chapter that the important subject of advanced ideals in American architectural design should not be lost sight of in Convention discussions and in the presentation of papers. To many this is a matter of concern quite commensurate with ethical codes and circulars of advice as to competitions.

While the Chapter unequivocally endorsed the Institute position as to the Lincoln Monument site on the Potomac at the end of the Mall, and the idea of a monument as against a roadway, the discussion within the Chapter showed clearly a feeling that the monument itself should be the highest possible present-day expression of the immortal qualities of Lincoln, and especially in relation to their bearing on our national life.

IOWA CHAPTER

The 1912 annual meeting was held in Keokuk, Iowa, November 8 and 9, attended by fifteen active, two honorary members, Institute Director I. K. Pond, a landscape architect and a draughtsman. President F. E. Wetherell delivered a fitting address, reviewing the ten years' history, quoting Mr. Pond's characterization of the function of the Institute as a "guardian of the interests of the client and community quite as much as of the welfare of the individual practitioner and the profession generally," and urged its loyal support in every way by every Chapter member. Various lines of activities were suggested.
library, which is destined to be a most valuable collection for the benefit of the public and the profession.

This was the second convention of the Chapter that Mr. I. K. Pond had honored by his attendance. His presence, with its evidence of good will and interest, and his words of counsel in the presentation of the Institute and Chapter relations and work, were thoroughly enjoyed and appreciated. If a representative from the Official Board of the Institute could attend the annual meeting of every chapter, it would do much to inspire and advance the work.

A “Question Box” was inaugurated, which collected thirty queries. Owing to lack of time, the questions were simply read and no attempt made to consider them, but they are to be circulated among the entire membership, for answers by each and all, to be edited, and the collection given to each by correspondence. It was deemed a valuable feature, worthy of a place on all future programs. The major part of two afternoons was given to the inspection, under official guides, of the 200,000-horse-power dam and works of the Mississippi River Power Company, at a stage of the work of construction particularly fitting for full examination and comprehension of this largest piece of concrete work in the world, the Panama Canal only excepted.

The next annual meeting will be held in Des Moines in November, 1913.

Pittsburgh Chapter

The regular monthly meeting was held January 21, 1913.

It was resolved that the Chapter should enroll itself as a chapter of the American Federation of Art.

A letter from the National One-Cent-Postage Association, asking the cooperation of the Chapter in an effort to reduce postage rates on first-class matter, was referred to the next meeting for consideration.

Arrangements having been made to hear an address, on February 3, by Mr. Franklin B. Wentworth, of the National Fire-Prevention Association, asking the cooperation of the Chapter in an effort to reduce postage rates on first-class matter, was referred to the next meeting for consideration.

Mr. C. F. Gould and Mr. Myers, members of a special committee to whom the subject had been referred, opened the proceedings with an able presentation of views giving many ideas for discussion, of which the other members present took advantage. Mr. Gould brought out the value of this expression of ideas on so vital a subject, and expressed a hope that some outdoor meetings might be held in an environment inspiring to artistic natures. Mr. Myers congratulated the Chapter on its consideration of this fundamental aspect of architecture, and gave expression to the hopeful signs in the architecture of today. He did not consider the use of historic styles in different modern structures to be a slavish adherence to precedent, but a healthy development of the architecture handed down from the past.

In the discussion that followed practically every member present took an active part. Mr. Loveless, Mr. Bohne, a visiting architect from the Louisville Chapter, Mr. Willatzen, and Mr. Huntington gave expression to individual views on architecture as affecting the work of today; Mr. Loveless spoke of the logical growth of architectural styles as determining the architecture of the present and future; Mr. Bohne spoke of growth and development depending on idealism and sentiment; Mr. Willatzen pleaded for a logical expression of each problem; and Mr. Huntington, speaking of architecture as an evolution, described our condition today as a “renaissance of mind.”

Other valuable contributions to the discussion were made by Mr. Hanson, who expressed optimistic views on the tendency of modern work and an awakening interest displayed by the public, with a note of warning to the architect as to the danger of ill-considered attempts at originality. Mr. Blackwell spoke on behalf of a truthful expression of the building material in the architect’s work, and in respect to the architect’s training as affecting his use of precedent. Mr. Thomas expressed the belief that the more thoroughly the student was grounded in the historic styles the harder it would be for him to depart from them. Mr. Gould spoke for the French school, stating that its training did not cause its students to become wedded to precedent, and that the classic forms exerted an influence from which no true architect could escape.

Although the valuable store of ideas was in no way depleted, the discussion was brought to a close by a motion that a series of meetings be arranged by the Chapter’s Program Committee, bearing on this subject of “Architecture as an Art.”

Previous to this special feature of the program, Mr. Stephen, a member of the Chapter on the Board
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of Appeal to the City of Seattle, gave a review of recent important work done by the Board with a statement of some difficulties preventing their effectiveness. No funds were at their disposal to investigate and test new material, yet the Board was required to establish rules governing its use. Proper provision was not made for enforcing the rulings of the Board, and they were often charged with duties not within their province. By vote of the meeting the question of Chapter efforts to improve these conditions was referred to the Legislative Committee.

The following were elected members of the Chapter: Regular member, Edgar Blair, Architect of the Seattle School Board, and, as Junior members, S. Clyde Merrell and G. C. Field.

BOSTON CHAPTER

The regular monthly meeting of the Society was held on December 3, 1912, with fifty-two members present. Dr. Franklin B. Dyer, Superintendent of Schools of Boston, and Mr. Charles G. Armstrong, engineer, of New York, were the guests of the Chapter.

After routine business had been disposed of, the special business of the meeting was in order, and Mr. Armstrong gave a most interesting illustrated talk on the "efficiency engineering" problems in the New York City schools, in regard especially to the question of heating and ventilation. This was followed by an exhibition of lantern-slide views of plans of schoolhouses in Massachusetts cities and towns outside of Boston, which had been collected by Mr. Humphreys. Doctor Dyer then addressed the meeting, expressing his pleasure at having the opportunity to speak to the members of the Society, and giving a brief statement of his ideas on the many different phases of public school education.

The annual meeting of the Society was held on January 7, 1913, with fifty-four members present.

The following officers were elected for the ensuing year: Secretary, for a term of four years, Mr. Charles N. Cogswell; Members of the Executive Committee, for a term of three years, Messrs. Louis C. Newhall, William Stanley Parker and Timothy Walsh.

It was voted that the Committee on Public Information should consist of the President and Secretary, ex officio, and a third member to be appointed by the Executive Committee, the third member to be the Recorder of the Society, making for the Secretary the records of each meeting of the Society.

An appropriation of $650 was made by the Society for the educational work of the Boston Architectural Club for the year.

The Lincoln Memorial on the Mall in Washington was endorsed, and the Society voted to oppose the transferring of the appropriation to the construction of a roadway to Gettysburg, and members of the society were urged to write personal letters to as many members of Congress as possible in regard to the matter. To this end, the Secretary was instructed to send a letter covering the above subject to each member of the Society, and append a list of names of Congressmen whose districts lie in the territorial limits of the Boston Chapter of the Institute.
MEMORIAL NOTES

RICHARD NORMAN SHAW, R.A.
Honorary Member of the American Institute of Architects

Richard Norman Shaw was born in Edinburgh, in 1831 and died November 17, 1912.

He was a student in the office of Mr. William Burn, and continued his studies in the Royal Academy Schools, from which he obtained the gold medal in 1853, and the traveling studentship the following year. In 1858 he published his book, titled "Architectural Sketches from the Continent," which contained a series of drawings from cathedrals and other ancient buildings, drawn by himself, on stone.

One of his first buildings was the New Zealand Chamber, on Leadenhall Street. Symmetry of arrangement was discarded in the design of the ground story in a manner that was considered indecorous. Above the ground floor, four great brick piers were carried up the height of the building, between which the wooden bay-windows were played with, and a curved-out cornice in plaster projected over them. While the detail suggested English Classic, it was of a type of what was afterward called "Queen Anne," and showed that the architect had not been sketching medieval work without feeling its influence. This design, being a starting outbreak of architectural originality, immediately attracted wide attention.

It is through Mr. Shaw's picturesque, simple, and dignified residences that he will be best remembered in this country. Among these may be mentioned Cragside, in Northumberland, built for Lord Armstrong; Dawpool, in Cheshire; Chesters, in Northumberland; and Adcote, in Shropshire; Lowther Lodge, designed in 1874; Swan House, Chelsea, in 1877.

The London Times mentions a block of mansions where no great expenditure on architectural effect could be allowed, in which Shaw managed to give variety and architectural expression by recessing portions of the exterior wall and grouping some of the windows under arches. This device, simple and inexpensive, was most effective.

Norman Shaw designed many churches, of which St. Michael's Church, Bournemouth, and St. Margaret's, Ilkley, are the best known.

He also designed many office buildings, such as the Alliance Assurance Building, corner of St. James' Street and Pall Mall, the Central Offices of the Metropolitan Police, and Parr's Bank, Liverpool. The New Scotland Yard is the most notable and admired of his business or municipal buildings.

Of late years, his advice was sought by the Government and by the London County Council on various matters connected with London architecture.

He was consulted by the Department of Woods and Forests on the rebuilding of the Regent Street Quadrant.

Mr. Shaw was joint editor with Mr. T. G. Jackson of the series of Essays published in 1892, entitled "Architecture as a Profession or an Art."

Mr. Reginald Blomfield pays the following tribute to Norman Shaw:

"Mr. Norman Shaw was an artist, absolute and ingrained. To scholarship and learning he made no claim, but he possessed a mind of rare distinction, a shrewdness and clarity of intelligence that illuminated the darkest corner of any difficulty, made everything seem delightfully simple and easy, and did in fact suggest the way out for those less favored than himself in resource and quick imagination. A man who disclaimed any powers as an orator or writer, he was in fact an admirable speaker, and few men have ever written more charming and characteristic letters. He handled every subject with an inimitable lightness of touch, letting his humor play on it, yet never losing sight of the essential purpose of his writing. To borrow a term from horsemanship, he had beautiful hands.

"There has been a singular completeness about the career of this most distinguished architect. An artist, and always an artist, he was indifferent to honors (I believe I am right in saying that he declined a baronetcy). He was equally indifferent to society in the technical sense. His whole power was concentrated on the art that he loved and to which he dedicated his life; and from the ideals that he formed in early life he never swerved. It has been a fine life: finely conceived and finely lived."

LOUIS DE COPPET BERGH, F.A.I.A.

Louis De Coppet Bergh was born December 20, 1856, and died in Washington January 27, 1913.

Mr. Bergh was educated in the Royal Polytechnical School of Stuttgart. While in practice, he built many churches in different parts of the country: The Church of the Covenant, in Washington, and the Church of the Indian school, at Hampton, being well known.

Mr. Bergh's education being largely engineering, he acted as expert architectural and sanitary adviser to Mayor Strong during his administration, in New York. He was Past President of the Department of Architecture, Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences; Brooklyn Chapter of the American Institute of Architects; Fellow of the American Institute of Architects; author of "Safe Building Construction," in two volumes, published in 1908.
William Rutherford Mead Awarded Gold Medal by National Institute of Arts and Letters

The joint session of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, and the National Institute of Arts and Letters, December 13, 1912, presented the Gold Medal for distinction in Architecture to William Rutherford Mead, F.A.I.A., L.L.D.

This medal is conferred annually for distinction in some branch of Arts and Letters. The first medal was awarded to Augustus Saint-Gaudens, for distinction in sculpture; James Ford Rhodes has received the medal for distinction in History and James Whitcomb Riley for poetry. Mr. Mead is the first architect to whom the medal has been awarded. Mr. Brander Matthews made the presentation address and among the other speakers were Kenyon Cox, John Galen Howard, Thomas R. Lounsbury, Carroll Beckwith, and Henry Van Dyke.

A Correction

In the article relating to the Missouri Capitol Competition, in the January issue, an editorial from the St. Louis Republic was quoted which stated that "for the first time in the history of American architecture a State Capitol design has been selected in conformity with rules of the American Institute of Architects."

This appears to have been an erroneous statement, inasmuch as the design for the first unit of the Washington State Capitol group was selected, a little more than a year ago, as a result of a properly conducted competition approved by the Institute.

While the editors of the Journal disclaim responsibility for all the statements of its contributors, they take pleasure in making this correction and, on behalf of the Institute, they gratefully acknowledge the excellent work of the members of the Washington State Chapter, which was so largely responsible for the happy result above referred to.

Office of New York State Architect to be Investigated

At the time of the election of Governor Sulzer, of New York, the office of State Architect was held by Herman W. Hoefer, an appointee of Governor Dix, and his reappointment to the office was made by Governor Sulzer within a few days after the latter's inauguration. When this appointment was made by Governor Dix, the New York, Brooklyn, Buffalo and Central New York Chapters endeavored to convince the Governor that the appointment was not a wise one, on the ground that the office was too important to be filled by a man whose experience in large affairs was doubted. Immediately after the reappointment of Mr. Hoefer, the Governor was waited upon by a committee from the New York Chapter, who argued that the responsibilities of this office were so great that they should be entrusted only to an architect of proven competence and experience. They urged upon the Governor that, as the State Architect would be charged with the judicious expenditure, in the near future, of four or five millions of dollars, he should be the sort of a man to whom anyone would entrust such responsibility. The committee felt that Mr. Hoefer had not had sufficient experience to warrant the belief that he would wisely conduct the office and disburse the appropriations. The Governor was told that the Chapter had no candidate to propose for the office, but was solely interested in the principle that such candidate should possess the required qualifications.

The Governor expressed his sympathy with the spirit of the committee's suggestions, and the conference resulted in the somewhat novel procedure of the appointment by the Governor of a special Commission, consisting of three prominent architects, selected from different parts of the state, empowered to make an investigation of the conduct of the office of the State Architect and the competence of the present incumbent. The Governor promised to be guided by the report of the Commission, and to make such changes as the exigencies of the case might demand, even to the point, if necessary, of removing the present official.

The Boston Chapter

At the recent annual meeting of the Boston Society of Architects it was resolved: "That the Executive Committee shall each year, between the annual meeting and the second meeting thereafter, suggest to the Society the names of those members who, in its opinion, should be advanced to Institute membership, and, on the acceptance of the members, shall endorse the applications of such members for admission into the Institute." This method of selection from and by Chapter members, of those thought most worthy for membership in the Institute, will make it a distinct honor to become affiliated with the Institute.

The Denver Post-Office

As indicative of an awakening interest on the part of the general public in matters relating to the Fine Arts, it is pleasing to note that Messrs. Tracy & Swartwout, of New York, architects of the Denver Post-office, have been asked by the Mayor of Denver to contribute the plaster models used in the construction of this building, to be preserved either in the City Library or Art Museum, as they were regarded by him as genuine works of art.
BOOK REVIEWS

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS. Message from the President of the United States Transmitting the Report of the Commission of Fine Arts for the Fiscal Year, Ended June 30, 1912.

The Commission, in submitting its second report, shows the great benefit which has already accrued to the country by the establishment of this Commission. During the past year it has considered forty-one projects. The total amount involved in the cases passed upon was approximately seven million dollars.

It has had submitted for its consideration statues of John Paul Jones, the Grant Memorial (advice in this case was sought on the bronze Artillery group designed by Henry Merwin Shrady), the Barry Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, Memorial Fountain, Buffaloes for the Q Street Bridge, the Q Street bridge, Normal School, Armory for the District Militia, the height of buildings in Washington, proposed system of sidewalks for Lafayette Square, Anacostia Flats, Decatur Street Terrace, Potomac Park, and Public grounds along Seventeenth Street.

It has passed upon the following questions of Art referred to the Commission by Congressional Committees:
- This Commission, if it continues to carry out its present policies, and if the men who compose it continue to be of the disinterested and capable character of the present commission, will be of great value in the country.


This publication is attractive in its form, selection of type, and character of illustration, and is a good example of a “by-product” in an active professional life, and a record of impressions gained in those portions of an architect’s life which are the more precious as they are infrequent—his vacations.

The book is in the form of detached essays, illustrated by the telling sketches of Mr. Peabody, entitled: “A Venetian Day,” “The Italian Renaissance,” “Rural England,” “French and English Churches,” “The Five Orders of Architecture,” “On the Design of Houses,” and “By the Sea.” These topics are treated in the charming style of the author, expressing his individual impressions and tastes.

An attractive note that runs through the work is a feeling for the broad elements of composition: the beauties of atmosphere, the foliage and water in connection with and as a part of the architectural setting. While quick to see and to call attention to details out of scale, or not in character with the structure, the dignity and beauty of great masses in the landscape, fitting into and forming a part of the scenery, is emphasized by the appreciation of the author as the most important element in the picture.

A personal interest in the water and in boats of all kinds is shown throughout the work; the pleasure in their lines, their sails, colors, and effectiveness in the view are never omitted in his narrative.

PAMPHLETS RECEIVED DURING DECEMBER, 1912

Presented by the United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
- Principles for Drying Lumber at Atmospheric Pressure and Humidity Diagram. By Harry D. Tiemann.

SOCIETY PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED DURING DECEMBER, 1912

THE Atlantic Terra Cotta Arch over Chambers Street in the New York Municipal Building is an interesting bit of construction.

Stone, on account of its weight, would be rather difficult to use for such a broad arch, while Terra Cotta can be made thin and easily anchored. And carving stone would involve a cost entirely out of proportion to the expense of modeling Terra Cotta; in fact the fluent lines of the design would be practically impossible in another material.

The Terra Cotta is made with a slightly rough surface and matches the granite exactly in texture and color.

*Booklet on request*

Atlantic Terra Cotta Company
1170 Broadway, New York
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