

THE
OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects



The Washington Situation
The Seventy-fourth Annual Meeting—Third Notice
Prefabrication and the Architect—Which is the Challenger?

Volume 14

APRIL
1942

Number 4

SPOT NEWS

Army Specialist Corps.

This office has conferred with Mr. Dwight Davis, Director General of the Army Specialist Corps, relative to the possibility of members of the profession obtaining positions in that Corps. It is a little too early to give details, as the organization of the Corps is not yet complete. However, applications are being received and if a request is sent to the Personnel Division of the Army Specialist Corps, Munitions Building, Washington, D. C., a personal placement questionnaire will be sent you. We have a limited number of these questionnaires on hand and we will make them available to those who call at this office. They may be filled out in The Octagon without the necessity of going to the Munitions Building.

We believe that the exact nature of the work and purpose of the Army Specialist Corps is not clearly understood. Its primary intent is to relieve for active duty many officers and men in the Army now engaged in pursuits which are not of a military nature, strictly speaking. The size of the A.S.C. is not exactly determined and may even fluctuate from time to time. Presumably, a Commander in the field or from a corps area will call upon the A.S.C. to furnish a certain number of mechanics, entertainers, or what not. It is not believed that there will be very many construction men needed.

In filing applications for the service in this Corps, architects are urged to enumerate as many of their various qualifications that they can bring to the fore. Architects might do well to bear this general advice in mind in registering for any occasion, particularly if they are called upon to register in the new draft. There are a great many jobs to be done in this country and there is no reason why members of the profession cannot fill a fair share of them.

Violation of Priority Regulations.

Attention is called by the W.P.B. Division of Industry Operations to a violation of priority regulations committed by an architect. This architect, acting as agent for a construction company, filed application for a priority assistance under a preference rating order, stating that the proposed sale price of the dwellings he was designing was \$6,000 and that all of them were to be sold to Government employees. Subsequently, representations made by the architect were found to be mis-statements of fact. Accordingly, the War Production Board issued a suspension order providing that no applications for priority assistance filed by this architect on his own behalf or on behalf of anyone whom he may represent will be granted for the period of one year. The net effect of this suspension order will most likely result in the extinction of the practice of the architect suspended.

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.
Official Office in the State of New York, 115 E. 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

The Washington Situation

Mobilization of the Profession.

In these stirring anxious days the professional imagination manifests itself in many ways. The architect has never been known for a poverty of thought. A run of luck—a dash of adversity—immediately sets him off to embroider or ameliorate the prevailing situation. This office has been the recipient of innumerable suggestions for the utilization of architectural effort and for the correction of conditions.

A large number of the suggestions might well be included under the general classification "mobilization of the profession." We are not altogether certain that this is a proper title, for strictly speaking, mobilization means to make mobile and it is doubtful if any but a few really have the thought in mind that the architectural profession, collectively or individually, is prepared to be moved about the country at the whim of leaders other than its own, or even under its own leaders.

"Mobilization" is susceptible to many interpretations and the suggestions that have arrived at this office are as numerous as the meanings of the word. These suggestions range all the way from the call for an outright military mobilization of the profession—to setting up close-knit corporations of chapters and state associations—to taking such steps as may be necessary to make possible the general availability of the profession.

Discussing the three general types of suggestions—First, a military mobilization of the profession indicates that all members of the profession would qualify physically and that all members of the profession would unhesitatingly place themselves at the

disposition of the Government and would make themselves available for duty anywhere in the United States or in foreign parts. The exact nature of the duties has not been made clear to this office by the proponents of military mobilization.

A military mobilization of the profession raises one or two interesting points. There are just about enough architects in the United States, assuming all to be hale and hearty, and available for duty, to form one small military division. Assuming that in any military enterprise there are bound to be losses, just where do the replacements come from? What about registration laws? Would the non-registered men taken into the ranks or commissioned be *ipso facto*, eligible for license to practice at the end of the war? The foregoing is extreme, but nevertheless a point raised by the authorities as indicative of one of the innumerable phases on the question of military mobilization.

On the more serious side, it must be remembered that there is only one profession that is in any sense militarized and that is the medical profession. It is true that there is a Corps of Engineers, however, its ranks are open to many others besides members of the engineering profession. The military authorities would be hesitant to start mobilizing professions as such.

The second general classification might be termed chapter or state society corporations. There have been instances where the very laudible program has been undertaken of attempting to form all of the professional talent within a chapter or state society area into one pool properly organized and incorporated—these corporations to be placed at the

disposition of the Government with the thought that the corporation could undertake all the work within the area and that each participating member might receive a proportion of the work and profit however small. This general suggestion is worthy of a good deal of study but there are two or three possible objections that might have to be overcome in order that the scheme achieve some sort of workability. In the first place a governmental agency insists upon its own selection of the professional talent that will serve it and that will actually carry out the work. A chapter or state association corporation removes the power of selection from the governmental agency and places it in the hands of the corporation. This would probably meet with governmental objection. Secondly, many of the states have laws which preclude a corporation from performing a professional service as professional services are regarded as personal. In addition to which, it is easy to foresee that "chapter corporations" will eventually lead to a rather general formation of architectural bureaus and threaten to create a completely bureaucratic profession.

The third general classification of the mobilization might be termed "general availability". In the major sense the profession is mobilized through The Institute with its constituent chapters and affiliated state association members. The Institute has its fingers very thoroughly on the profession throughout the country and has manifested its ability to deliver when any occasion has arisen. May we cite the housing panels as one instance.

May we remark that in contradiction to the oft-repeated statement that the building industry is badly organized, that quite the reverse is true. Granting the nature of the industry itself it is extremely well organized and organized as satisfactorily as is needed. The building industry is a fluid industry. However, all of its elements—design, manufacturing and constructing—have nationwide organizations, have headquarters and representatives in Washington, are in continual communication with each other, thoroughly understand each other and could without doubt produce any sort of convention or gathering that the Government might desire within less time than it would take almost any other industry to do likewise.

Recently a Government spokesman severely criticized the organization and representation of the

building industry. When the matter was presented to the Government, it developed that the industry was satisfactorily organized not only in the eyes of the Government but in its own eyes and was prepared to immediately render whatever service or organization the Government might seek.

The question of general availability evokes three questions, the answers to which The Institute is studying at the present time.

1. What is the work that needs to be done?
2. What is the scope of the architect's ability which his talent and training could produce?
3. What is the most efficient machinery for bringing the talent and training of the architect to the service of the country?

The last question we have the answer to and we have given the answer on innumerable occasions. On the second question we feel that the profession does not know itself what it can do and has only scratched the surface of its ability. And the answer to the first question rests for the moment with the Government.

Conservation of Critical Materials.

In the last issue of THE OCTAGON there appeared a message from President Shreve on the conservation of critical materials. The importance of the thought of that message cannot be emphasized too greatly. The Institute has appointed a Committee on the Conservation of Critical Materials under the Chairmanship of Mr. H. R. Dowsell of New York, who has had years of experience in the construction field. This Committee is in effect a committee to collaborate with a similar committee appointed by The Producers' Council.

Through the efforts and under the sponsorship of these two committees it is planned to collect, digest and disseminate information that will be helpful to the profession in present-day design and will tend to offset the possibility of the rejection of plans and specifications on the grounds of misuse of critical materials. The difficulties incident to a discussion of this subject are well recognized. What is a critical material today may not be a critical material tomorrow and what is even more likely, available materials today may be extremely critical materials tomorrow and may become so without warning.

Probably for that reason the Government has not seen fit to be too definite in its recommendations other than to establish information concerning those materials which are truly critical.

In view of the handicap under which the Government found itself The Institute and The Producers' Council, collaborating with the Bureau of Industrial Conservation of the War Production Board, believe it imminently fitting that they should take some of the initiative in placing the problem before the profession and discussing it with them.

As a furthering of this general end, a series of meetings have been planned, the first one of which took place in Washington on Friday, March 27. This was a joint meeting with The Producers' Council and The American Institute of Architects and was presided over by President Shreve. The speakers at the meeting were as follows:

Lessing J. Rosenwald, Chief, Bureau of Industrial Conservation, W.P.B.

Stephen F. Voorhees, Special Advisor, Construction Branch, Production Division, W.P.B.

Col. Raymond F. Fowler, Chief, Supply Division, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army

Capt. L. B. Combs, Asst. Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks, U. S. Navy

D. W. Kimball, President, Associated General Contractors of America, Inc.

F. J. Plimpton, President, The Producers' Council, Inc.

It is expected that this meeting will be followed by a series of meetings held jointly by chapters and Producers' Council clubs.

Legislation.

There is not only one but a number of bills which if passed in their present form may have a serious effect on the architect's profits on defense contracts. The obvious injustice to a professional man—architect, engineer or lawyer—is so strong that it is doubtful if these bills, (if passed at all), will be passed in their present form. At the moment, we do not know if there is any immediate need for the profession to protest to their Congressmen on these bills. Should the occasion arise, we will notify you. However, it is suggested that before protesting the architects familiarize themselves with

the contents of the bills which are H.R. 5781, H.R. 6790 and H.R. 6792. The alarming provision in all of these bills is a clause restricting the profit of the professional man to a percentage of his costs and not to a percentage of the cost of the project.

Housing.

Herbert Emmerich, formerly with War Production Board, has been appointed Commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority. In reality Mr. Emmerich becomes the successor to Mr. Nathan Straus. This appointment has been confirmed by the Senate. It is believed that the National Housing Agency in all of its ramifications has not yet been completely reorganized and that we may look for further changes in personnel. The major key positions appear, however, to be settled and the appointments for them made. In a recent bulletin to the presidents of chapters and state associations and Regional Directors, sent out by this office, there is contained a list of the regional directors of the F.P.H.A.

A.E.M. Contract.

The approved form of the A.E.M. Contract, F. F. Form No. 6, A. & E. Construction-Management Service Contract, has been sent to this office by the War Department. Some indication of the nature of the contract has already been made clear to the presidents of the chapters and state associations in recent bulletins sent them from this office.

Briefly, the contract calls for the setting up of what might be termed a service team consisting of the architect, engineer and the general contractor. This team receives a fixed fee and works together as a unit to furnish all of the services necessary for the construction of a large Army project. The elements of service to be furnished by the architect and engineer are well understood. The element of service to be furnished by the general contractor appears at first glance to be something of an innovation. However, it can be readily recognized that the contribution of the general contractor differs in no essential from the service that he has customarily rendered on projects within the last few years. He is recognized somewhat in the light of a broker, a bookkeeper, a superintendent and the coordinator of the work in the field.

As the actual construction is all by subcontract

and as the A.E.M. principals are receiving a fixed fee, there is no indication of an architect having a contingent interest in the construction cost. The distribution of the fixed fee among the principals and their relationships to each other will probably be determined by the nature of the projects themselves. There is no indication that one of the principals is subordinate to the other. On the contrary, each renders his respective element of service which lumped together forms the services necessary for the realization of the project.

On the whole, the contract offers a very interesting method of participation for the architect and one, the effect of which, might well be far-reaching.

There has been no opportunity to obtain an expression of opinion on this contract from The Board of Directors of The Institute, however, The Institute's Consultant on Contract Procedure, Mr. William Stanley Parker, writes "It seems to me entirely fair and reasonable and an efficient method of procedure under the circumstances involved. * * * It

seems to me the contract is in excellent form and a workable document, well devised to meet the exigencies of the present situation."

The text of the contract itself indicates a program of projects of such individual immensity that it is obvious that the experience, organizations and abilities of the principals must have been considerable.

* * *

This office greatly appreciates the tenor of a recent editorial in which this office was mentioned. We fear, however, that our kind friends were a trifle too enthusiastic. We do what we can for the profession and we try to open as many doors as possible through which the architects may enter. However, it is not within our province to select architects for jobs and we wish to emphatically call to your attention that on no accord do we select or aid in the selection of architects.

EDMUND R. PURVES

Washington Representative, A.I.A.

The Seventy-fourth Annual Meeting

THIRD OFFICIAL NOTICE TO MEMBERS

THE Board of Directors at its special meeting in New York on March 19-22 inclusive, directed that the seventy-fourth convention, which will be held in Detroit, Michigan beginning June 23, be henceforth referred to as "The Annual Meeting".

The Board also directed that the annual meeting be shortened to three days, i.e. June 23, 24 and 25. June 26 which, as previously announced, would have been the closing day of the annual meeting probably will be devoted to tours and special features.

The first official notice of the seventy-fourth annual meeting was published in the January OCTAGON. The second official notice was published in the February OCTAGON and included complete information concerning:

- Election of Member Delegates
- Election of State Delegates
- Preliminary Notices Concerning Numbers of Delegates and Votes
- Offices and Directorships Becoming Vacant
- Procedure for Nominating Officers
- Procedure for Nominating Regional Directors

Nominations for offices and directorships should be filed with The Secretary not later than May 13, which is the dead line. (See Procedure for Nominating Regional Directors—page 6—Feb. OCTAGON).

The May number of THE OCTAGON will contain information concerning other meetings held in conjunction with the annual meeting, such as:

- Conference of State Associations of Architects
- Council of Architectural Registration Boards
- Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture
- The Producers Council, Inc.

L. C. Dillenback, Chairman of the National Convention Committee, and the Convention Committee of the Detroit Chapter, of which Clair W. Ditchy is chairman, are engaged in planning the program of the annual meeting and it is hoped a tentative draft of the program will be available for publication in the June OCTAGON.

Watch for the coming numbers of THE OCTAGON. They will contain many important items concerning the seventy-fourth annual meeting.

Prefabrication and the Architect—Which is the Challenger?

By ARTHUR C. HOLDEN, A.I.A.

IS THE growing business of prefabrication a new menace on the architectural horizon? Should the architect resist it? Must the profession enlist in another all-out campaign to make the public understand the value of the architect as artist? Is prefabrication a new challenge which calls for still one more attempt to stem the rising tide of commercialism?

The profession is always concerned about the attitudes which it should take. The attitudes of other men toward architects should be an object of equal concern. Architects are especially sensitive if others take a displeasing attitude toward them. They instinctively try to persuade the public to adopt the views which architects hold about themselves.

When the A.I.A. assembles for its next annual meeting in the usual garish ballroom, with its complement of committee meetings in nondescript mezzanine alcoves, no doubt the battle will be joined as to whether or not open war should be waged against the prefabricators. It probably will not occur to the architects to ask, "What sort of opinion do the prefabricators hold respecting architects?"

The writer has had some contact with the prefabricators. In association with his partner, Robert W. McLaughlin, he worked at some of the early attempts at prefabrication. As an advocate of research into all the diverse problems which affect housing, he was acquainted with the motives which prompted research in the field of prefabrication. He knows what the prefabricators are seeking, as well as some of the obstacles which they have encountered. He has had a chance to learn what the prefabricators think of architects.

Perhaps it would be well to start with a statement which is unavoidably personal. The firm of Holden, McLaughlin & Associates was not "hired" by prefabricators and thereby given a soft job doing research. No, it did not happen that way. Our firm started designing in terms of prefabrication. In 1932 Cemesto board was successfully used as an integral wall material, applied vertically between slotted steel ribs. A four-room house was erected for the Jeddo Highland Coal Co., Hazelton, Pa.,

which cost, including architect's fee, \$4,750.

It took a very short time to discover that the problem of design was tied up with the problems of shop assembly and field erection. In 1932 a few of Mr. McLaughlin's friends agreed to furnish a modest amount of capital if he would agree to take charge of the management of the company and direct its activities. It was thus that *American Houses, Inc.* was founded.

The policy of the company was founded upon the idea that design was responsible for the direction of the forces of manufacture. Design has been constantly directed so as gradually to simplify the complicated processes inherited from the past. To achieve the most desirable balance between the processes of shop fabrication and field erection, the company made three distinct shifts in the design patterns of its houses. Experience showed that facility in purchase, delivery, packing, and erection had to be considered in the selection of materials. From the original steel frame house, the pattern shifted to the house built from all wood basic parts. From the maximum of shop assembly, fabrication shifted as a result of experience to the field installation of marable finishes and details. Always, however, the paramount importance of design has guided the policies of the company.

Sceptics Oppose Innovations.

In the attempt to sell prefabrication, there have been battles with overzealous officials over the aesthetic properties of simplicity, repetition and variation, and their respective importance as elements of design. The current joke about the tipsy Philadelphia row-house dweller who couldn't distinguish his own home amid a hundred exact reproductions has had its effect upon susceptible mortgage underwriters, and made them wary of anything in the design of a neighborhood which could be dubbed with the epithet "sameness."

The prefabricators have come up against these problems in the natural course of their work. They have been astonished to find that most architects, especially architects in official jobs, have had far less interest in what the public wants and why, than

in what architects want the public to have. This has not been conducive to winning the sympathy of the public!

The public may have been slow to realize that a design of great beauty can be achieved by the grouping and harmonious arrangement of a single basic element. The citing of the achievements of the mediaeval mosaic workers has not always been a happy parallel. Though the neighborhood may be conceived to be a mosaic in which houses are the important element of the design, nevertheless, due to the small scale of the human being, this design must achieve its harmony without dependence upon an airplane view. Group planning must not be abstract. It is only necessary to recognize the house as a unit in a neighborhood composition. Harmony in the group design is evidence that the solution of human living problems has been achieved. Beauty of composition is best achieved through the harmonious grouping of harmonious units.

Quantity Production in Housing.

With the advent of quantity orders, opportunities have also been given to improve the organization of production. All of the prefabricating companies have been able to increase their staffs; to put specially trained production specialists into their shops and into their purchasing and distributing departments. The architect leadership has been given new contacts and new opportunities for improving the product, and has meanwhile been prepared for this by the business experience gained in the experimental period.

With quantity production, however, it is not only the architects who are working directly at prefabrication, but all architects, who are offered new opportunities. The range of design has been greatly extended. It is no longer necessary for the individual practicing architect to put on horse blinders to shut out the disharmony of the surrounding neighborhood, while he lavishes his ingenuity on the over-embellishment of one single house. The house now becomes a unit in the neighborhood pattern and it is essential that its beauty be of a type which harmonizes with and enhances the beauty of its neighbors, rather than of a type to rival them for attention.

To put it mildly, the prefabricators have been disappointed that so few architects have grasped the opportunities that are offered to them. Perhaps the

explanation lies in the architect's conception of his own job. To those architects who consider it their job to utilize every available facility to produce a better house, prefabrication offers no terrors. Such architects will seize upon prefabrication to find out what use they can make of it. To those architects, however, who consider that the making of drawings ought to be a monopoly to be enjoyed as the private prerogative of the architect, the growth of prefabrication appears to offer a threat to their livelihood.

The Pencil Not the Sole Means of Expression.

Prefabrication reduces the necessary drawings to the terms of an erection schedule. Prefabrication has posed some very pertinent questions as to the function of the architect's pencil. Perhaps there is some truth in the charge that the architect, by increasing his proficiency with his pencil, has made himself a slave to his pencil. The clever draftsman has been able to make his picture, and then sit back and challenge the builder to imitate the drawing in solid materials. Some of the excrescences and excesses which "adorned" the main street facades of ten and twenty years ago are today embarrassing testimony of the influence of the lead pencil upon wood, stone and terra cotta.

In contrast, the architect who designs in prefabricated forms must think in terms of the units of materials of which his design is composed. He must, in his mind's eye, be able to fit these units together just as the child learns to fit together building blocks, or the units of a "mechano set." This is creative vital work. To many architects it may mean re-learning the art of design. It may mean putting the art of creative building above the art of creative sketching.

The emphasis of structure rather than aspect goes back to sound tradition. The early colonial builders of New England laid out the buildings framed in oak posts, girders and beams. The sizes of the timber available and the practical spans determined the box-like character of the buildings. But what a wealth of finesse and variety was achieved within the limits of the squared rectangular frame. When power cutting machinery came into use, and the new type of stud and joist construction became a possibility, so great was the flexibility of the design that drawings became a greater necessity. Finally, the jig saw and turning lathe became the slave of the man with the pencil.

Ingenuity Unbridled in Victorian Times.

Between 1870 and 1890 American "cottage" or domestic architecture underwent a revolution. The architects of that day were called on to draw plans and they drew not only plans but elevation, which, through the ingenuity of carpenter builders, were actually built not only once but many times. The magazines of the day regularly published new ideas for "designs." "Popular designs" were collected in books and circulated in the rapidly growing cities of that period. America owes its embarrassing Victorian domestic hodgepodge to those architect makers of these drawings, who, little as they knew about beauty in drawings, knew infinitely less about the art of building. These men were called upon to put new materials together in new ways which they didn't understand. They knew nothing of those basic elements of building which make for beauty and utility.

The architect of the last twenty or twenty-five years has made marvelous strides in the design of small domestic buildings. Where he can be director or master builder, he handles the individual job well. Where he is asked merely to use his pencil to make pictures to be imitated in building materials, the results are sometimes fully as deplorable as were the errors of Victorian days.

Too few architects are asked today to work out a design for a neighborhood or a street. Too many architects are still being asked to submit half a dozen or more designs of houses so that when these are used, all the houses on the street will not look alike. In some of our larger projects today, mortgage underwriters are laying down rules that no design may be repeated more than a specified number of times. This shows almost a complete misunderstanding of the problem. An imaginative and well trained architect could take a design for a single house and by varying its placement and grouping could work out a scheme for a neighborhood far surpassing in beauty, practicality, and economy, a scheme where money had been unintelligently wasted merely in the attempt to make each individual house look different. Ask an untrained man to take the lumps out of a sugar bowl and arrange these as if he were working out a community design. Ask a trained architect or a man of genius to do the same thing, and note the different result. No better test can be suggested.

Prefabrication an Opportunity for the Real Designer.

Give a real architect an understanding of what prefabrication means and he will grasp the opportunity and deftly apply the new technique which is placed at his disposal. He will accept the fabricated chassis; he will put emphasis upon the setting and the variation in detail, texture, and color which he can give to it.

What the prefabricators want to know is why more architects have not come forward with eagerness to grasp the opportunity before them, and to play their part in developing an improved technique.

It has been the writer's privilege to meet many architects on the occasion of their first introduction to prefabricated methods. By some he has been lectured about the impossibility of getting anywhere that way, the failure to effect adequate savings, the costs of distribution, and the great difficulties involved. By others, he has been viewed with suspicion, lest in remaking drawings to conform to the prefabricated system of modules, the spirit of the design might be destroyed. Again he has found architects who were eager to find out how far the technique of prefabrication had been advanced and how they might become conversant with the progress already made. He has found architects who were ready to throw away their pencils and design in three dimensional models. He has found that such men were not only quick to realize the advantages of the new approach but were eager to join the campaign to break down many of the old prejudices and prerogatives which retarded progress.

It is architects of this type that the prefabricators are eagerly seeking. The prefabricators look upon open-minded architects as their strongest allies in the movement to get rid of mystery and red tape in the building industry. It is these architects whom the public will single out for reward, for the public will be the ultimate beneficiary. Let it be remembered that the public cares nothing about the prerogatives of making drawings. The public wants an increasingly better product for less money. The public will follow those who lead in this direction. Architects have a great part to play in the shaping of the future. To grasp the opportunity, architects must do more than talk at the prefabricators. They must come into tangible contact with the work under way, and be ready to shape their methods to give the public improved service.

Onward Architects!

By JOSEPH E. SMAY, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON MEMBERSHIP

THE American Institute of Architects should be the one organization that represents the entire architectural profession. How can this be accomplished when only about one-fifth of the practitioners are now members of The Institute?

The most obvious method is to interest the profession in going forward by unified effort. To do this we must face two issues. On one hand we find, on the part of some Institute members, a hesitancy to enlarge the membership. On the other hand many practitioners outside The Institute display an indifference toward accepting their responsibilities towards advancement of the profession. Professional antagonism and jealousy complicate these problems. The practice of architecture *can* and *must* go forward. It can do so only by the coordinated effort of the entire profession.

One of the first questions that comes to mind regarding the enlarged character of The Institute is: what shall we do with the unqualified and unethical practitioner? Why should such an individual be allowed to become a member of *any* architectural or professional organization? In fact, why should he be allowed to practice architecture at all? If he continues in practice because limitations of his State licensing laws do not permit revocation of his license, why should other members of the profession recognize him? Such recognition is implied if he belongs to professional organizations.

What are the qualifications for membership in The American Institute of Architects?

They are clearly set forth at another point in this article. That is, *as far as The Institute Board is concerned*. In recognition of autonomy of chapters there is a great variation of these requirements. But these further restrictions are chapter matters that can only be revised by chapter action. As long as some chapters prefer to keep their membership definitely very selective there is nothing that can be done in those chapters' territories. It can only be hoped that those chapters will consider the welfare of the entire profession above local interests.

In practically every instance where an increase in membership has been made, it has been stimulated by progressive-minded chapter officers. Stagnation of

membership often means stagnation of chapter activities. Where such inactivity exists there is a trend on the part of some members to drop their memberships. The only answer is active and aggressive leadership in the chapters.

The ratio of Institute members to the total number of registered architects in the various states varies from 10 per cent to 86 percent. Should we be led to infer that, where membership is low, the qualifications of the practitioners are poorer than where that ratio is high? Such an inference is unjustified. Should a chapter consider that, because its ratio is high, that it has done the utmost? Not unless all qualified architects are Institute members.

Some chapters have sought refuge in the pretext that *now* is a poor time to do anything about increasing membership. This is *not* the time for selfish interests. Now is certainly the time to march forward with unified step. It can be done.

If you question that it *can be done*, look at the list of newly elected corporate members, on page 7 of your February issue of THE OCTAGON, and see what an increase has resulted from active leadership, especially on the part of one regional director. His personal effort and self-sacrifice should prove an inspiration to every member of The Institute.

Some ask, "What has The Institute done for me?"

That is not a fair question and in your hearts you know it. It is not right that many of you, who have never contributed a single solitary effort, should condemn an organization in which you have not shown sufficient interest to make it better. Without the leadership of The Institute, without its efforts and accomplishments, the entire profession long ago would have been completely disorganized and demoralized.

Services of such men as the officers, directors, committeemen and many other members of The Institute who are constantly making sacrifices of time and money, could not be purchased for many times the amount of Institute dues.

The Institute has not been selfish in its attitude. It works for the entire profession. Then why should not the entire profession support it?

The Institute has an ambitious program that can

only be realized by increased finances. This does not mean higher dues; but it does mean more members. We already enjoy the excellent and capable services of an efficient staff in Washington. Also Ned Purves, Washington Representative, is very much on the job and most of us know of the greater recognition of the profession which has resulted from his efforts. You want The Institute to maintain its national program, and the solidarity of the profession, regardless of war and the effects of war. Then get behind that program with loyal and enthusiastic support. Increased membership will be inevitable. Just give the rest of the profession an opportunity to help support *your* Institute.

For the general information of every member there is printed below "Essential Steps in Applying for Corporate Membership in The Institute." The Institute does not make membership applications difficult. Too often the chapter does. Too

often, by unjust and personal refusals, there is built up a barrier between professional men that is almost impossible to overcome. It has been found good policy to circularize a prospective membership list to chapter members *before* individuals are asked to join, thus saving face for sponsor and applicant alike.

Success in a membership campaign can be accomplished effectively only by *personal contact*. Let each Institute member distinguish clearly between ethical and personal criticisms and dislikes. The latter have no place and deserve no consideration in Institute affairs. After your candidate has been approved by your chapter, tell him about The Institute. Tell him what it has done and is trying to do. Convince him that when he helps The Institute he helps himself and his profession.

Onward Architects! Let us go forward shoulder to shoulder in 1942 with the slogan "Every qualified architect a member of The Institute".

ESSENTIAL STEPS IN APPLYING FOR CORPORATE MEMBERSHIP IN THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

1. Obtain an application for corporate membership and execute same in duplicate (white copy and grey copy).

2. Have both copies signed by two proposers who are corporate members of The Institute in good standing.

3. File the duplicate (grey copy) with the secretary of the *chapter of your choice within the state* in which you reside or maintain your place of business, obtaining the secretary's receipt therefor.

4. Send the original of the application (white copy), together with the secretary's receipt for the grey copy, and check for \$10.00 (\$15.00 after June 30) to The Secretary of The Institute at Washington. If you are not a registered architect nor do not hold a certificate from the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, you may be required to send photographs of executed work and other supporting data. If your election is favorably recommended by the chapter the submission of photographs will not be required.

5. The Secretary's office will proceed from that point, corresponding with state registration boards,

endorsers, chapter secretaries, etc., and put the application before The Board of Examiners.

6. You will be informed of the action of The Board of Directors as soon as possible after the meeting of The Board of Examiners which occurs on the Tuesday following the first Monday of each month.

Explanatory

A new applicant will send with his application his check in the amount of \$10.00, which represents the admission fee of \$5.00 and \$5.00 for the first year's dues in advance. (After June 30, 1942, dues for the first twelve months will be \$10.00. See notice on page 12.)

In the case of application for associateship and junior and student associateship, the applicant deals directly with the secretary of the chapter, following the instructions printed on the application blank. These classes of membership are entirely a chapter matter and do not come before The Institute in any way other than that the names of associates and other statistics are included in the chapter's annual report to The Institute.

Results of the Insurance Questionnaire

LAST November a questionnaire was distributed to about one in every six members of The Institute, in an effort to find out whether and to what extent the new form of fire insurance on buildings in course of construction was known about and used. The new form referred to in the Questionnaire as "Full Cover Builder's Risk Form" is now referred to by the insurance companies as "Builder's Risk—Completed Value" form.

Out of 500 questionnaires 140 were returned. Five were non-committal. The others were about evenly divided between *yes* and *no*. According to Institute Districts, the results appear as follows, "yes" meaning that the new form was customarily used; "no" meaning that the architect did not use it because he lacked knowledge of its existence:

| | Yes | No |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| New England | 7 | 10 |
| New York | 9 | 13 |
| Great Lakes | 8 | 13 |
| Illinois—Wisconsin | 3 | 4 |
| Central States | 3 | 3 |
| Western Mountain | 7 | 1 |
| Sierra Nevada | 5 | 7 |
| Gulf States | 9 | 7 |
| South Atlantic | 4 | 0 |
| Middle Atlantic | 13 | 9 |
| | <u>68</u> | <u>67</u> |

From this result The Middle Atlantic, South Atlantic, Gulf States, and Western Mountain Districts lead in having a majority of those who answered conversant with and customary users of the new form. The negative answers are a measure of the problem that has always faced The Institute, as it has all other organizations, of getting its information across to its members.

From New York one architect wrote, "The Completed Value Form is almost universally used for this kind of work as the coverage is complete and it saves an immense amount of detail work."

From the Underwriters, also, word is received that the new form is now looked upon very favorably and they feel that the insurance companies were unduly conservative in not having issued such a form earlier.

Those architects who are not familiar with the new form can obtain full information from their local insurance agent. The form applies to all structures other than residences. It saves the architect time and responsibility connected with the monthly reports. It gives the owner and the contractors assurance that the work is at all times completely covered. It is the safest procedure.

WILLIAM STANLEY PARKER, *Chairman,*
Committee on Contract Documents

Increase in Dues of New Members—Notice

NOTICE TO CHAPTERS, MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEES AND ALL CORPORATE MEMBERS OF THE INSTITUTE:

On and after July 1, 1942, the dues of newly admitted members will be increased from \$5.00 to \$10.00 for the first year of membership.

Until July 1, 1942, the present dues of \$5.00 for the first year of membership will continue in effect.

This change does not become effective until the close of business on June 30, 1942, thus giving ample time for chapters and membership committees to bring in those prospective members whose names are now under consideration.

This increase of \$5.00 in the annual dues of new members was ordered by The Board of Directors at its recent March meeting. The Board took this action with reluctance. It had to be taken be-

cause The Institute, like the architect in private practice, is faced with a serious financial problem. Under present circumstances it cannot continue to accept new members at an admission fee of \$5.00, and dues of \$5.00 for twelve months of membership.

There will be no change in the present procedure under which the dues of newly admitted members are increased by \$5.00 for each succeeding year until the present annual dues of \$20.00 are reached.

By leaving the admission fee at \$5.00 and raising the dues for the first year of membership to \$10.00, The Board places upon new members part of the obligation borne by all corporate members whose dues support The American Institute of Architects through the adverse conditions of war.

CHARLES T. INGHAM
Secretary

At-
cts
ed
ew
he
it
on

m-
or
it

ed
or-
ies
ch

he
cir
ill
ni-
he
n-
n-

its

te
n.
to
0,
r-

re
rs
ar
d.
ng
0,
he
se
ts

ry