

THE
OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects



APRIL
1931

Volume 3

Number 4

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

THE OCTAGON, WASHINGTON, D. C.

OFFICERS

President.....ROBERT D. KOHN, 56 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.
First Vice-President.....ERNEST J. RUSSELL, Chemical Building, St. Louis, Mo.
Second Vice-President.....HORACE W. PEASLEE, 1225 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
Secretary.....FRANK C. BALDWIN, The Octagon, Washington, D. C.
Treasurer.....EDWIN BERGSTROM, Citizens National Bank Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

For One Year (1931-32)
 FREDERICK W. GARNER, 616 Walnut St., Cincinnati, Ohio (Great Lakes Div.)
 CHARLES T. INGHAM, 1211 Empire Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa. (Middle Atl. Div.)
 FRED F. WILLSON, P. O. Box 497, Bozeman, Mont. (West. Mount. Div.)

For Two Years (1931-33)
 FRANKLIN O. ADAMS, 509 Twigg Street, Tampa, Fla. (South Atlantic Div.)
 M. H. FRIBINGER, 110 Porter Bldg., Memphis, Tenn. (Gulf States Div.)
 FRED. H. METZ, 525 Market St., San Francisco, Calif. (Sierra Nevada Div.)

For Three Years (1931-34)
 GEORGE H. GRAY, 30 Whitney Avenue, New Haven, Conn. (New England Div.)
 ALBERT L. BROCKWAY, Clinton Sq. Bldg., Syracuse, N. Y. (New York Div.)
 FREDERICK M. MANN, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. (Cen. Sts. Div.)

LIST OF CHAPTERS 1931

ALABAMA—*Frederic Child Biggin, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.; †Jesse W. Green, 713 Education Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.
 ALBANY—*Norman R. Sturgis, 91 State St., Albany, N. Y.; †Harvey W. Jackson, 32 Clermont St., Albany, N. Y.
 ARKANSAS—*George H. Wittenberg, Home Insurance Bldg., Little Rock Ark.; †Lawson L. Delony, 2407 Louisiana St., Little Rock, Ark.
 BALTIMORE—*Henry S. T. White, Baltimore Life Insurance Building, Baltimore, Md.; †Charles D. Loomis, 12 East Pleasant Street, Baltimore, Md.
 BOSTON—*Wm. Stanley Parker, 120 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.; †Millard B. Gulick, 20 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.
 BROOKLYN—*Chas. C. Wagner, 32 Court St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; †George Francis Kiess, 130 E. 15th St., New York, N. Y.
 BUFFALO—*Karl G. Schmill, 1342 Prudential Bldg., Buffalo, N. Y.; †Benjamin C. Buell, 647 Franklin St., Buffalo, N. Y.
 CENTRAL ILLINOIS—*Philip R. Hooton, Peoples Bank Bldg., Bloomington, Ill.; †E. L. Stouffer, 306 Administration Bldg., University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
 CENTRAL NEW YORK—*Melvin L. King, 300 Denison Bldg., Syracuse, N. Y.; †Merton E. Granger, 474 So. Salina St., Syracuse, N. Y.
 CHICAGO—*Howard L. Cheney, 80 East Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Ill.; †Carl E. Heimbrodt, 20 No. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
 CINCINNATI—*Ernest Pickering, 1 Interwood Place, Cincinnati, Ohio; †Russell Potter, 1305 The American Bldg., Cincinnati, Ohio.
 CLEVELAND—*Philip L. Small, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; †James H. Duthie, Union Trust Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio.
 COLORADO—*George H. Williamson, Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.; †Roland L. Linder, Insurance Building, Denver, Colo.
 COLUMBUS—*W. C. Ronan, 1694 N. High St., Columbus, Ohio; †Ralph Chas. Kepton, Atlas Building, 8 E. Long St., Columbus, Ohio.
 CONNECTICUT—*Edward B. Caldwell, First National Bank Bldg., Bridgeport, Conn.; †Louis A. Walsh, 69 Center Street, Waterbury, Conn.
 DAYTON—*Edwin F. Simpson, 889 Reibold Bldg., Dayton, Ohio; †Elliason R. Smith, 1005 Commercial Bldg., Dayton, Ohio.
 DETROIT—*Branson V. Gamber, 3500 Union Trust Bldg., Detroit, Mich.; †Arthur K. Hyde, 904 Marquette Bldg., Detroit, Mich.
 EASTERN OHIO—*Barton E. Brooks, 821 Dollar Bank Bldg., Youngstown, Ohio; †Walter J. Canfield, 1301 City Bank Bldg., Youngstown, Ohio.
 FLORIDA CENTRAL—*Henry L. Taylor, Times Building, St. Petersburg, Fla.; †C. Sedgwick Moss, 500 J. Bruce Smith Bldg., St. Petersburg, Fla.
 FLORIDA NORTH—*Mellen C. Greeley, 32 West Forsyth St., Jacksonville, Fla.; †Jefferson D. Powell, Professional Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
 FLORIDA SOUTH—*Richard Kiehnel, 930 Seybold Bldg., Miami, Fla.; †Russell T. Panceast, 1139 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.
 GEORGIA—*Francis P. Smith, Norris Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.; †Preston S. Stevens, 101 Marietta Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.
 GRAND RAPIDS—*Harry L. Mead, 902 Michigan Trust Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.; †Roger Allen, 453 Houseman Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.
 HAWAII—*Wm. C. Furer, 507 Hawaiian Trust Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.; †Herbert Cayton, 324 S. M. Damon Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.
 INDIANA—*Arthur Bohn, 215 East 32nd St., Indianapolis, Ind.; †Warren D. Miller, 619 Ohio Street, Terre Haute, Ind.
 IOWA—*Vernon F. Tinsley, Hubbell Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa; †Edwin H. Wetherell, 517 Shops Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa.
 KANSAS CITY—*H. H. Dunham, 350 West 47th Street, Kansas City, Mo.; †Raymond L. Vonkamp, 4011 Charlotte Street, Kansas City, Mo.
 KANSAS—*Charles W. Shaver, 147 1/2 South Santa Fe Street, Salina, Kansas; †George M. Beal, 305 Marvin Hall, Lawrence, Kansas.
 KENTUCKY—*Wm. G. O'Toole, 714 Louisville Trust Bldg., Louisville, Ky.; †G. M. Grimes, 1708 Heyburn Building, Louisville, Ky.
 LOUISIANA—Richard Koch, 604 Audubon Bldg., New Orleans, La.; †Mortimer Favrot, 1205 Hibernia Bank Bldg., New Orleans, La.
 MADISON—*Frank Riley, 34 E. Mifflin Street, Madison, Wis.; †James R. Law, First Central Building, Madison, Wis.
 MINNESOTA—*Wilbur H. Tusler, 104 S. 9th St., Minneapolis, Minn.; †Guy N. Crawford, 517 Essex Bldg., Minneapolis, Minn.
 MISSISSIPPI—*Emmett J. Hull, Merchants Bank Bldg., Jackson, Miss.; †Frank P. Gates, Merchants Bank Bldg., Jackson, Miss.
 MONTANA—*Chandler C. Cohagan, Box 1305, Billings, Mont.; †W. R. Flew, Bozeman, Mont.
 NEBRASKA—*W. L. Younk, Capitol Commission, Lincoln, Nebr.; †Noel S. Wallace, 2561 Whitmore Ave., Omaha, Nebr.
 NEW JERSEY—*Cornelius V. R. Bogert, 210 Main St., Hackensack, N. J.; †Clement W. Fairweather, Metuchen, N. J.
 NEW YORK—*Stephen F. Voorhees, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; †Theodore I. Coe, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
 NORTH CAROLINA—*James B. Lynch, Southern Bldg., Wilmington, N. C.; †W. W. Dodge, Jr., 20 Woodlark Rd., Asheville, N. C.
 NORTH TEXAS—*Roscoe P. DeWitt, Kirby Building, Dallas, Texas; †M. C. Kleuser, 609 Construction Bldg., Dallas, Texas.
 NORTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Henry H. Gutterson, 526 Powell St., San Francisco, Cal.; †James H. Mitchell, 369 Pine St., San Francisco, Cal.
 NORTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA—*Karl E. Morrison, Marine Bank Bldg., Erie, Pa.; †Walter T. Monahan, 808 Palace Hardware Bldg., Erie, Pa.
 OKLAHOMA—*Leon B. Senter, 306 Philtower Bldg., Tulsa, Okla.; †Asbury Endacott, 625 Wright Building, Tulsa, Okla.
 OREGON—*Harold W. Doty, 697 East 46th Street, Portland, Oregon; †W. H. Crowell, 1041 Pacific Building, Portland, Oregon.
 PHILADELPHIA—*John S. Schwacke, Architects' Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; †Horace W. Casper, Architects' Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
 PITTSBURGH—*Frederick Bigger, Westinghouse Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.; †Robert C. Bowers, 407 N. Craig St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 RHODE ISLAND—*Gorham Henshaw, 87 Weybosset Street, Providence, R. I.; †John F. Hogan, 315 Grosvenor Bldg., Providence, R. I.
 SAN DIEGO—*Wm. Templeton Johnson, 1400 San Diego Trust & Savings Bldg., San Diego, Calif.; †Charles H. Mills, 1400 San Diego Trust & Savings Bldg., San Diego, Calif.
 SANTA BARBARA—*Russell Ray, San Marcos Building, Santa Barbara, Cal.; †E. Keith Lockard, 114 East of la Guerra Street, Santa Barbara, Cal.
 SCRANTON-WILKES-BARRE—*Thos. A. Foster, 909 Brooks Bldg., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; †Donald F. Innes, 176 S. Main Street, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
 SHREVEPORT—*Clarence W. King, Shreveport, La.; †Edward F. Neild, Shreveport, La.
 SOUTH CAROLINA—*Albert Simons, 42 Broad St., Charleston, S. C.; †Samuel Lapham, 42 Broad St., Charleston, S. C.
 SOUTH GEORGIA—*Walter P. Marshall, 1001 Savannah Bank & Trust Bldg., Savannah, Ga.; †Percy Sugden, 125 East 49th Street, Savannah, Ga.
 SOUTH TEXAS—*Alfred C. Finn, 508 Bankers Mortgage Bldg., Houston, Texas; †J. Russ Baty, 506 Bankers Mortgage Bldg., Houston, Texas.
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Harold C. Chambers, 1107 Cal. Reserve Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.; †H. Roy Kelley, 1102 Architects' Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.
 SOUTHERN PENNSYLVANIA—*Henry Y. Shaub, 20 1/2 North Queen St., Lancaster, Pa.; †Harry E. Yessler, 38 Schmidt Bldg., York, Pa.
 ST. LOUIS—*Eugene S. Klein, 716 American Trust Bldg., St. Louis, Mo.; †P. John Hoener, 3605 Laclede Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
 ST. PAUL—*Thomas F. Ellerbe, 692 Endicott Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.; †Ray R. Gauger, 605 New York Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.
 TENNESSEE—*William Crutchfield, 1st Nat. Bank Bldg., Chattanooga, Tenn.; †Louis H. Bull, 1301 Volunteer Bldg., Chattanooga, Tenn.
 TOLEDO—*Leonard Gerow, Spitzer Bldg., Toledo, Ohio; †Karl B. Hols, 1118 Madison Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.
 UTAH—*Raymond J. Ashton, Vermont Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah; †Lorenzo Young, 1455 Princeton Ave., Salt Lake City, Utah.
 VIRGINIA—*Philip N. Stern, 21 Law Building, Fredericksburg, Va.; †S. J. Collins, 230 Institute St., Staunton, Va.
 WASHINGTON, D. C.—*Gilbert L. Rodier, 726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.; †Fred E. Robbins, 726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.
 WASHINGTON STATE—*Roland E. Borhek, 918 Washington Bldg., Tacoma; †Lance E. Gowen, 307 Lumber Exchange Bldg., Seattle, Wash.
 WEST TEXAS—*Emmett T. Jackson, Builders' Exchange Bldg., San Antonio, Texas; †Robert M. Ayres, Smith-Young Tower, San Antonio, Texas.
 WEST VIRGINIA—*L. G. Tucker, Masonic Temple Bldg., Charleston, W. Va.; †Herbert S. Kyle, 1107 Union Trust Building, Charleston, W. Va.
 WISCONSIN—*Roger C. Kirchhoff, 710 N. Plankinton Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.; †Alexander C. Guth, 1249 N. Franklin Place, Milwaukee, Wis.

*Presidents.

†Secretaries.

N. Y.
s, Mo.
D. C.
D. C.
s, Cal.

ic Div.
os Div.)
is Div.

†W. R.
; †Noel
r, N. J.
N. Y.
a, N. C.

Texas:
St., San
al.
ne Bank
Erie, Pa.
†Asbury

Oregon.

adelpia.

gh, Pa.

vidence.

Savings
Savings

ara, Cal.
Cal.

e Bldg.
arra, Pa.
F. Neill

a, S. C.

& Trust
annah, Ga.

Houston
as.

rve Bldg.
ales, Cal.

Queen St.

uis, Mo.

an.; †Ray

ga, Tenn.

B. Holm

y, Utah

a.; †S. I.

N. W.
Washing

on Bldg.
Wash.

San An
io, Texas

harleston
s, W. Va.

Hilwauber
Via.



ap 11/31 Journal on the subject



View of the tower, San Antonio
Jan 19/31



ap 1/31 Palace of the Monarchs San Antonio



MISSION SAN JOSE - 1777 - San Antonio
17-2

MEMORIES OF SAN ANTONIO, by Hubert G. Ripley, F. A. I. A.
Supplement to The Octagon, a Journal of The American Institute of Architects, April, 1931

T

the
write
sible.
tions
fires

But
the
fertile
strea
the
the
bran
stran
their
doub
devil
temp
mem
cryin
place
Anto

Th
Conv
tects
and
ets o
Arch
south
servi
fired
"Pra
have

THE OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects

Published Monthly by

The American Institute of Architects

Executive and Publication Offices, The Octagon, 1741 New York Avenue N. W., Washington, D. C.

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS THE COPY. \$1 PER YEAR. (FORRIGN \$2)

Checks or Money Orders should be made payable to The American Institute of Architects
All communications for publication should be sent to The Secretary, The A. I. A.

Copyright, 1929, by The American Institute of Architects

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

San Antonio

By EX-ATTACHÉ

THE pious Spanish Friars who carried the True Cross into the wilderness of the New Continent were fortified and strengthened by the Holy Passion of self-abnegation. So say the writers of history, and the statement seems plausible. Hunger, thirst, danger on every hand, privations of every kind buoyed them up, and fed the fires of their zeal.

But when, after many heroic wanderings across the hot sands of the desert, they came upon this fertile place, watered by so coy and meandering a stream, the waving grasses, the feathery leafage of the mesquite, the languorously nodding fronds of the palm trees, and the gnarled and writhing branches of the live-oaks must have done something strangely disturbing to their souls. They found their senses yielding in a sweet intoxication; and doubtless felt that they were being tempted by the devil, even as the good St. Anthony himself had been tempted in the wilderness before them. And remembering his victory, they fell upon their knees, crying to him for help, and calling the tantalizing place, in which they had pitched their camp, San Antonio in his honor.

The pious delegates to the Sixty-fourth Annual Convention of The American Institute of Architects set forth with the same high resolve to suffer and to conquer an empire in the name of the prophets of order, and the gods of the living religion of Architecture. From east and west, and north, and south, they came, marching to the battlecries of service, duty, cooperation and responsibility, all fired by the high resolve to make their mission "Practical." Time alone can tell how far they have succeeded; time, and the makers of the dic-

tionary, for of all the words we conjure with, the word practical is perhaps the most deceiving. The poet has one definition, the politician another, the bag man yet another, and so on ad infinitum.

The sessions of the Convention were thoughtfully arranged to provide practical discussions of practical subjects, and the net result of these sessions was practically concrete. The feelings of the membership regarding certain important matters were crystallized, and made articulate. And yet, when the dust of words died down, and the faithful took their ease under the spreading mulberry trees in the patios of the Menger, something of the same poison which frightened the Friars of old crept into their blood and disturbed their sense of values. Pleasant words like beauty and charm, idleness and grace came unbidden to their lips, and they relaxed with a willingness to surrender principle, at least for the time being, to pleasure.

The delegates of the West Texas Chapter, although they themselves had asked that the Convention be a practical one, did everything in their power to demoralize their guests. In the basely human desire to make us happy, they enlisted the assistance of their wives, and even went so far as to engage minstrels and dancing girls to beguile us. The success of their efforts was spectacular. But this is to be no too complete record of our moral decay, but rather a brief history of what we were permitted to accomplish in the face of both powerful and seductive distractions.

First and foremost, we cleared our minds, and our throats, with regard to the attitude of the profession toward the present Federal Building Program. The Board's report, read on the morning of

the first day, was received with much favor by all the delegates assembled. This report was discussed in some detail at the evening meeting presided over by Mr. Arthur Wallace Rice, Chairman of the Committee on Public Works; and the Board's resolutions calling upon the government to avail itself of the services of the best architectural ability in the nation to expedite our National Building Program were unanimously adopted. The Board's statement is a matter of record and will be widely promulgated. It stressed the fact that so great a building program should not be concentrated in a single architectural office like the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, where the results, in spite of the best intentions in the world, are apt to become hackneyed, and perfunctory and to smack of their bureaucratic origin. And furthermore, that in a country so great as ours, so varying in climatic conditions, so diverse in its local needs, the best results can only be achieved by the enlistment of the talents of our ablest men, resident in the sections which our Federal buildings are designed to serve, cooperating of course with the recognized Federal authorities. Only by the employment of our best architects can the taxpayers achieve the kind of architecture to which the expenditure of their money entitles them.

The profession further feels that it has a just cause in protesting the present policy of the government in persisting in the practice of architecture on so large a scale. Such a policy is inconsistent with President Hoover's firmly enunciated desire to keep the government out of business.

Second only in importance to the Institute's action as to this great issue, were the steps taken at the Convention to unite under one aegis all of the elements in the profession. Several joint meetings were held with the representatives of various state societies of architects, notably those of California, Illinois, Ohio and Michigan, who were present. Our common aims were recognized, and it is the hope and desire of everyone who attended these meetings, that plans may be speedily consummated, as the result of which we may be knit more closely together in one great National Organization which will reflect the ideals of the entire profession.

Though this report may seem to stress unduly these two major matters, it must not be concluded that other items of weighty import were neglected. Synchronizing with our own sessions, and sometimes merging with them were the Councils of our cousins the Producers, our brothers the Registrarians, our betters the Educators, and our martyrs of the Small House Service Bureau. There were moments when one couldn't tell one from t'other so complete was their accord. As they ebbed and flowed through the lobby of the old Menger, or out into the sunny courtyard; or drifted into the Salle des Conferences, they seemed one great happy family.

The Producers lived up to their title handsomely. The Consumers did what was expected of them also and the economic balance of supply and demand was nicely preserved. The creed of the Producers may be summed up in the one word Quality; and I think we see eye to eye with them there. Quality in Design, Quality in Materials, Quality in Workmanship, these are ideals no good man can deny. Nor is Quantity to be sniffed at either, by Architect, Producer, or Contractor whenever conditions may warrant. God grant that they soon may do so!

It's hard to write about this Convention because there was so much of it, so much of quality, and so much of quantity. The Board's report alone, covering a multitude of subjects, was a mouthful, at least for Secretary Baldwin; but his table manners were very good indeed.

The Board's report, as every woman knows, is nothing more or less than the summing up of various Committee Reports, accompanied by Good Resolutions. And as very few reputable people care, or even dare, to debate the propriety of Good Resolutions, those presented by the Board met with hearty and unanimous approval. We are all in favor of Education, and Public Information, and City Planning, and Proper Industrial Relations, and Honor Awards; and against Bill Boards and poorly designed Hot Dog Stands. In fact the Board seemed to have had great difficulty in hitting upon any really controversial subject this time; such as for instance, the Octagon Building Plans which the present state of the nation forbids us to discuss. One might fancy that the Treasurer's Report would be apt to at least provoke question, but Mr. Bergstrom's reputation is now so great that no one dares to peep as he deploys his regiments of figures. Do not conclude, however, that because we were not contentious that we were not talkative. The Program was laid out in the Grand Manner, and instead of one symposium as we had last year, three were provided.

The first was conducted by Stephen F. Voorhees, his subject being the "Growing Scope of the Architect's Functions," a bitter title in the light (or darkness rather) of our present plight.

As an academic discussion of conditions which can either be remembered or hoped for by most of us, this session can be called a Success. It was lightened by the breezy and human remarks of Mr. William T. Warren of Birmingham, representing, as he claimed, the rough element. Mr. Ellis F. Lawrence of Portland contributed a trombone obligato, Director Garber played the 'cello and Mr. A. P. Greensfelder, President of the Associated General Contractors (of America) beat the drum in behalf of "Practical Cooperation between Designer and Constructor," which of course is exactly the kind of cooperation we want. If the Constructors were only a little more sensitive and if we Architects were

only a little more hard-boiled, what a delightful place the world would be.

The second symposium was presided over by Mr. William Stanley Parker of Boston. This was called for want of a better title, "Newer Aspects of Land and Building Development." That any better title could have been chosen is doubtful; for the field covered was very wide, extending from New York to Palos Verdes, with stops by the way at Pittsburgh and Houston. Several valiant knights, each arrayed in armour composed of the incrustations of his own experience, attacked the dragon of selfishness, greed and ugliness which stands in the way of our orderly land development, and our harmonious ideals of housing. That the interests of the financier and realtor do not always seem to be consistent with the standards of good architecture is unfortunate; but we are hopeful that gradually the economic value of sensible design, not to mention beauty, will be recognized. Real estate operators and mortgagees are keenly susceptible to the instinct of self-preservation (which has been called the first law of nature) and only by the most patient efforts can they be convinced that ultimate security lies on the side of order and system, rather than on the side of anarchy.

Mr. Cheney's theory of an enlightened and altruistic censorship, while seeming to work fairly well in the case of a private development like that of Palos Verdes, seems a little more than a jump ahead in our present state of rampant individualism. It was unfortunate that, owing to the fact that the list of speakers was long (and some of their speeches likewise) Mr. Henry Wright had to be crowded out of the sub-division where he, if anyone, might have felt at home.

The third symposium occurred on the morning of the last day, and was directed by Mr. M. H. Furbringer, Regional Director of the Gulf States Division. Mr. Furbringer presided with firmness, and tried to keep a grip on the check-rein with which he equipped each speaker. He stated at the outset, that discussion would be confined to the practical problems of the architect, and that any references to Mexican dinners, Chile Queens or the Old Missions would not be tolerated. He also advised speakers not to begin their remarks with the statement, "I once had a client." This, I think, was unfortunate, for few relaxations are so satisfactory as reminiscence. Moreover, the Client is perhaps the most practical problem with which an architect has to deal. Most of his other problems can be summed up in that one word. The discussion diffused itself out over the no-man's-land of fees; sketches, free and not so free; the general subject of starvation; the prominence of the architect in his community and the desirability of joining fraternal organizations. All of the speakers, and some

of the listeners, derived much benefit and not a little satisfaction from the discussion.

Throughout the duration of these symposia numbers of the delegates were voting, others were basking in the sun along with the alligators in the patio, some were dreaming in the shade, and some were driving out in the country to see the Missions.

The election itself was a quiet affair and must have been extremely satisfactory to all the candidates, as the results showed a complete unanimity on the part of the delegates regarding our best minds.

It is now in order to speak of two evening sessions without which no convention would be complete. On the evening of Wednesday, the 15th, the Committee on Education under Chairman Butler, had charge of the program. The report of the Committee was read, and no disapproval was manifest. Chairman Butler then introduced Mr. Eliel Saarinen, early of Finland, later of Cranbrook, and now first in the hearts of his adopted countrymen. Mr. Saarinen was as sincerely reluctant to speak as Harry Sinclair himself, but, in the public weal, he smothered his reluctance and unfolded his conception of the art which we are supposed to revere, in simple, straightforward and consequently eloquent terms. His masterly drawings, and photographs of the beautiful work which he is doing at Cranbrook, and has done in Helsingfors, hanging on the walls of the room in which he spoke, graphically illustrated his text and revealed what modernism may mean under the inspiration of a true artist. Mr. Saarinen spoke as an architect, but his words were by no means the least practical in this most practical of all conventions.

The Institute Fine Arts Medal was awarded to Frederick Law Olmsted for distinguished achievement in Landscape Architecture, and the Craftsmanship Medal was awarded to Leon V. Solon for distinguished achievement in Ornamental Terra Cotta and Faience. Knighthood was bestowed on an impressive galaxy of Fellows; and the Institute bestowed upon itself a shining accolade by the election of Miss Lois Howe to Fellowship. The ceremonies attendant on the award of these honors greatly contributed to our self-esteem. Consequently, the annual dinner which took place on the following evening, was a complete success. The night was balmy to begin with, and the setting in the larger patio was poetic. President Kohn himself, relaxing after an arduous week, was in happy mood as he unhitched his string of speakers. Mayor Chambers bade us welcome and good-bye; Mr. E. J. Russell bade us behave and be good citizens; and Dr. John Gaw Meem of Santa Fe told us all about the apartment houses (Pueblos) of those Indian tribes who love to dwell together like New Yorkers. The evening, we repeat, was balmy to begin with,

but as the speeches wore on the air became chilly and chastened the end of the evening.

Of course there were many unofficial gatherings of which no minutes were made, and these perhaps were as fruitful in inspiration as our more formal sessions. Their purpose was primarily practical, the word service was frequently heard and the co-operative "spirit" was sufficiently in evidence.

The visit on our last glittering afternoon to the Casa Urrutia, and the delightful entertainment staged in the garden of Miraflores by Dr. Urrutia needs a special de luxe number of THE OCTAGON.

As a beautiful illustration of the "Growing Scope of the Architect's Functions" it will long be remembered. We understand now the implications of Ambassador Morrow's purpose to cultivate our Mexican relations. He should be made an Honorary Member of the Institute at once. The spell cast by so lovely a group of flower garlanded senoritas dancing for our delight, made us forgetful of all conventions. One can not be didactic about Beauty; there is no fixed authentic standard; but speaking personally I preferred the little one on

The End.

Address of Eliel Saarinen

Editor's Note: The following is the verbatim report of the address of Eliel Saarinen, Member of the Institute and the Detroit Chapter, at the Sixty-fourth Convention.

When I received a letter from Mr. Charles Butler, asking me to come down to San Antonio to give an address at the Institute's Convention, I decided not to come.

But then one day, Albert Kahn telephoned and said to me: "You must go,"—So I had no choice, and now I am here.

I did not want to come because I do not like to speak. We speak and write too much about architecture in our day and I certainly think architecture cannot be done in that way. "Male Kuenstler, rede nicht," says Goethe, that is: "The painter should paint and not speak."

Mr. Butler in his letter asked me about two topics,

first: *A description of the Cranbrook development;*
and then: *My point of view of contemporary architecture.*

We are just beginning with our art development at Cranbrook and we have not yet done very much in actual art work. Much of the time has been spent in studying our problems from different points of view and in trying to find the right path for an Institute so that its existence would have a lasting quality in the development of the art of today and of the future.

To explain the whole idea and to describe closely the various institutions at Cranbrook would take more time than I am allowed to speak tonight. I have to limit myself to a few principal points.

Cranbrook is an estate in Bloomfield Hills, twenty miles north of Detroit. The estate consists of about 250-300 acres and has a beautiful location with woods, lawns, lakes and many flowers in summertime. The owners of this estate, Mr. and Mrs.

George G. Booth, have developed here already for many years an educational center.

Before I came to Cranbrook, Mr. and Mrs. Booth were already erecting a Church as a gift to the community. The Church is in beautiful modernized Gothic and one of the last designs by Goodhue.

Besides this Church the Cranbrook educational center consists of the following institutions:

The Brookside School Cranbrook, which is a children's school and a kindergarten.

The Cranbrook School for boys, a preparatory boarding school.

The Kingswood School Cranbrook for girls, a boarding school, which is now under construction and will be ready in September of this year.

Cranbrook Institute of Science, which houses natural history collections and an astronomical observatory.

Cranbrook Academy of Art, which is to afford talented and highly trained students the opportunity of pursuing their studies in a favorable environment and under the leadership of artists of the highest standing.

When fully developed the Academy of Art is planned to include departments of Architecture, design, decoration, drawing, painting, sculpture, landscape design, drama, music and artistic craftsmanship.

The Academy of Art group will include buildings for various purposes, such as: Museums for painting and for sculpture, for collections of contemporary art from various countries, for collections of building materials. In the academy group will be an Auditorium and lecture rooms, Assembly and club-rooms, a dining hall, an Art Library, theatre, music hall; Studios for general use and for private artists, living quarters for artists and craftsmen, studios for weaving and textile designing, cabinet work, silver

work, iron work, stained glass work, pottery, book-binding and book printing, and so forth.

The Cranbrook Academy of Art is not an Art School in the ordinary meaning. *It is a working place for creative art.* The leading idea is to have artists of highest standing and reputation to live at Cranbrook and execute their work there. Those artists form a more or less permanent staff of the Art Council. Besides these artists we will have living quarters and studios for visiting artists, who will stay at Cranbrook for a year, for six months, or so. Those visiting artists from various parts of the country or from foreign countries, will bring freshness and new impulses to the Cranbrook Art life and will help us to a richer and closer understanding of the contemporary movement in various minds and in various countries.

No doubt this rich and creative artistic atmosphere will bring to Cranbrook young artists and art students, who are eager to develop their talents. They will have their private studios where they do their own work; and in being continuously in close contact with the master artists they can learn from them how to develop their own individualities.

Creative art cannot be taught by others. Each one has to be his own teacher. But connection with other artists and discussions with them provide sources for inspiration.

To develop an Academy of Art in a direction, as above mentioned, is a slow process. The problem has to be carefully studied and the right men have to be found.

We have already at Cranbrook studios for weaving and textile designing, for cabinet work, silver work, iron work, for book-binding and book-printing. Instruction in life-drawing and painting is given for outside students under the leadership of Mr. Frank L. Allen. Professor Carl Milles, whom we regard as one of the foremost living sculptors, I would say, the best living sculptor, is connected with Cranbrook and has his studio and his home there.

The Cranbrook Academy of Art is the nucleus of the whole Cranbrook Development.

As time goes on and the Academy idea becomes a reality on a larger scale, Cranbrook will have a reputation as an important center for creative art.

It will soon be that parents all over the country, who find in their children interest and talent for art, will send them to the Cranbrook schools. There they will, while young, find the possibility of following their art in every day contact with the academy.

Mr. Milles says that an artist should be born in a studio. It means: The earlier a talented child gets his impulses in art the deeper roots will he have in his future work.

The young students' close connection with creative art and with artists will be a good inspiration for

them and the Academy will take care of those students, who are best talented and are most interested in art. The others, who do not have enough talent to become artists themselves, will grow up in an art environment, and will understand that art is not only for the artists, but for everyone; they will look upon art as an everyday necessity for everybody. They will know that culture without understanding and interest for art is not culture, and that—as it is carved in stone on one of the gateways in Cranbrook—"The life without beauty is only half lived."

The students who are not destined to become artists, become probably future art protectors and patrons, and thus the interest for Art and the development of higher culture will spread through the country.

How much we can do, we do not know. The buildings will not do the work. The artists we can get to live at Cranbrook do the work partly, but most depends on the artistic creative power of the youth of the country. However, we do think the time is ripe for such an Institution, and we have reason to think the location is good, because it is on the cross roads of the country.

In connection with the Cranbrook development, I will furthermore emphasize two things—because many visitors and many magazine articles about Cranbrook seem to be mistaken in two principal points.

For the first: Many have the impression that the Art Academy tries to teach all the boys and girls in the schools to become artists.

It is just the opposite. Art has to be created by an artist and only a person who has natural gifts should become an artist. That is the only way to raise the standard of our art.

The Cranbrook Academy of Art takes care only of such youth who have natural gifts and a living interest for art.

For the second: Many think the Academy with its craft studios tries to revive the mediaeval spirit of craftsmanship against our machine age.

That is not so. The main idea with the craft studios is not to develop craftsmanship, *but the design.* We all know how in our days the development of design is mostly done on paper. The young designer in his growing years comes seldom in contact with the real material in which his design is to be executed. This is true regarding architecture, as well as design in general. If the young man in developing his design has possibilities to follow the work in a cabinet-maker's shop, in a bronze foundry, in textile and weaving shops, if he can follow the work in iron, silver, glass, wood, and stone, he begins to understand the material and his design will be influenced by the character of the material.

There is no use for skillful craftsmen if we do not know the form of our time. *The first thing and*

the most important one is to develop an adequate design to express our contemporary life. And if the form is there, it is of minor importance if we use the hand of man or the machine.

But both are necessary.

Then Mr. Butler asked me to speak about my point of view of our contemporary architecture.

I am sure you will not agree with me in everything that I am going to say tonight, so to begin with I shall make this remark:

Louis Sullivan explained once to me his philosophy of architecture. When he finished, he said: "That is the only right thing to do."

I looked skeptical and said: "Do you think so?"

"Yes," he answered, "that is the only right thing to do—for me. You have to consider what is right for you."

I have to say the same thing to you, when I am going to explain my opinions:

"That is the only right thing to do—for me. You have to consider what is the right thing for you."

There is still another point I will mention, so there will not be any mistake. When I speak about contemporary architecture, I do not mean the French modernistic, as you call it in this country. I will not mention anything in this way or that way, or my personal opinions of contemporary architects and their work. I will speak only about principles and I only take into consideration architecture, which has principles and logic behind the forms.

I will not criticize. And if I do criticize, I will limit my criticism to a little story:

There was a man walking crooked along the street. His friend met him and said:

"What is the trouble with you—lumbago?"

"No," he answered, "That is not lumbago. That is modern furniture."

My topic will be:

The historical and ethical necessity of the contemporary movement in the development of our culture.

We all know that when something new comes in our art life, minds are divided into two main parts. One part is for the new: the progressive minded; another part is against the new: the conservative minded. Both are necessary. The progressive part is the motor which gives the speed; the conservative part is the brake which prevents accidents.

There is a third group in the middle, doubtful, hesitating, and asking:

"Is this only a fashion for today, or will it last?"

The conservatives who are against the new are against it partly because they have grown up with the old forms and they are slow in changing their minds. They are watching to see how the new will

develop. Others are against because they are satisfied with the old forms, they are afraid of something new which disturbs them, and they do not see anything good in it.

And I have heard remarks like this:

"Why all this searching of new forms? We have architecture already settled. We have the antique and the Gothic. They have been regarded for hundreds of years as basic things in all architecture. Aren't they good enough?"

It is surprising that they ask this.

Because nobody asks: "Why all this thinking today? We have Plato, Aristotle and Kant. Aren't they good enough?"

Or: "Why all this composing today? We have Bach, Mozart, Beethoven."

I think, however, most of the people understand the movement. They see the logic of it, they know that a new time has to create new forms. But they maybe think it goes often too far. Why revolution? Why not evolution?

There is not much difference between revolution and evolution in art matters. Revolution is only evolution at more speed. All the different appearances in human culture have to develop parallel with each other. If one is slower than the others, it has to hurry. But the result will be evolution.

Suppose that our cultural life from the Renaissance to our day had developed with smooth evolution. Suppose our architecture had developed parallel with it, always moulding its forms according to the changing life, day after day, year after year. Suppose further we still would wear the Renaissance dresses, with gilded brocades and colorful ornaments. Don't you think that one day there would be quite a radical change? Don't you think that we would take off the ornaments and fit our dresses to the spirit of the time?

But now we wear golf knickers and straight cut suits and enter Greek temples and Roman palaces, and are surprised that there is a revolt in architecture—a revolution.

But, is there a revolution?

He, who still sticks to the old forms, thinks so. He who has for years been longing for new forms does not think so.

I became an architect in 1897. I had a classical training in school, but already in the school years I freed myself from the old forms and went my own way. I don't see the revolution. I see only evolution. And as I look back over those thirty-five years, I think often that the evolution is too slow.

A few weeks ago we had a dinner at the Architectural League in New York. Ralph Walker made a speech. He spoke about the individuals who do research work in contemporary architecture. He explained how they go different ways,

how they solve their problems differently, and how they look upon things from different angles. He said: "We need those individuals. They are our leaders. They try to find the way for us."

That is true. And it is right that those individuals go their different ways.

But could you imagine the old styles like antique and Gothic being born if the individuals, the leaders had *not* gone different ways in those days? Quite naturally, they had to do their research work too; they had to try different ways; they had to seek just as we have to do it today.

But there was something which, as time went on, drew them together. There is a repulsion and attraction in art development just as in nature. There is something fundamental in the power of the human mind, in the power of a nation, or in the power of a cultural epoch, which directs the whole life.

I call it: *The fundamental form*. The fundamental form of the time, the fundamental form of a nation.

This fundamental form is the attractive power which leads the art development towards a coming style.

We have many kinds of individuals, but only those individuals are our leaders, who feel the fundamental form of our time and who can express it in an adequate architectural language. And the strongest of them will remain as milestones in the history of architecture.

That is so in every art.

But more in architecture than in other arts the outline of the individual disappears when the time passes by and the spirit of the time comes in the foreground.

When we study sculpture, we like to know the name behind the sculpture. When we study painting, we like to know who is the master and we name the painting after the master: a Rembrandt, a Van Dyck, an El Greco. When we read literature, and go so far in the past as to the antique literature, we still like to know the name of the author.

But when we go to a town in France, Germany or Italy, we are not so much concerned over the name of the architect. We say: "This is Twelfth Century; this is Thirteenth Century." The *spirit of the time* speaks to us.

And we feel the spirit of the time not only in the forms of the architecture, but we feel the spirit of the time in the entirety of life *through the forms* of the architecture. This because the whole life was conducted by the fundamental form of the time.

The Fundamental form of the time was the real leader.

What it is, we do not know. Its influence comes through intuition, and it has to be felt with intuition.

In studying the architecture of old Greece, their sculpture, their painting, their crafts, in studying their philosophy, literature, drama, their whole life with customs, dresses and even their movements, as far as we can study them from their paintings and their sculptures, we feel how everything is especially Greek, and *only Greek*. There is something which draws everything together and forms it to an entire world for itself.

If we take something from Greek culture and compare it with the culture of Old Egypt, we will find that it is strange there. It doesn't fit. It doesn't fit, because the fundamental form of Egypt vibrates differently than the fundamental form of Greece.

Compare Romanesque, Gothic, Assyrian, and Chinese with each other. And we see how each one has built his own world of forms. Each one has his own fundamental tune. No one can imitate the other, it would sound false. *Each of those great cultural epochs has had creative power to build its culture in an expressive style of its own through a fine sense for its fundamental form.*

Now, if we compare our attempts to develop a contemporary architecture of today with those great epochs of the past, we have to ask:

"Does the fundamental form of our day conduct our movement, or do we still wander in darkness? Where do we find our leaders?"

The same question is asked in other arts.

Who is the leader of Music today? Is it Debussy? Is it Stravinsky? Is it Sibelius?

In painting we have had in a few decades impressionists, symbolists, pointilists, cubists and so on. Each one thought it had found the key of the time.

We have Cézanne and Picasso. Many say that Picasso is the greatest painter of today. Maybe. Maybe he will found the painting of the future. Or maybe his influence is gone in a few years, a few decades.

Maybe there will appear some day a strong mind which will go deep into things, and the doors will open for the painting of the future.

Maybe the same will happen in the art of building!

Only the future can tell.

But, says someone, why all this talking about deep thinking?

Our time is practical! We have to build in a practical way. Practicality has to decide the form of our architecture.

If a building is practical, it is beautiful. This is what they say.

But I wonder! I wonder if it is so, because we so often see very, very practical buildings, practical

from every angle, practical in every point, and they appear so terribly ugly. They have no proportions, no rhythm, no balance of masses. The color is terrible, the treatment of materials is terrible.

So, I don't think we can say that if a building is practical it is beautiful.

But, I think we could say—or rather—I *do think we should say that a building has to be practical to be able to be beautiful.*

And further: *A practical building is able to be beautiful only if the architect has a sub-conscious sense for beauty, that is: if he is a creative artist.*

Is the practical really so especial a mark of our age as we think? We are inclined to think so when we see what they had in the earlier days. But it seems to me that they were more practical than we are, because they could get along with lesser needs. And on the other hand, we do not know what the future holds for our practicality. Maybe then it will be said: They were not practical at all. They used gasoline in their cars, just as in the old kerosene lamps! Why couldn't they take the power directly from the air as we do?

Every age has its own point of view regarding practicality. Practicality is one of the cornerstones of all architecture, has always been and always will be so. Nature is our teacher in the principles of architecture, and nature itself is the perfect functionalism.

When we speak about practicality, we mostly think about our daily comfort. We push a button here and a button there, we get cold here and hot there, and that is all very practical. But we do not live for our daily comfort. We have higher ideals.

And the very man who preaches the coldest and hardest practicality is not always practical himself. He plants roses in his garden.

Why roses? Roses are not practical.

Cabbage is more practical.

Then there arises the question of our traditions.

Couldn't we take the forms from our forefathers and mould them so that they fit our time and then develop our architecture through tradition?

That is evolution!

It sounds good.

But where do we find our traditions?

If we go to the forms of yesterday, I am afraid we will arrive in trouble, because we will find so many different styles. Which of them should we adopt? Or should we take all of them and melt them together to a gay potpourri?

Or should we go deeper in the past and find our forms there?

We all know how well the Gothic architecture expresses the Gothic life. But, life keeps changing from day to day. Instead of dry Scholasticism there comes something new in the mediaeval life. People

begin to read antique literature, they begin to study antique art, and during two hundred years or more the antique ideal of man meets the Gothic ideal of God through humanism. We have a new cultural epoch. We have a new architectural form.

A new style.

There are three things which together form a style:

1st—The conditions of the life itself.

2nd—The tradition.

3rd—The outside—coming influences.

When we speak about the outside—coming influences, we do not mean to take foreign forms and include them in our style as they are. No, art is always creative, and if we are influenced by foreign forms, and will adopt them in our art, they have to be melted into our style *through a mental process.*

For instance:

If we buy a Chinese sculpture and place it in our garden, it is still a Chinese sculpture, and will always remain so. If we take a replica of it, it is still Chinese in form. But when we are inspired by its beauty, do something of our own, maybe in the same spirit, then it is our work. It has passed our individuality, our personality, and through a mental process it is part of our culture.

Just in the same way the antique forms were melted together with Gothic forms to be a beautiful style which we call: The early Renaissance.

But there soon came a change.

In the later Renaissance, men began to take forms direct from the antique world. Instead of using their intuition, they began to use dividers and rulers. They began to write theories and formulas. They began to make science for practical use of an artform which did not belong to them.

They founded schools—where they *thought* their theories, formulas and measurements. There was no need anymore to have artistic intuition to do good work; a little taste and much theory was enough.

The great masters of the Later Renaissance still used their intuition. They were educated in the spirit of intuition, and they erected masterpieces.

But the poison of copying spread through the schools and architecture began gradually to lose its mother place among the arts. Architecture became more imitative than creative, and the strongest minds and the strongest talents of the time became sculptors and painters, and sculpture and painting became the ruling arts.

Sculptors and painters disregarded the architectural principles and used architecture as the playground for their artistic imagination.

Bernini and his followers made architecture sculptural, and sculptural forms overflow cornices and columns. Tiepolo painted his theatrical effects of clouds and skies and forgot the proportions of the room limited by walls and vaults.

This developed further in Rococo. Rococo was gallant as the life was gallant, and playing ornaments made architecture purely decorative.

After the French revolution the life became much simpler. The social life was new. There was a new literature, new science. Even the dresses were new and simpler and expressed the spirit of the time. There seemed to be a strong creative power in the air.

But the gods of architecture were dead: only imitative art from old Rome, neoclassicism.

And from now on during the Romantic time and the whole Nineteenth Century, we see a fairy play with architectural forms. All the styles, antique, Romanesque, Gothic, Renaissance from here and Renaissance from there, towers, pinnacles, crenellations, all dancing together in this fairy play.

Imitation is fashion of the time. Imitation in style, imitation in material, imitation in construction.

The logic and the meaning of style was entirely lost.

And I ask: "Is this our tradition? Are we going to build our contemporary architecture on forms that do not mean anything?"

No!!!

If we have to find our tradition from our ancestors, we have to go to a time when *art was still creative art*, in the Greek architecture and the Gothic time.

But what is our tradition and what is our wisdom from the Greek architecture?

The Greek architects tell us:

Our tradition comes from Egypt. They had a dualistic construction, the support and the weight, the column and the architrave. We used this principle because it was practical for our purpose. But they had their own fundamental form. It would have been easy for us to use their form, but it would have been a lie. *Art has to speak truth as well as man has!* So we had to use our own fundamental form and develop through it a style of our own.

Our architecture has been admired for thousands of years because it is truthful in form and truthful in expression.

This is our advice to you and this is your tradition from our art:

"Be truthful in form and expression, and the future will admire your work."

The Gothic architects tell us:

Our tradition comes through the Romanesque and through the Christian architecture from old Rome. We accepted the Roman planform because it was practical for our purpose. We found the pointed arch in the Orient and we adopted it because it was practical for our high windows. But we had our own fundamental form, and it governed our architecture. Look at our lofty vaults

and buttresses; look at our high towers. The whole is a logical organism; it rises from the bottom to the top, stone built upon stone. You can feel the power go through the material and you can follow the power line the whole way to the top. It is truthful in material and truthful in construction and therefore our architecture has been admired for centuries.

This is our advice to you and this is your tradition from our art:

Be truthful in material and construction and the future will admire your work.

Be truthful in form and in expression.

Be truthful in material and in construction. This is our tradition and this is our ethics.

Our time is quite different from the earlier times: We have become more or less international.

Our time is a machine age.

Science helps us to feel the construction of the whole universe.

The form of our life is new.

And the form of our architecture has to be new if there will be truth in expression.

But our building problems are so manifold in comparison with the earlier times.

Every day brings new materials and new construction methods.

And we ask: Are our architects able to concentrate themselves, to listen to the voice of our fundamental form? Do we have enough creative power to build up our own style?

Style, can *not* be artificially made.

It comes or it does not come.

But if it does come, it comes only through intuition.

Style grows as folk songs grow. People sing their songs, and those songs which express deepest the best feeling of the nation remain as folk songs. It is the fundamental form of the nation which sings through the soul of the nation.

Therefore, those architects who have the strongest imagination are *not* the strongest leaders. They are those architects who feel deepest the silent song of the fundamental form and who can express it in forms of truth.

They are our leaders. And they will build the foundation for the architecture of the future, and the architects of the future will continue their work.

* * *

When we speak about our future architects, we come directly to educational problems because the schools of architecture have to take care of the architects of the future.

I am not the right man to discuss educational problems, because my experience in this line is limited to the hard task of educating myself. But this evening deals with education, and I feel that I should say a few words.

The function of the school is to develop, besides technical and historical instruction, in the students:

- 1st—their artistic intuition;
- 2nd—their sense for the spirit of the time;
- 3rd—their instinct to translate the spirit of the time in an expressive architectural form;
- 4th—their sense for truth, ethics and logic in architecture;

and finally—their creative imagination. Creative because art is always creative in every moment and at every point. And the devil of copying has to be kept far from the schools.

To develop those things in the students is the problem of the schools.

How to do it, I don't know, and it is mostly very individual.

But, I have a distinct opinion as to how *not* to do it:

Do not kill the intuition with theories. Art based on theories is a dead art.

Do not teach theories of proportions. They only disturb the sense for proportion. Theories of proportions are only for arrived men to play with when they have leisure time and do not like to play bridge. The gifted man does not need them. A man without gifts cannot use them correctly.

Do not teach theories of color. They only mislead the sense for color, and, besides, they are all wrong, at least for art purposes.

Do not teach the students the Greek form language before they understand their own form language. You don't teach your children Latin before they speak their mother tongue.

Do not teach style in connection with design. The only style you could possibly use in connection with design is the contemporary.

But there isn't any!!!

"But," someone says, "How can we teach architecture when we have nothing to go by. We have no theories, no styles. It is difficult."

It is difficult or it is easy, it all depends.

I would say: It is *impossible*, or it is *very easy*.

It is impossible if the teacher has no sense for architecture in deeper meaning and the student has no talent.

You can't grow roses from cabbage.

But if the teacher is a living artist, and if the student has natural gifts to become a living artist, it is very easy. You hardly need to teach him. He will find his path himself.

There is still one point in connection with the educational problem.

We speak so often about the lack of interest for architecture on the part of the public. We have to get the public much more interested in our doings. It would be helpful for our profession.

That is true. But how can a person be interested in a thing he does not understand?

Well, we have to educate him.

Someone asks us: "What style is this building?"

We say: "It is Italian Renaissance."

Now he knows it is Italian Renaissance because we tell him so. But it does not help him very much. When he goes to the next building, we have to tell him again about its style.

So we have to educate him. We have to go with him through the whole history of architecture; we have to explain the differences between the various styles, their characteristics and their ornamental treatments. It is a hard task, because there are so many styles and varieties of styles, a long list of French kings and English kings and queens, and so on.

When we are through, he says: "Well, now I can see myself this building is Italian Renaissance. But there is one thing I can not see. Why *should* it be Italian Renaissance? The owner is an Irishman, the architect is a German, the contractor is Danish, the workmen and the building materials are American, and the building was built in the United States a few years ago."

"Why *Italian* and why *Renaissance*?"

"Well," we say, "it is Italian Renaissance because the architect thinks it is a beautiful style."

"What, a beautiful style! What does it mean? Beautiful forms without any meaning! I wouldn't like to read a book filled with beautiful words without any thoughts. No, sir! I don't care for your architecture."

So there we are. He was not interested in architecture because he did not understand it. Now we have educated him to understand it, and he is not interested at all. He likes to have thoughts behind the forms. He likes to have logic.

And there is no logic!

Or here is the logic: I read in the paper some time ago that a person in Detroit had the intention to build a building, and he said: "I will build it in Spanish Renaissance because this style is so little known in the Middle West."

I could say as well: "I have to go to San Antonio and make a speech, and I will speak in Finnish because this language is so little known in Texas."

There is the logic!

No, we can not get logic in architecture as long as we use styles which are only decorative, only empty ornaments which do not mean anything and which do not have any connection with our contemporary life. We have to get rid of the styles. They are poison for living architecture, for living art.

They do not use styles in other arts, do they?

Or, could you imagine someone speaking about Galsworthy's books and saying: "Is it early Italian, or is it Greek, or is it Spanish?" No. Or, could you imagine someone speaking about Tchaikovsky's

Fifth Symphony and saying: "Is it early Orpheus, or late Liszt, or Middle Mozart?"

No, you couldn't.

You couldn't, because you know what it is. And everyone knows that Tschaikovsky's Fifth Symphony is Tschaikovsky, and it comes directly from his innermost soul and goes directly into the deep-

est heart of the public. And the public understands it.

The public understands our language, too, if we speak directly, and if there is logic in our thoughts and if there is truth in our words.

We don't need to educate the public.

Our Art has to do it.

The Federal Building Program

PROGRESS REPORT—By LOUIS LA BEAUME, F. A. I. A.

Chairman of the Committee on Public Works

May 15, 1931.

THE Sixty-fourth Convention of the Institute unanimously adopted a statement and two resolutions which were proposed by the Board of Directors. The statement and the resolutions—as adopted—follow:

The Report of the Committee on Public Works, comprising a thorough historical survey of Federal Building activities, extending over a long period of years, has been received by the Board. In addition to this report the Board has received numerous resolutions by Chapters, in various parts of the country, protesting the present composition and policies of the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, and also communications in similar tenor from many other sources.

After careful consideration of all these documents, the Board makes its own statement on the Federal Building Program, as follows:

The willingness of the architectural profession as represented by the membership of the Institute to cooperate with the Federal Government is well known, and we are proud of the contributions which the institute and civic organizations, with the aid of sympathetic Government officials, have been able to make toward the planning and development of Washington, our Capital City.

For thirty years this cooperation has been freely given through the services of many distinguished architects serving without compensation on the McMillan Commission, the National Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, supported by The American Institute of Architects throughout the country.

We welcome every opportunity to make available to the Government the best professional ability which the country possesses in order that the splendid example already established in our national capital may be extended to every community where these ideals may be reflected and emphasized in our Federal architecture.

Great sums of money have been appropriated by the Congress for the erection of many governmental structures in all sections of the country. Under the stress of circumstances, despite the large organization of the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, few out of many projects have been assigned to architects in private practice, but it is the conviction of the architectural profession that public policy will be best served by a further extension of this work into the hands of able architects resident in the localities which the buildings are designed to serve.

We believe that the country is entitled to the services of the best architectural talent available, and that the concentration of so large a volume of work as the present appropriations provide, into the hands of a single Government bureau must inevitably tend to produce stereotyped, mediocre, uneconomic, and uninspiring results.

We believe further that our national policy of encouraging private business initiative is wise; and that therefore the operation of the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury is inconsistent with this policy, and an invasion into the field of individual professional activity.

In urging upon the Government the desirability of availing itself of the services of architects in private practice, we stress the importance of the care which must be taken in their selection. That they should be chosen for reasons of fitness alone, and on the basis of their records, cannot be too strongly emphasized. Their selection should be left to a Board which might be composed of the Chairmen of the Public Buildings Committees of the Senate and House, a representative of the Department concerned, disinterested architects and a qualified layman representing a national civic or business organization.

We affirm that our Federal buildings in all parts of the country should proclaim the highest standards of enduring architecture. The special customs, traditions and local resources of the communities in which they are located should be recognized and met in their design. Such standards of excellence can be achieved only by enlisting the best ability in the architectural profession. Men capable of producing these results are not to be found in subordinate capacities in government bureaus, certainly not in numbers capable of creditably carrying into effect the greatest national building program the world has ever known. This condition is recognized and clearly stated in the words of a distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Franklin MacVeagh, concerning the functioning of his own Department. He said, in 1912:

"Our Federal Government is the largest builder of buildings ever known in the world—and its building enterprises are to be far more important; and the fact that it builds in every part of our great country gives it an unexampled influence upon the architectural art of the entire people. It cannot avoid affecting the growth of good architecture in all communities; for the effects and influence of our building operations are completely nationalized. The Government, therefore, enjoys in its building operations a tremendous opportunity for good, in the judgment of all who regard architecture as one

of the important factors of the higher civilization. This opportunity is really unexampled.

"The elimination from the service of the Government of the knowledge, gifts and inspirations of all architects except those confined within the Treasury building, reduces our architectural dimensions to those of a single architect's office, and limits us to the architectural control of one man; whereas such continual building as we do, such opportunities of influence upon all the buildings in the country as we have, such responsibilities to the architecture of the nation as we cannot relieve ourselves of, demand that the Government should have at its disposal every bit of architectural ability that the nation possesses."

A government building policy should be consistent and general in its application. In his message to Congress outlining the building program for Washington, President Coolidge stated: "This program should represent the best that exists in the art and science of architecture." President Hoover confirmed this policy in an address delivered in April, 1929, in which he stated:

"It is the wish and the demand of the American people that our new buildings shall comport with the dignity of the Capital of America, that they shall meet modern requirements of utility, that they shall fulfill the standards of taste, that they shall be a lasting inspiration. In architecture it is the spiritual impulse that counts. These buildings should express the ideals and standards of our times; they will be the measure of our skill and taste by which we will be judged by our children's children.

"Mr. Mellon has insisted that the great responsibility before us is not one which can be discharged by any one individual. It must be the product of the common mind of many men, devoted to secure for America the vast realization of the expression of our Nation. And I am confident that we have within the Nation the taste, skill and artistic sense to perform our task, for our architects have already given to America the leading place in their great art."

The American Institute of Architects accepted these statements as expressing the general policy of the Government, not merely applicable to Washington. It is now faced with the fact that the departments in charge of the execution of the present nation-wide program have not been guided by this policy. Data furnished by the Government shows that while the public buildings in the National Capital have been entrusted to architects of distinguished reputation, the policy for the country at large has thus far been restricted to the appointment of comparatively few architects in private practice.

Outside of Washington, of 378 buildings to be erected in the United States, only 40 buildings in 18 states have been assigned to architects in private practice, leaving the remaining buildings in the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury. The American Institute of Architects submits that this policy is unfair to the nation at large. The Institute reiterates its stand that every section of the country is entitled to public buildings which shall represent the best architectural ability of the nation.

The Board offers the following resolutions:

Resolved, That The American Institute of Architects, through its delegates assembled at its Sixty-fourth Annual Convention, ratifies and approves the report of its Board of Directors relating to the Federal building program and to the desirability of enlisting the services of the nation's ablest architects in the execution of this program; and be it further

Resolved, That the incoming Board is directed to transmit the views of the Institute to the proper legislative and executive branches of the Government, and to take such other measures, in cooperation with the chapters of this

Institute and related organizations, as may be necessary to accomplish the aims expressed herein.

(These resolutions and the report preceding them were unanimously adopted by the Convention.)

Pursuant to these resolutions, the Committee on Public Works has addressed itself to the task of presenting the views of the Institute, and such other elements of the building industry as would cooperate, to the proper governmental authorities.

On Wednesday, May sixth, Messrs. L. W. Wallace, Executive Secretary of the American Engineering Council; A. P. Greensfelder, President of the Associated General Contractors of America; H. H. Sherman, President of the Producers' Council; Frank C. Baldwin, Secretary of The American Institute of Architects, and Louis La Beaume, Chairman of the Committee on Public Works of the Institute, met at The Octagon and collaborated in the preparation of a memorandum to be presented to President Hoover. That memorandum covered points stressed in the Board's report to the Convention at San Antonio. It offered to the Government the assistance of the entire construction industry in any measures which might help to expedite the present Federal Building Program. It urged the employment of able architects and engineers resident in the localities where public buildings are to be built. It emphasized the importance of utilizing the best architectural and engineering ability in the country, not only because of the necessity for speed in the present emergency, but because it would be advantageous to the country at all times to draw upon the best abilities in those professions.

The memorandum also stated that the operation of great bureaus as creating-agencies is inconsistent with our national policy of encouraging business and professional initiative, and not in accordance with the present views of the country with regard to keeping the Government out of business. The memorandum was signed by all of the individuals above mentioned, representing their respective organizations.

On Thursday, May seventh, President Hoover received the above named group and the entire situation was frankly discussed. The President expressed himself as very anxious to do anything possible to expedite the Federal Building Program, and advised the committee to seek an interview with Major Ferry K. Heath, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Our memorandum was left with the President for his mature consideration.

In accordance with the President's desire, an appointment with Major Heath was sought. Major Heath being obliged to leave the city, arranged a meeting with Judge Wetmore, the Acting Super-

vising Architect, and Mr. Martin, also of that Office, who, he said, would represent him. At the conference which followed, detailed facts and figures showing the present status of the Federal Building Program were gone over. Judge Wetmore and Mr. Martin assured us of their full intention to cooperate in every way feasible. They stated that sixty-three private architects had already been appointed; and that some of these had been coupled with consulting or advisory architects, bringing the total number of private architects now engaged to something near one hundred. They stated further that it was the intention of the Department to make at least fifty more outside appointments within the next few months.

They both said that they recognized the value of outside cooperation from every point of view, and that the relations of the Supervising Architect's Office with private architects already appointed had been satisfactory.

Judge Wetmore and Mr. Martin expressed the hope that we would report to President Hoover the result of our interview, and this will be done. On our part, should the memorandum left with the President be referred to them, we asked them to frankly comment on any other points with which they might take issue. They agreed to do this. The Committee on Public Works of the Institute will continue its efforts to bring about future cooperation by all Federal bureaus having charge of building construction.

Newly Elected Officers

The American Institute of Architects

A complete roster of the new Officers and Directors of the Institute appears on page two of this number.

The Architects' Small House Service Bureau, Inc.

President—William Stanley Parker, 120 Boylston Street, Boston, Mass.

Vice-President—William W. Tyrie, 1028 Andrus Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

Treasurer—Edwin H. Hewitt, 1200 Second Avenue, South, Minneapolis, Minn.

Secretary-Technical Director—Robert T. Jones, 1200 Second Avenue, South, Minneapolis, Minn.

The Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture

President—Dean Ellis F. Lawrence, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

Vice-President—Roy Childs Jones, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Secretary-Treasurer—Sherley W. Morgan, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards

President—James M. White, 256 Administration Building, W., Urbana, Ill.

First Vice-President—Albert L. Brockway, Syracuse, N. Y.

Second Vice-President—A. M. Edelman, Los Angeles, Calif.

Third Vice-President—J. W. Holman, Nashville, Tenn.

Secretary-Treasurer—Emery Stanford Hall, Suite 2300, 175 W. Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

The Producers' Council

President—H. H. Sherman, 31 State Street, Boston, Mass.

First Vice-President—W. E. Hart, 33 West Grand Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

Second Vice-President—F. W. Morse, 318 South Columbus Avenue, Mt. Vernon, New York.

Secretary—J. C. Bebb, 260 Eleventh Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Treasurer—A. D. Tibbetts, 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

Architects on Memorial Day

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

THE Washington, D. C., Chapter is now making its preparations for the annual tributes on Memorial Day, sponsored by the Chapter, at the graves of L'Enfant, Thornton, Hoban and Hadfield.

These annual pilgrimages were initiated several years ago; and the National Capital Park and Plan-

ning Commission, the Fine Arts Commission, the Architect of the Capitol, and other officials and national organizations have participated at different times.

The services are very simple, consisting merely of a tour, lasting about two hours, in which the four graves are visited in succession, with a simple ad-

dress on some phase of the life or work of these great architects, and the placing of a wreath on each grave. More and more interest is being aroused each year, and more organizations are participating.

It is hoped that other chapters will undertake similar programs in their own sections. Perhaps

when the architects themselves manifest more interest in and appreciation of the work of their predecessors, and begin to consider them as individuals rather than as incidental elements of certain buildings, the public estimate may be similarly formed and eventually an American architect may find his way into the hall of fame.

Applications For Membership

May 20, 1931.

Notice to Members of the Institute:

The names of the following applicants may come before the Board of Directors or its Executive Committee for action on their admission to the Institute, and, if elected, the applicants will be assigned to the Chapters indicated:

<i>Albany Chapter</i>	- - - - -	AUGUST LUX, WORTHINGTON PALMER
<i>Boston Chapter</i>	- - - - -	C. PARKER CROWELL, WALTER S. LANCASTER, MAURICE P. MEADE
<i>Chicago Chapter</i>	- - - - -	PAUL T. HAAGEN, JOHN W. OGG, HAL PEREIRA
<i>Detroit Chapter</i>	- - - - -	W. E. N. HUNTER
<i>Georgia Chapter</i>	- - - - -	MCKENDREE A. TUCKER
<i>Iowa Chapter</i>	- - - - -	E. R. SWANSON
<i>Minnesota Chapter</i>	- - - - -	FLOYD W. BROWN
<i>Montana Chapter</i>	- - - - -	GLENN GORDON COTTIER, NORMAN BRADLEY DEKAY, C. J. FORBIS
<i>New Jersey Chapter</i>	- - - - -	EDWIN R. CLOSS, EDWARD C. EPPLE
<i>New York Chapter</i>	- - - - -	GEORGE L. GLYNOS
<i>North Texas Chapter</i>	- - - - -	WALTER ARTHUR GRAY
<i>Northern California Chapter</i>	- - - - -	NEWTON ACKERMAN
<i>Philadelphia Chapter</i>	- - - - -	GABRIEL MASSENA
<i>Washington State Chapter</i>	- - - - -	N. LESTER TROAST

You are invited, as directed by the By-laws, to send privileged communications before June 20, 1931, on the eligibility of the candidates, for the information and guidance of the members of the Board of Directors in their final ballot. No applicant will be finally passed upon should any chapter request, within the thirty-day period, an extension of time for purpose of investigation.

FRANK C. BALDWIN,
Secretary.

Members Elected from March 8, 1931, to April 30, 1931

<i>Albany Chapter</i>	- - - - -	CLARENCE HAYNES GARDINIER, RALPH G. GULLEY, RALPH EDWARD WINSLOW
<i>Baltimore Chapter</i>	- - - - -	JOHN A. AHLERS
<i>Chicago Chapter</i>	- - - - -	HAROLD BATCHELDER McELDOWNEY
<i>Georgia Chapter</i>	- - - - -	ERNEST OREN SMITH
<i>New Jersey Chapter</i>	- - - - -	EDWARD M. ANNITTO
<i>North Carolina Chapter</i>	- - - - -	MARION ROSSITER MARSH
<i>Philadelphia Chapter</i>	- - - - -	HORACE TRUMBAUER
<i>St. Louis Chapter</i>	- - - - -	WILLIAM H. MILLS
<i>Southern Pennsylvania Chapter</i>	- - - - -	DAVID AMOS ROYER
<i>Virginia Chapter</i>	- - - - -	PENDLETON SCOTT CLARK, WALTER ROGERS CROWE, STANHOPE S. JOHNSON
<i>Washington State Chapter</i>	- - - - -	THEODORE JAN PRICHARD

in-
le-
als
ld-
ed
his