IT IS easy to look back six months or a year and see very clearly where we have made mistakes, or have failed to make the most of opportunities that were present at that time. It is not always so easy to size up the situation existing at any given moment and do, right then, those things which will contribute most to our future well-being and prosperity.

The entire building industry of the United States is extremely active and prosperous. Architects' offices in most sections are handling a large volume of work; employment is at the highest point we have ever known it to be at the best average wages. No competent draftsman today need be out of employment.

It is human nature, nothing more or less, to take the future for granted when the present is highly satisfactory. Without in the least sounding a note either of pessimism or warning, we would bring it home to the drafting fraternity generally that things may not always be quite so rushed and rosy as they are at the moment, and suggest to each man to take a little peek ahead and adopt a definite program calculated to improve his position with respect to the profession of which he is a factor and insure to himself, so far as may be possible, continued satisfactory employment.

The one true answer is constant self-improvement. We do not mean by this that every man, even in the practice of architecture, gets just exactly what he wants. When associates are being taken into firms the principals very naturally offer the first opportunities which will contribute most to their present opportunity to develop their talents so that they may become increasingly valuable to their present employers or to someone else. When taking it by and large, the man who is really advanced usually has something which justifies his choice for greater responsibility. He may not be a better draftsman than the one who is preferred but may fall down in one or more of the other qualifications, all of which have a bearing on the matter.

The great present-day opportunity of the draftsman, as we see it, is three-fold, or rather branches three ways, and these should all be carefully studied with the circumstances, qualifications and ambitions of each individual mind. Some men contemplate opening offices of their own and to such, if they are qualified, we recommend that now is the time to consider this move. Others may have as their ultimate goal an association or partnership with the firm with which they are now connected. To them we recommend the most careful application to their work, never missing an opportunity to advance the interests of their firm in every possible way. Still others of the drafting room force who, because they are not good business getters or executives, may never consider it advisable or possible to start for themselves should, nevertheless, take full advantage of the present opportunity to develop their talents so that they may become increasingly valuable to their present employers or to someone else. We notice a tendency on the part of many men to let down in the matter of study in good times. No man who takes himself seriously can afford to do this. And no man can go far in our profession, or in any other, unless he does take himself seriously. The architectural magazines, all of them, should be carefully read and read regularly. The few hours each month necessary to digest these publications carefully should be laid aside as a primary duty. Good books, which can be found either in the architect's library or in the Public Library, should be studied. It is a mistake for any ambitious man to permit himself to get into a rut. Possibly his present duties are more or less circumscribed. If that is the case, and in these days of specialization it is frequently the case, a man should make an extra effort to keep up with those branches with which he does not come in contact as a part of his job, but a full knowledge of which is so essential in equipping an individual to grasp a larger opportunity, which may be offered to him tomorrow or three months hence.

Maybe this sounds like a sermon, and maybe it is, but if so it is a sermon taken from the book of experience. We have been watching the things of which we are writing for a good many years. We have seen successes and failures—and those in between. Success, in a majority of cases, comes to the clear-thinking man who analyzes his problem, sizes up his abilities and limitations and strives for a definite goal.
Water Color Drawing by Edward H. Bennett. Roman Forum—
Temple of Antoninus and Faustina.
EDWARD H. BENNETT was born in a country where the English language is spoken and, being burdened with an English private school and technical college training, was brought into these United States and became a citizen before the "quota" was invented or the language of the Port of New York had gone so far towards becoming that recorded as having been inflicted, originally, upon the workers on the Tower of Babel. Under the examinations now held in those tongues, he might still have been a "furriner." Whether the circumstance was fortunate for him, or only for those of our citizens who welcome into this country every trained mind and energetic worker with artistic capabilities, would seem to be answered by his distinguished success as a consulting architect specializing in city planning.

His father had intended that young Bennett should become a rancher and took him to California; but his own inclinations led him to take up drawing at night and spend a great deal of time sketching in water-colors around San Francisco Bay. He worked for some time in architects' offices in the metropolis of the coast, and fell in with a coterie of young students who met at the home of Mr. Bernard R. Maybeck, a Beaux-Arts trained architect (whose admirable work, by the way, is not as well known as it should be), who instructed an informal class at his home in Berkeley, and whose influence caused young Bennett to decide to aim for a Paris training.

Bennett went to Paris about 1895, passed the examinations for entrance to the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and followed its courses until 1902, when he received the diploma of the French Government.

During the period of the course at the Ecole, he spent some time in England in architects' offices, made a number of tours in France and in Italy, and finally a trip to Greece and Turkey. The drawings of the porches of Chartres Cathedral, reproduced on page 50, were prepared partly for the archaeological course in the Ecole des Beaux Arts and partly for the Pugin scholarship of the Royal Institute of British Architects. He received a medal in the competition for this scholarship. He made also a number of color renderings of enamels, mosaics, etc., in competition for the Owen Jones scholarship of the R.I.B.A., which he won in 1901.

In the late '90's, Mr. Bennett became convinced that he had devoted too much time to water coloring and practically abandoned that work, as well as color rendering, and concentrated on architectural composition,—line and mass. Looking back, he says he cannot but be struck by the great necessity for wise general counsel in a young man's course of study and that an architect's study in color should be pointed not toward the pictorial, but in the direction of decoration and decorative values of building materials and the production of fine effects. It would be better, he thinks, to record this information mostly in rendered drawings. His observations are parallel with those of other men, who, having made a remarkable success of a given kind of work, feel that they might better have employed their time at something else. It was his water color sketching that led him to the study of the decorative value of color and to a great deal of his early success as a student.

When he returned to the United States, he worked for a time for Mr. George B. Post, being put up hospitably by Joseph Howland Hunt. Warm ties were formed in New York and the associations made in the office of Colonel Post and his sons, William and Otis, were left regretfully to join the powerful Burnham in Chicago. This came about largely by contact formed with Peirce Anderson, an intimate friend during the days at the Ecole, who had become designer with D. H. Burnham.

Bennett was first employed to take charge of the Burnham design in the West Point competition, after which he returned to New York, only to be again invited to Chicago to study the playground parks for the South Park system in Chicago with Mr. Burnham. He then became assistant to Mr. Burnham on the plan for the City of San Francisco (Continued on Page 49).
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and finally, as associate with Mr. Burnham, on the plan of Chicago in 1906-1908. Since the completion of the great plan for Chicago, Mr. Bennett has devoted his time to the practice of city planning and has developed plans for many of the larger cities of the United States, and one, at least, (Ottawa) in Canada. They have all been designed on definitely architectural city planning lines, with the conviction that the great force and influence of the Burnham-McKim-Olmsted plan of Washington and the plans of San Francisco and Chicago lay in their architectural composition and design. A conviction founded on incontestible fact, and, it may be added, understood by the layman only through the effective presentation of the architects’ ideas by means of their especial conventions, rendered plans and perspectives. By such means the American public has come rapidly to the understanding of city planning as the legitimate field of the designer with an architectural, rather than an engineering, training. The essential difference in the fitness of the professions, lies in the fact that architects are trained to plan in a broad, general, and monumental sense, while engineering training is rather in the details of the services of the plan.

The branch of architectural work known as “city planning,” but including in its details any grouping of structures and open places (parks, boulevards, arrangement of streets, etc.) on lines of beauty with due consideration of physical, social and economic conditions, is now engaging the principal attention of many of the more advanced and best-trained architects throughout the world.

The attendance at the recent National Conference on City Planning included a hardly less distinguished body of planners than the convention of the American Institute of Architects. That the gatherings were held in New York at the same time doubtless added to the attractiveness of each. At the exhibitions of the Architectural League of New York and of the T-Square Club of Philadelphia an unusual number of city improvement plans were shown, while the architectural character and interest of the designs made many problems in city development clear to laymen to whom all engineering designs are “Greek”. The exhibits of maps produced by aerial photography produced surprise in many amateurs by reason of their remarkable resemblance to the Beaux-Arts type of rendered plans. A comparison of a French drawing made in accordance with the conventions of the Ecole could be distinguished only by close examination from an aerial photograph of the same group of buildings. By means of the photographs public interest has been drawn to the meanings of the conventions of architectural drawings of plans: just as the ordinary snap-shot has made known to the general public the difference between the “English” and “Colonial” styles of residential architecture. It has not gone far yet, in either direction, but the roots have taken hold and the plants will flourish. The field of opportunity for the architect of ideas to (Cont. on Page 56)
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utilize all that he has of imagination, training and skill in the presentation and production of those ideas has broadened again into another field of its own estate—so long held at such great cost to the public by the city and state "engineers." Yet observations and records prove that wherever a city has developed in the beautiful, orderly and efficient senses it has been due to architectural planning.

It is, perhaps, doubly interesting that a leader in such planning should have commenced his training as a water-colorist and gone on from that stage to a student of decoration before finally directing his attention to the planning which involves "heavy engineering".

Upon the point this observation brings up—the question of whether engineering or artistic training best fits a man for the big problems in life—I am reminded of the assertions made by the late Sir William Van Horne (builder and former president and chairman of the Canadian Pacific) in discussing the building of a great pulp and paper plant and railway. He said that he "would rather have one Stanford White than a dozen such chief engineers as so-and-so, because the artist sees any part of the earth's surface as a plane with a bump in it that is easy to get around or through, while the engineer sees bumps in every vacant lot that are insurmountable difficulties to him."

Mr. Bennett has been consultant on city planning to the Chicago Plan Commission since 1909, involving direction of design of the public improvements projected and carried to execution. These include: the Michigan Avenue project, architectural approaches and bridge, bridge houses, and abutments; South Water Street double level river embankment project; Ogden Avenue; and the great Railway Terminal projects that concern the city development; and numerous bridges, also the entire Lake Front project.

He planned military training camps of Camp Grant, Rockford, Ill., and Camp Knox, Stithton, Ky., after the entry of the United States into the World War. He also organized and is a member of the firm of Bennett, Parsons and Frost, city planners, Chicago.

FRANCIS S. SWALES.

Drawing by Edward H. Bennett. Entrance to Orangerie, Twelve-hour Esquisse, Ecole des Beaux Arts.
LITHOGRAPH BY JOHN RICHARD ROWE
PROVINS.
On the other side of this sheet is reproduced one of many interesting lithographs made by John Richard Rowe as a result of his travels abroad. This, like the lithographs by Mr. Rowe which have been published in Pencil Points from time to time during the past year or so, shows an excellent technique and an unusually good appreciation of the character of the architectural subject rendered. Mr. Rowe has been a student at the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris, in the Atelier Gromort and in the Atelier Laloux. He exhibited in the Autumn Salon in Paris, 1922, and at various art galleries in this country, including the Toledo Art Gallery and the Albright Art Gallery in Buffalo.
PASTEL BY TROY KINNEY
"THE WARRIOR DANCE," LAURENT NOVIKOFF.

Courtesy of Kennedy & Co.
An action study that is of great value to the student in addition to being a good picture is the pastel, "The Warrior Dance," reproduced on the other side of this sheet. Here, Laurent Novikoff, the famous Russian dancer, is shown in a movement of one of the barbaric dances that form so important a feature of the work of the Ballet Russe. The action has been recorded with remarkable skill. This is due very largely to Mr. Kinney's practice of making many rapid sketches of a single subject in progressive stages of the movement so that when he draws a pastel or makes an etching his knowledge of the complete movement enables him to give an extraordinary degree of life to the action. It is interesting to note that in making this kind of a sketch Mr. Kinney frequently sits among the audience and draws on a small pad of paper lighted with a little electric flash light shaded by his hand.
DRAWING BY WALTER B. CHAMBERS
MT. ST. MICHEL.
The sketch reproduced on the other side of this sheet is one of the large number of sketches made by Walter B. Chambers on one of his early trips to Europe. It shows an unusual delicacy of treatment and command of technique. Other sketches by Mr. Chambers have appeared in earlier issues of Pencil Points and we have been so fortunate as to secure several others which will appear in future issues.
DRAWING BY OTTO F. LANGMANN
THE OELRICHS HOUSE, NEW YORK.
The drawing of the Oelrichs House, Fifth Avenue, New York, by Otto F. Langmann, reproduced on the other side of this sheet, has an unusually attractive tonal quality due to the fact that it is drawn on a Chinese paper of silky fibrous texture and rich buff color. The work in soft velvety black pencil strokes has an ease and freedom in keeping with the character of the paper.
A Six Room Suburban House

REPORT OF THE JURY OF AWARD OF THE NINTH ANNUAL COMPETITION CONDUCTED BY THE WHITE PINE SERIES OF ARCHITECTURAL MONOGRAPHS

RUSSELL F. WHITEHEAD, Professional Adviser
Judged at Yuma Farms, Naposoch, New York, June 15, 14 and 15, 1925.

As it happened, one or two of the Jury at first felt that the competition had not brought forth any one design that was obviously superior to all of its competitors. In a number of cases it was possible unanimously to agree that a certain competitor had achieved an unusually successful and compact plan, or another had developed an undoubtedly interesting and workable plan; but it did not at first appear that any of the designs which attracted attention, either from superior plan arrangement or architectural treatment, had been completely developed by the competitor to a point where, from both points of view, his design was undoubtedly of the first place. At one period of the discussion it almost began to appear that the Jury felt disinclined to award any one design the first prize; while at the same time it became apparent that, with a first prize design not at first apparent that any of the designs which attracted attention, either from superior plan arrangement or architectural treatment, had been completely developed by the competitor to a point where, from both points of view, his design was undoubtedly of the first place. At one period of the discussion it almost began to appear that the Jury felt disinclined to award any one design the first prize; while at the same time it became apparent that, with a first prize design not at first appeared to the Jury, inevitably and logically a first prize design; upon which they shortly came to unanimous agreement, and which they hope all those who have made a careful study of the competition program—whether or not they finally submitted drawings—will, after mature consideration, also be willing to accept as best worthy of that position.

To summarize, the program stipulates that consideration be given to the following points, in the order named: First, excellence and ingenuity of the plan; second, the architectural merit of the design and its fitness in expressing the material—wood—of which the house was to be built; third, the practicality of its construction; fourth, the appropriateness of the design to the given site.

Of these four the first two are obviously of major importance. The appropriateness of the design to the site was evidently a consideration not thoroughly understood by most of the designers,—and at first sight may not appear of great importance to the result. If the reader of the program in the manner indicated this merely to refer to the natural aspect of the site, it had not much importance; because the lot was there described as level, without any markedly unusual physical characteristics, and all the competitors were able to make different treatments of facing the house upon either the south or north side of the street. It was interesting to note that by far the greater majority chose to face their house to the north rather than to the south. The important, and perhaps not at first ob-

PROBLEM: Mandatory. The design of a useful, substantial and attractive six-room suburban house, not over 24,000 cubic feet in size, to be built of wood. The site is a rectangular lot with a frontage on the highway of approximately 160 feet (150 ft. unobstructed), and a depth of 200 feet (150 ft. unobstructed); a highway runs east and west. It is assumed that the adjacent lots are of similar dimensions and that the local restriction preventing building near the front from the highway property line and that no building may be placed directly on either the east or west lot line.

The house is for a small family in moderate circumstances where the expenditure of every dollar is to be made carefully considered, and is to be compartmented without servants. It shall contain a living room, dining room, bathroom, entrance into hall, vestibule or living room, kitchen, two-fixture lavatory, three bedrooms, one bathroom, an entrance porch, a hall, a closet, a storage closet, and a separate service entry. There shall be one closet for each bedroom, a linen closet and a coat closet. No bedroom can be smaller than 80 square feet in area.

The architectural style is optional, originality and variation of treatment from the traditional, which is sound architecture and shows a proper regard for the realities of a wood-built house will be welcomed. The designer may select any section of the United States for the location of the house. The territory chosen shall be plainly marked on the drawings.

Due consideration should be given to the lengths and widths of lumber used for floor joists, studs and siding with a realization of those points where the price increases out of due proportion with the increased length and width required. A similar kind of treatment as to the dimensions of doors, windows and glass areas.

COMPUTATION OF CUBIC CONTENTS: Measurements must be taken from the outside face of exterior walls and from the level of the cellular floor in all parts excavated or from the bottom of floor beams in any unexcavated portion. “Average” shall be a point at a distance from the top of the wall plate to the top of the ridge. Open porches are to be figured at one-fourth the total gross cubic if to be measured from the finished grade. One-story wings or bays or enclosed sleeping porches two stories high shall be figured at their actual cubic, measurements taken as stated above.

All cubic figures will be carefully checked by a representative of Mr. Whitehead before designs are submitted to the Jury. Designs exceeding 24,000 cubic feet will not be considered.

THE nearly three hundred drawings received in The White Pine Series Competition for a Six Room Suburban House presented a number of interesting and somewhat unusual problems to the members comprising the Jury of Award, when they met to judge the competition on June 13, 14 and 15, 1925, at the invitation of the Professional Adviser. In the first place, the Jury felt that the increase in the amount of the awards offered for this competition rendered it especially desirable that the most careful consideration be given, not only to the designs submitted, but also to the requirements of the competition program, and the extent to which the competitors had studied and perfected their designs in accordance with a fair interpretation of these requirements. A similar kind of treatment as to the dimensions of doors, windows and glass areas. The result of this threatened impasse was to send the Jury once more to a study of the entire group of plans submitted, and cause them to make—for their own consideration in awarding judgment—a new and stricter analysis of the competition program. The result of that analysis brought out, as it often does to the Jury, inevitably and logically a first prize design; upon which they shortly came to unanimous agreement, and which they hope all those who have made a careful study of the competition program—whether or not they finally submitted drawings—will, after mature consideration, also be willing to accept as best worthy of that position.

To summarize, the program stipulates that consideration be given to the following points, in the order named: First, excellence and ingenuity of the plan; second, the architectural merit of the design and its fitness in expressing the material—wood—of which the house was to be built; third, the practicality of its construction; fourth, the appropriateness of the design to the given site. Of these four the first two are obviously of major importance. The appropriateness of the design to the site was evidently a consideration not thoroughly understood by most of the designers,—and at first sight may not appear of great importance to the result. If the reader of the program in the manner indicated this merely to refer to the natural aspect of the site, it had not much importance; because the lot was there described as level, without any markedly unusual physical characteristics, and all the competitors were able to make different treatments of facing the house upon either the south or north side of the street. It was interesting to note that by far the greater majority chose to face their house to the north rather than to the south. The important, and perhaps not at first ob-
For instance, even a 30 foot house, placed upon a 50 foot lot, would be no more than 20 feet away from its neighbors on both sides. This 10 foot set-back from the lot line was further agreed that, where the program had so prescribed. By this means did they finally commit, that one which best took advantage of the limits up on this as the best type of solution for the problem; and any other analysis of the plans, along the lines indicated, the owners must inevitably in the long run remain the most satisfactory type of dwelling in a closely built-up rural or suburban community of the type we have been dealing with the problem of. But when it came to the plan of a 50 foot lot, making no more use than was absolutely essential of the two east and west elevations—practically only for air or sunshine—would make a more convenient and comfortable dwelling than a house crowding closer upon the lot line, and therefore closer to the next neighboring dwellings—and depending to any great extent upon the outlook upon either side.

For instance, even a 30 foot house, placed upon a 50 foot lot, would be no more than 20 feet away from its neighbors on both sides. This 10 foot set-back from the lot line was further agreed that, wherever the program had so prescribed. By this means did they finally commit, that one which best took advantage of the limits in making this their selection. To give as much of the major portion of his lot, with this accompanying sunlight, he would come most to depend upon the rear or southern part of his property; leaving the street frontage, with its possible undesirable noise and dust, and depending upon another sunlight,—the less occupied or less used portion of his property.

After some argument, the judges came to entire agreement upon this as the best type of solution for the problem; and any other analysis of the plans, along the lines indicated, they believe would substantiate their judgment in making this their selection. To give as much of the major portion of his lot, with this accompanying sunlight, he would come most to depend upon the rear or southern part of his property; leaving the street frontage, with its possible undesirable noise and dust, and depending upon another sunlight,—the less occupied or less used portion of his property.

After some argument, the judges came to entire agreement upon this as the best type of solution for the problem; and any other analysis of the plans, along the lines indicated, they believe would substantiate their judgment in making this their selection. To give as much of the major portion of his lot, with this accompanying sunlight, he would come most to depend upon the rear or southern part of his property; leaving the street frontage, with its possible undesirable noise and dust, and depending upon another sunlight,—the less occupied or less used portion of his property.

After some argument, the judges came to entire agreement upon this as the best type of solution for the problem; and any other analysis of the plans, along the lines indicated, they believe would substantiate their judgment in making this their selection. To give as much of the major portion of his lot, with this accompanying sunlight, he would come most to depend upon the rear or southern part of his property; leaving the street frontage, with its possible undesirable noise and dust, and depending upon another sunlight,—the less occupied or less used portion of his property.
general criticisms upon the drawings as a whole. While many—in fact, most—of the designs, maintained a high standard of excellence (the present competition being, in the opinion of those who have had the opportunity of keeping track of these competitions for several years, a marked advance in this respect)—it never developed that a marked lack of originality in design was in evidence in the drawings that the Jury were considering. All of the competitors had adopted, as the basis of their designs, the conventional solutions of the problem; whereas it was the intention of those connected with these competitions to endeavor to obtain a higher standard of design than it is usual to find in the ordinary type of American suburban development.

Many of the contestants had looked no higher than the average type of house they could find about them. Others had gone back to the colonial cottage for the inspiration of their architecture and the plan of the building; and, again, in this group, a lack of real understanding of the originals of our colonial architecture developed; and the designers of this type seemed mostly to claim a commonplace conventionality of a small house construction.—far more than is usually the case—that many designs, afterwards discovered as having been submitted by western or middle western contestants, had been based closely upon the study of the later architecture of our eastern colonies,—among which any local regional grading of the designs was to be discovered by the Jurors. Doubtless this was because of the required use of the material, in many instances,—but certainly it was the most popular choice among the contestants. It developed from other types of wood construction than those chosen by most of these competitors! Indeed, our own earliest types of dwelling in this country were themselves immediately derived from a quite different style of English cottage of the Tudor period—usually entitled "half timber" construction.

The Jury found themselves entirely in agreement upon a factor which has unfortunately, in the past too often influenced the results of competitions, in this country as well as abroad. Whereas, in the preliminary sorting of the designs, it was inevitable that one should be immediately attracted by a design's purely compositional aspect; yet it was found, in the closer study of the designs that was later undertaken, that these well presented exteriors had a constant tendency to move down the list in their placing; either through some real weakness of plan development, or as a closer study of the elevation brought out a better appreciation of the true merit of the house-design itself, quite aside from the engagingly appealing quality of the picturesque compositions developed. Incidentally, it was also noticed, when the interiors were considered, that a considerable number of all of the entries, were not as good, either in presentation or in design, as the exteriors. Often times the competitors had endeavored to obtain interesting interiors by entirely ignoring the structural and practical requirements of the arrangement of the space, and including complicated and costly arrangements of paneling in the execution of their designs. The frequent choice of the earlier type of upright paneling, without cross stiles, in these interior designs,—and how generally fortunate the struggling owners of these houses were in having inherited such a "conventional" shell.

The Jury was interested and pleased to observe that a true appreciation of the best uses of the required material, wood, was generally prevalent among the contestants. It was also noticeable that a considerable number of the contestants had a true understanding of, and had given much study to, the practical requirements of the arrangement of the interior for convenience and economic use in the small house, where the wife of the owner would be expected to do most of the housework herself.

To come now to the more detailed consideration of the designs themselves. The one finally placed first, No. 88, selected on the basis already stated at length, seemed to the Jury in many ways to be the nearly ideal solution of a house required to be placed upon a very narrow lot,—although it was the subject to two major objection, which it was endeavoring to overcome. The entire northern exposure of the house is insulated from the living portion by hallway, staircase, bathroom, etc., and these are kept in close connection with the living rooms. Upon the other hand, it is fair to say that in several instances, based upon the judgment of the elevations rather than the accompanying perspective, that the house would appear to even better advantage than it had been within the ability of the competitor to indicate in his perspective. It might be of interest also to add, that the drawings grouped themselves into two major classifications; first, of over-large projects, in which case the designer was often pure to consider the labor necessary to justify his design, or in some cases that the houses were so extremely over-large and pretentious that it was definitely difficult to anyone limiting himself, in perfecting his design, strictly to the requirements of the 50 foot lot. It is also interesting to note that, of the twelve designs which have received mention or place of honor, eight could be described as belonging to the informal rather than the balanced classical composition. This was not true of the majority of the plans submitted; but a result of the demand on the part of the Jury for maintaining as high a standard of interest and imagination as possible in judging the competition, and therefore—in cases where other points were felt to be sufficiently equal—preferring the unconventional to the conventional solution.

Others of the competitors, who had gone to some extra effort to obtain an interesting composition; had so broken up the sub-division and the general lines of the building, as to obtain a number of unusual combinations of details, grouping of several details of such nearly equal importance as to cause them to compete with one another. Simplicity in treatment was also desired by the Jury as to be desired in a solution of the problem, and the competitor who was able to produce this effect of simplicity by the lack of expensive detail requiring special mill work or labor in its construction,—and instead secured results by a straightforward use of easily available and inexpensive sizes and shapes of his material. It was, in several cases conceded that designs which otherwise might be classed as overpretentious or too expensive to construct would, if savings such as were indicated above had been held in mind by the designer, have come well within the limitations established by the competition,—because of the resulting interest and architectural success secured in its construction,—and instead secured results by a straightforward use of easily available and inexpensive sizes and shapes of his material.

The Jury was interested and pleased to observe that a true appreciation of the best uses of the required material, wood, was generally prevalent among the contestants. It was also noticeable that a considerable number of the contestants had a true understanding of, and had given much study to, the practical requirements of the arrangement of a kitchen for convenience and economic use in the small house, where the wife of the owner would be expected to do most of the housework herself.

PENCIL POINTS
plans were, by the way, so small as to be absolutely un-
available for the purpose for which they were intended. This
same criticism is also true of some of the service entries. The
front veranda, too, is a minimum in size, insufficient to pro-
protect the opening of the outside door into the house, and
provide space for the refrigerator at a position convenient to the kitchen. The kitchen itself is perhaps too closely placed to the hall and to the porch; although the
Jury never finally settled among themselves as to whether or
not it was desirable in a small house still to maintain a pantry
or china closet to be used as a passageway between kitchen and
dining room. In those cases where it was, placed immediately out of the kitchen for instance, this se-
paration has obvious customary advantages. Too close a rela-
tion of kitchen to the front door has also been disadvanta-
ges.

The porch in this plan does not depend upon side outlook,
nor is it so large as to cut off southern sun from either din-
ing or living room. The dining room is so placed as to get
the eastern sun, the living room such western sun as is avail-
able upon so small a plot plan. The width of the house, 29
feet 6 inches, is undoubtedly the minimum possible in a
problem of this sort, with the conditions such as we have al-
ready described. If the house on the lot at the east of his dwelling
had been built! It is, however, an ingenious and clever solu-
tion which he has selected. He blocks the south end of his
living room—which is practically his only street outlook—by
having it run into his entirely separate kitchen. In doing this he prevents any door or French window open-
ing directly upon the street porch,—and the latter itself is
of small size. It would have been possible to have furnished it with a little privacy to those using it, if the street was any nearer to his
lot line, or the location of the house was in a suburb near any large
city. It is true that the exterior treatment given this solu-
tion leaves the village eye to be left to picture the one that was in the mind of the competitor. The arrangement of the kitchen, rear entry, and the service portion of the plan is very good, especially the convenience of access to the cel-
lar stairs. The toilet is too small. Upon the second floor
the author again fails to obtain for the occupant of the in-
termediate bedroom the south outlook to which he is en-
titled. The staircase coming directly from the living room
is not to be had. It is never intended for this entire space of the Jury; nor is the staircase carried up between walls gen-
erally attractive. Nevertheless, accepting the disadvantages
of the latter, the staircase opens from the nearest possible point in relation to the porch.

The designer, in the judgment of the Jury, has made the
most of the artistic possibilities latent in his plan. His de-
sign is simple, unpretentious, well composed, small in scale, home-like and homely. The spacing along the north and south
perspective and the west side shown in his elevation, are
pleasingly and simply presented. He has also produced by
simple means a pleasing suggestion of his living room, with atmosphere and homeliness. His attempt to avoid the interjection of all expensive detail requiring special millings or labor,
would tend to counteract the somewhat greater—and there-
fore, more costly—amount of exterior wall surface pre-

cessed by his solution of the problem. However, the square
plan is not always the least expensive to build. The long
and narrow plan possesses inherent advantages of short
joints length and low overhang; but the advantages of this
arrangement are not determined in length. Both the exterior and inte-
or of this design possess an unusual amount of archi-
tectural interest that is harmonious with the plan,—once the
long and narrow house is accepted. This is especially true of the problem of the narrow lot. It nevertheless remains a
design that would normally be better suited to a more rural
development, with wider lots, or to a village rather than a suburban site.

The design given third place, No. 117, would have been
placed higher if the Jury had not felt that the facade was lacking in originality and architectural interest. There is also a question whether the provincial type of house having
the early overhang of the second story, would be likely to
possess as elaborate a type of cornice as indicated in this
design. The plan is nevertheless the best from among the
number that adopted a similar outline for their perspective and
is altogether too wide for the lot, however, running to 35
feet outside the chimney, in width. It is economical to con-
struct, so far as the plan arrangement is concerned; and
simple and convenient in the disposition of the rooms, par-
ticularly on the first floor. The kitchen is an unusually
good working space, with a pleasant breakfast nook to the
north. While the kitchen does not open directly into the
front hall, it is convenient to the cellar stairs and lavatory.
It does not have sufficient separation from the dining room;
and the plumbing, as planned, would require two stacks, an
element of some additional expense in a small house plan.
The porch view would be very s, being blocked off entirely by
the trees which is too close for proper privacy for the inhabitants.
The interior perspective shows a simple and interestingly
presented room.

The fourth design, No. 125, is acknowledged one of the
most competent. It presents a small cottage, with a well
arranged kitchen upon the north, and dining room and living
room across the south side. The plumbing is not well ar-
ranged; as three stacks would be required,—far too expen-
sive a disposition for such a small house as this. The kitchen,
also, is not sufficiently separated from the dining room, and
again the western end of the porch comes immediately upon
the side lot line. Both exterior and interior perspective are
adequately but simply drawn. The entrance doorway is per-
haps almost too modest for even so modest a cottage as this,
and it is more than questionable whether it is desirable to
divide a 50 foot lot in two with a fence, as has been shown in
the perspective and plot plan. Other than the plumbing,
this design would undoubtedly make an attractive cottage
house and one that would be inexpensive to build.

The eight mention designs again presented to the Jury a
problem that caused considerable discussion,—and they were
only selected after painstaking thought and consideration of all
possible factors. The drawing of the exterior perspective and
drawings submitted in the competition were again gone over
by the Jury, a number of plans were drawn out and com-
pared in connection with the drawings that were received
after making one or two changes, the Jury came unanimously
to the conclusion that they had made what was, in their judgment, the best selection from the material
that was available. It was not a question of art type, as the
designs in any order of excellence; feeling that, as all were
to be given an equal honorarium, any such attempt would be
invidious and unnecessary under the circumstances.

The design shown in No. 129, at several times in the dis-
cussion, was considered for a higher position; but the close study and analysis of plan and elevations (disregarding the engaging character of the perspective, which portrays such a house on a country or village site of considerably larger area than designed)—and is in its present form (twenty or twenty-five years of occupancy), convinced the Jury that it was not, on its merits, as good as the designs that were finally given preference. The plan has a toilet evidently entirely for family use, as it is entered from the inside of the house only through the kitchen. The living room is rather narrow for its length, the staircase opens from it, and the entire length of the room has to be traversed in crossing through the vestibule; it confesses its weakness by the corners of two rooms cut off at the north; and while the bath room is unusually large and commodious, the exterior of the house—as shown in the two-sided perspective (although that of the other contestants, many of the other contestants. It seemed to the judges a somewhat forced and trickily devised scheme, while the interior perspective shows an altogether incorrect pitch to the stai

No. 78 is another design where the chief emphasis of its good points in the perspective is calculated to blind one, at first sight, to the defects that develop in its architectural treatment, when one turns to the study of the elevation. The plan is well arranged, although, as the house face to the south, only one room upon each floor has windows opening from that exposure. The kitchen is unusually well separated from the dining room and hall, by the convenient arrangement of the porch, entry, kitchen, toilet, and watch room, thus enclosing the front door and cellar stairs, which are compartmented in this plan within the one area. The plumbing is also unfortunately separated, three stacks again being required in its installation; whilst a considerable amount of space is wasted by extending the staircase so far to the east as was done, in order to work out the roof shown in the elevation. Attention should also be called to the incorrect placement of the trap in the trap closet, and the extended roof ridge on the gable to the north. In this plan— as in many others—provision is not made for a convenient laundry yard; possibly on the grounds that a small family would prefer an outside laundry out; allowable enough, and possibly the custom where there are no small children, when a certain amount of labor is both necessary and desirable in the house, but, even with the cleanness may be obtained in the certain amount of light washing is always conveniently done in the house, and little, if any, provision for permitting this appears in most of the plans shown in the competition.

No. 90, shows a nice and simple plan, with the practical inconvenience of a deck on top of the roof, a kitchen that shares the difficulties of the inside type of kitchen of the prize winning design, and a toilet on the first floor, altogether too small for practical use. The arrangement of the plumbing requires two soil stacks, and a certain amount of space to be wasted in the hall on both stories. The house facially is designed by the designer in the center of his lot. While evidently he has striven to avoid a conventional arrangement in the street facade, it is doubtful if he has in exchange succeeded in obtaining anything that is either very original or strikingly successful in result.

No. 66 is to be commended for an effort to avoid a conventional elevation. In referring to earlier colonial precedent for his idea and treatment of overhang, the competitor has evidently been growing upon a novel arrangement, despite the deck shown on his elevations (which could probably be eliminated by further study without injury to the appearance of his design). The house substantially repeats the general arrangement of the square plan; being 29 feet 6 inches wide and 27 feet deep. In carrying the overhang entirely around the building—an element, by the way, of additional expense, particularly in some localities where a “balloon frame” type of construction is usually employed,—it seems to suggest its derivation from the “block house” or “garrison house” still to be found in some old New England communities. The kitchen is convenient, contains a small breakfast above, and is separated from the front door—but it is pipped up through a stack carried up between walls. The plan is complicated somewhat by the arrangement of the plumbing—although it could probably be all gotten into two stacks—and by the division of the chimney into some form of two exterior chimneys otherwise made to carry it arbitrarily to the point in which it was desirable for it to appear upon the front elevation. In the opinion of some of the judges, the eight sided window as an external feature upon the second story was not wholly successful.

No. 98 was a design, which was the cause of considerable discussion during the process of the competition judgment. Undoubtedly one of the most interesting in its exterior expression, harking back to well-known precedents in New England; and one of the few providing a convenient and well enclosed service yard,—it was nevertheless felt to be a necessarily expensive type of arrangement to build, which finally prevented its being placed for a prize in this competition—despite the undoubtedly superior interest of the house, and the cleverness of the plan, which provides an unusually good kitchen, well separated from the living room—if a somewhat reverse in relation to the direction from front to rear. The rear entry, with relation to kitchen and cellar stairs, and supplying wood for the living room, place, is exceptionally well placed. The plumbing in that separation—so as to require two medium sized stacks—was considerable. A “garage” is placed too near the street for privacy, and has necessarily to be estimated as a porch in regard to the cubic contents, as provided in the limitations of the program. The bedroom over it is at a considerable distance from the bath, and the roof is so very broken as to be necessarily rather expensive to build. Nevertheless, the house presents—next to the second prize design—what is undoubtedly the most interesting and ‘different’ motion obtained in this competition, and the treatment of the interiors indicated would produce rooms of atmosphere, and allow for taste and individuality in furnishing and decoration. Both exterior and interior perspectives are somewhat sketchy, and possibly incoherent,—and only an addition of a small glass-size—6 x 8 inches; for each; historically accurate, by the way—keeps the house in scale with its dimensions.

No. 52 is a similar type of plan to the one given third prize. In the judgment of the Jury it was not as successfully worked out, although the kitchen is perhaps better separated from both dining room and hall. The second story hall wastes a certain amount of space, however; and there is very little opportunity to get connection between kitchen range and chimney, which in some sections of the country would be required,—and is therefore somewhat of a disadvantage. The interior simple and graceful, the exterior endeavors to emphasize the length and lowness of the house by the frieze treatment shown. The front door detail treatment shows a striving for “something different,—” that is entirely adaptable to construction in wood, without perhaps very much improving upon established colonial precedent! The house would not be an inexpensive one to build, however, on account of the number of details called for by this design, and the amount of unnecessary and additional lattice work shown upon the lot.

No. 99 is an interesting and simple design. The plan is somewhat different from any other given place or mention by the Jury. The entrance detail shown is a bit large and crude in composition, and the interior sketch of the fireplace not very well thought out nor developed,—the designer has, nevertheless, obtained a pleasing grouping on the street exterior,—by a simple expedient which apparently did not occur to any other competitor. It gives the house a pleasingly informal character, makes a more artistic composition and apparently does not detract from the workability of the plan.

No. 39 was another design that caused much discussion among the Jury. It was believed to be an entirely logical development of a house plan and form, and the entrance detail shown is a bit large and crude in composition, and the interior sketch of the fireplace not very well thought out nor developed,—the designer has, nevertheless, obtained a pleasing grouping on the street exterior,—by a simple expedient which apparently did not occur to any other competitor. It gives the house a pleasingly informal character, makes a more artistic composition and apparently does not detract from the workability of the plan.

(Continued on page 96)
~ DESIGN FOR A SIX-ROOM SUBURBAN HOUSE ~

FIRST PRIZE DESIGN
Submitted by Owen Lau Growman, New York, New York.
PENCIL POINTS

DESIGN FOR A SIX-ROOM SUBURBAN HOUSE

FIRST PRIZE DESIGN. Detail Sheet.
Submitted by Owen Lau Gowman, New York, New York.
SECOND PRIZE DESIGN
SECOND PRIZE DESIGN, Detail Sheet.
Design for

"A SIX ROOM SUBURBAN HOUSE"

THIRD PRIZE DESIGN

Submitted by Amedeo Leone and H. A. Surman, Detroit, Michigan.
Design for

A SIX ROOM SUBURBAN HOUSE

THIRD PRIZE DESIGN, Detail Sheet.
Submitted by Amedeo Leone and H. A. Surman, Detroit, Michigan.
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FOURTH PRIZE DESIGN

Submitter: Lewis E. Welb, New York, New York
DESIGN for a SIX-ROOM SUBURBAN HOUSE

FOURTH PRIZE DESIGN, Detail Sheet.
Submitted by Lewis F. Welch, New York, New York
PENCIL POINTS

DESIGN

for A SIX ROOM
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THE LOCATION MAY BE ANYWHERE IN THE CENTRAL ATLANTIC STATES; THE EXTERIOR SHOULD BE OF SHINGLES AND CLAPBOARDS OF IVORY GRAY WITH WHITE TRIM.

MENTION, Design No. 129.
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MENTION, Design No. 129, Detail Sheet.
MENTION, Design No. 98.
MENTION, Design No. 98, Detail Sheet.
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DESIGN FOR A SIX-ROOM SUBURBAN HOUSE

MENTION, Design No. 78.
DESIGN FOR A SIX-ROOM SUBURBAN HOUSE

MENTION, Design No. 78, Detail Sheet.
MENTION, Design No. 39.
Submitted by Sherburne J. Watts, Dorchester, Massachusetts.
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DESIGN FOR A SIX-ROOM SUBURBAN HOUSE

MENTION, Design No. 39, Detail Sheet.
Submitted by Sherburne J. Watts, Dorchester, Massachusetts.
Design for A Six Room Suburban House

MENTION, Design No. 66.
Submitted by J. Douglas Lorenz and Wirt C. Rowland, Detroit, Michigan.
MENTION, Design No. 66, Detail Sheet.
Submitted by J. Douglas Lorenz and Wirt C. Roseland, Detroit, Michigan.
LISTEN Points

~ Perspective View ~

~ Design for ~
A SIX ROOM SUBURBAN HOUSE

~ CUBAGE ~
Main Portion... 17' 2' 8'
Second Portion... 15' 2' 11 1/2'
Cellar Portion... 13' 2' 6'

~ First Floor Plan ~

~ Second Floor Plan ~

~ LOCATION and FINISH ~
This house was designed for a suburban town
All material to be WHITE PINE ~
Exterior finish to be white painted clap-
boards or Shingles; doors and front door to
be black. Windows to be inside double hung
in the Colonial style with divided lights, outside
accompanied by black trim as shown ~

MENTION, Design No. 90.
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MENTION, Design No. 90, Detail Sheet.
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DESIGN FOR A SIX ROOM SUBURBAN HOUSE

MENTION, Design No. 52.
Submitted by Charles W. Cleary and James N. Holden, Boston, Massachusetts.
DESIGN FOR A SIX ROOM SUBURBAN HOUSE

MENTION, Design No. 52, Detail Sheet.
Submitted by Charles W. Cleary and James N. Holden, Boston, Massachusetts.
MENTION, Design No. 99.
Submitted by Walter J. Thies, Dayton, Ohio.
Design for a
SIX ROOM SUBURBAN HOUSE

MENTION, Design No. 99, Detail Sheet.
Submitted by Walter J. Thies, Dayton, Ohio.
THE AMERICAN ACADEMY IN ROME

FROM a letter recently received by C. Grant La Farge, Secretary of the American Academy in Rome, from Frank P. Fairbanks, Professor in Charge, School of Fine Arts, we quote the following:

"About 175 works were shown at the annual spring exhibition, which was inaugurated on the morning of the 16th of May in the presence of the King of Italy, the American Ambassador and the members of the Academy. In the afternoon the exhibition was opened to the public and a program of the works of Randall Thompson and Winter Watts was given in the dining room of the main building. About three hundred guests attended the concert, which comprised a suite for piano and five odes of Horace for mixed chorus, by Randall Thompson; two Hawaiian songs, by Watts, were sung by Luigi Nardi. The Choir of San Salvador in Lauro gave the odes of Horace under Thompson's direction. "The Choir of San Salvatore in Lauro gave the odes of Horace under Thompson's direction. "The Choir of San Salvatore in Lauro gave the odes of Horace under Thompson's direction."

"The distinguishing feature of the show was the display of one of Mr. Blashfield's executed mosaics, laid out on the Common Room floor. Lascari, who has this work in charge, showed portraits and figure compositions. "We were fortunate, in being able to show only reproductions of Frank Schuster's Anticoli triptych. The craftsmanship and disposition of the figures in the composition, as indicated in photographs of the executed work and preliminary studies, attracted considerable attention. "Floegel, senior painter, had a group of stained glass studies, frescoes, copies and studies of decorative details. Both sculptors, Stevens and Meyer, displayed busts, figures and small sculptures. Stevens had ten etchings not appearing on our catalogue. Antonio Di Filippo, visiting student in Italy, contributed etchings and works.

"Norman T. Newton, landscape architect, showed among other drawings and sketches, three very fine renderings of his study of the Villa Medici in Florence. "We were fortunate in receiving the news of the collaborative prize award in time to announce the winners to the public at the beginning of the exhibition. Messrs. Marceau, Bradford and Camden, architect, painter and sculptor, had the prize design, a memorial chapel, showing magnificent craftsmanship. Marceau has twice been a member of a winning collaborative team. "Paul Simpson, visiting student on the Le Brun scholarship, contributed fifty water colors and pencil sketches of unusual charm and Frederick Woodbridge, another visiting architect, showed five drawings of the restoration of a commercial building at Ostia and a restoration of a triumphal arch at Antioch, Pisidia. "Floegel, senior painter, is finishing the third-year composition, making further studies of stained glass, and he recently requested permission of the Vatican authorities to study the frescoes in the Sistina Chapel in order to make a careful examination of the technical treatment of the composition of the frieze. "Stevens, senior sculptor, is having his standing figure, called Alba, cast in bronze. He has recently moved much of his work into storage space at the Academy in order to himself to move about more freely while finishing his group and relief. "Newton, landscape architect, and Bradford, painter, are in Florence. Dean, architect and Finley, painter, are traveling together in Spain. Douglas is busy with his restoration of the Temple of Dougga. Camden, sculptor, has his relief, a detail of his collaborative problem, in the process of "laying up."
The Architectural Bowling League has decided to bowl on Joseph Thum's White Elephant alleys the coming season, and arrangements have been made for the use of 11 alleys every Thursday night, beginning the latter part of September or the first part of October, and continuing until the end of the bowling season next May. All friends of the league and club, as well as fellow draftsmen, who are not members of either, are hereby cordially invited to drop in and visit with us on these nights (and that includes the other 75% as well. Bring her along by all means).

At this writing the following offices have made requests for participation in the coming tournaments:

Cass Gilbert
Donn Barber
Alfred C. Bosson
McKenzie, Voorhees & Gmelin
Warren & Wethermore
McKim, Mead & White
James Gamble Rogers
Thomas W. Lamb
Guilbert & Beadle
Stand & Van Vleck
Schwartz & Gross

With business details and congratulations in the background, the gathering advanced upon the refreshments provided for the occasion. All present enjoyed themselves unrestrainedly, with the assistance of the very able talent engaged for the ceremonies, for the balance of the evening.

It was noted that the main topic of discussion was the new Architectural Club, and since we must remember that the league is really the parent of the club, it is not surprising in the least that the league assumes the proverbial protecting attitude of the father for his natural offspring, and true to form with all good fathers it waxes enthusiastic in its pride for, and the future glory of the Club, which is showing such surprising energy and growing by leaps and bounds. THE CLUB IS HERE, AND THE CLUB WILL STAY. Hence the enthusiasm. But more about that in the next issue. Besides, we are encroaching on other domains.

Henry Sasch, Secretary.

JUDGES FOR ORNAMENTAL IRON COMPETITION

The competition for designs of ornamental iron work, as announced on another page of this issue, will be judged by the following jury: Dwight James Baum, New York; W. M. Buchroeder, Richmond, Va.; Frank H. Quinby, New York; C. Weller, New York; and Samuel Yellin, Philadelphia.

PERCIVAL GOODMAN

Percival Goodman, winner of the Eighteenth Paris Prize, was born in New York and received his early education under private tutelage. His architectural training began in the office of his uncle, Mr. Benj. W. LeVitan, Architect, New York, under whom Mr. Goodman worked for a number of years. He was later employed in the office of John B. Peterkin. During this time he attended the Fontainebleau School of Fine Arts for American Students where he received instruction from M. Jacques Carlu. Mr. Goodman feels that he owes much to Mr. Geo. A. Licht, in whose atelier he has worked, M. Jacques Carlu, Mr. John Peterkin and Mr. David Varon. Mr. Goodman will sail for Paris shortly where he is planning to enter the Atelier Pontremoli.

THE ARCHITECTURAL SKETCH CLUB OF CHICAGO

The Architectural Sketch Club of Chicago realized its long cherished dream when its new home at 1801 So. Prairie Avenue was officially opened with a great house-warming party. Some seventy-five members and guests turned out in response to the invitations sent out by fellow members, Mr. Robert L. Minkus and Mr. Paul J. McGrath. A reproduction of the announcement sent out is published on page 96. The party started off with a royal dinner set out by Mr. Sayles, our resident manager. Following the dinner the guidance of the future welfare of the Club was entrusted into the hands of Mr. Robert L. Dando, who will officiate as president and who will be ably assisted by a very capable line-up of fellow-officers and directors.

Among those present was Mr. Ted Hoffmeister, who early in the evening showed great indications of publicly addressing the assembly. As the youthful evening aged Mr. Hoffmeister's urge greatly increased, with the result that finally he did arise and address the assembled mob in a very informal and humorous vein. Ted is the holder of the Foreign Traveling Scholarship of 1925 and he discussed his plans for his trip abroad. After the applause following Ted's address had subsided, the party adjourned to the Atelier where the balance of the evening's program was enjoyed. The committee had some sterling entertainment scheduled in the forms of some "femmes très charmant," who did very well in furthering along the aging of the evening and who helped discover quite a few of our members who are very adept in tripping the light fantastic.
Announcement sent out by the Architectural Sketch Club of Chicago.

All these events helped immensely to infuse our new home with a warm glow and we hope that it may stay warm for many a year to come. A photo of our Atelier is published on page 95.

Following is a list of the personnel of the new régime under whose guidance the Architectural Sketch Club of Chicago will be for the next year.

President, Robert E. Dando
Vice-President, George M. Nedved
Secretary, Edmond A. Bradbury
Treasurer, Gerald A. Bradbury
Directors
Active 2 years, Pierre Blonke
Active 1 year, Clarence W. Parrier
Associate 1 year, William F. Thomsen
Active 2 years, Rudolph Nedved
Active 1 year, Paul J. McGrath
Associate 1 year, Charles H. Sierks

As a final adieu to the old quarters of the Club, the Program Committee staged the 1925 scholarship competition en loge in the old quarters, on April 26th, and it certainly was a busy and industrious place. There were nine competitors very energetically pushing the pencils and slogging ink on the final day.

The subject of the competition this year was "An Air Line Station," which was to be designed to accommodate the future mode of transportation which will be by airplane.

Messes. Rupinski, Ryan, Nicolai, Hoffmeister, Albion, Dando, Fuhrer, Schweiker and Walden all submitted final drawings.

An innovation in the program this year was the requirement that all "calques" were to be brought into the Club quarters and all final drawings completed in the Atelier en loge.

The competition was open to all members and non-members in the City of Chicago.

The judgment of the final drawings took place on May 2nd, at the Art Institute of Chicago.

The jury was composed of Mr. Raymond Hood, Chairman, Mr. Edward Bennett, Mr. Shaw and Mr. Hall.

After two hours of very careful and serious consideration the jury made the following awards:

Mr. Ted Hoffmeister—1st prize
Mr. Fred Ahlson—1st Mention Placed 2nd
Mr. Eugene Fuhrer—1st Mention Placed 3rd
Mr. Edward Rupinski—1st Mention
Mr. E. Nicolai—2nd Mention

The winner, Mr. Hoffmeister, is now completing his itinerary and more complete information as to his plans will be announced later.

The building plans for the Sesquicentennial International Exposition are being made by John Moliter, City Architect, Philadelphia. The exposition will be held in Philadelphia in 1926 to celebrate the 150th anniversary of American Independence.

CORRECTING A MISTAKE

The American Face Brick Association keenly regrets an error which appeared in their advertisement published in the July issue of this paper. St. Paul's M. E. Church, South, Clarksburg, West Va., was designed by Mr. C. H. Snider, architect, Fairmont, West Va., to whom credit should have been given.
N. J. SAPIENZA

N. J. SAPIENZA, winner of one of the special Student Scholarships at Massachusetts Institute of Technology for 1925-26, was born in New York City, July 1, 1903. He obtained his early education at a parochial school and graduated from the New York Evening High School in 1920. He then attended Cooper Union for several years, completing the course in 1924. Since then he has been doing Beaux-Art work in the Atelier Hirons, receiving several mentions and one first mention placed during the past year.

Mr. Sapienza is at present in the office of W. P. McCarthy & F. E. Kelly, A.I.A., of New York and Philadelphia, to whom he is indebted for their encouragement in continuing his Beaux-Art work and competing for the M.I.T. prize. He also feels that he has received a great deal of help and inspiration from his associations in the Atelier Hirons.

THE IDEAL CELLAR COMPETITION

E VERY architect or draftsman is invited to enter this Ideal Cellar Competition which is being conducted by The Architectural Forum for the American Radiator Company. The prizes are as follows:

Grand Prize: $1,000
First Prize: Class A, $500; Class B, $500
Second Prize: Class A, $300; Class B, $300
Third Prize: Class A, $200; Class B, $200
Fourth Prize: Class A, $100; Class B, $100
10 Mentions: Class A (each), $50; Class B (each), $50

The competition closes at 12 o'clock noon, August 25th, 1925. For complete information write to the American Radiator Company, 40 West 40th St., New York City.

COMPETITION FOR GARAGE DESIGNS

T HE Steel Trade Extension Committee, as announced more fully on another page of this issue, is offering prizes aggregating $1,000 for designs submitted on or before October 20th, 1925, in accordance with the terms of the program prepared by the professional advisor, Edward B. Lee, Architect, 1210 Chamber of Commerce Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa. Entry blanks for the competition, copy of program and complete information may be secured from Mr. Lee.

Design by N. J. Sapienza, which was awarded one of the special Student Scholarships at M. I. T.
COMMENTS ON "SUBSTITUTION."

To the Editor of Pencil Points,

Dear Sir:—

In connection with your article on "Substitution" in the July issue, the entire discussion apparently hinges around the words "or equal." Personally, the writer is at a loss as to the elimination of these words in specifications. I believe they were originally inserted purely in the interest of keeping down the cost of a building. It served two purposes, in a way, one to allow the contractor to use his discretion in furnishing something which might be considered equal and also allowing a concern to bid on their product if they consider it equal to the one specified. The contractor would, naturally, take the lowest he could and also know that he would quote the lowest, but in this day of competition, why not eliminate these words "or equal?" They are causing a great deal of trouble.

According to a recent legal decision published in one of the architectural publications, an owner refused to pay the contractor because he maintained a substitution of materials had been made. The architect approved the substitution on the strength of the words "or equal," but the court upheld the owner. Now, if the words "or equal" are in there even though an architect does approve a specification he has got to safeguard himself and secure the approval of the owner in writing, according to this decision.

The contractors today are certainly keen after business and the proper selection of materials is determined by the architect and the contractors today so that if a contractor finds that a certain concern is jacking-up their price because they were specified outright, he bicificates and the architect would welcome such information and a suggestion of a substitution by the contractor at the time of his bidding. The merits of the substitution can be better appraised by the architect but it would be in the interest of the contractor to make note of the above.

You suggest also, a closer supervision by the architect and more firmness on his part to insist that the materials specified go into the building. This certainly is true. To this I would add that some of this firmness should be exercised so as to discourage some of these "or equal determined salesmen" who walk into the office and all but persuade you that the building will fall down with the material specified and their's is the only thing that will save it.

As to the architect selecting his own contractor, this is most satisfactory and architects dream of the day when they can do this. Still, we all have to realize that the owner is the man spending the money, therefore, he has the right to say who he wants to build just as much as he has to select his architect. I am frank to say that even though the owner may insist upon a contractor whom an architect may know has a reputation that is not good for the architect, there is no excuse for the architect to let such information for letting the contractor get away with something and then blaming the owner. The owner is paying the architect for protection, regardless of who builds the building and it is up to the architect to see that he gets what is specified.

There is another side that can be of assistance and which some concerns are adopting and that is, that the manufacturer, instead of trying to pick out places where he is not specified and trying to convince those people they haven't the best product, he should select the specifications and see that the contractor, who is awarded the job, purchases his material, notifying the architect in such a case. I am sure an architect would appreciate this.

The practice today is almost becoming unbearable, due to the keen competition. If you specify a certain material, regardless of whether the words "or equal" are used, it is unfair to the other concerns in the office with all kinds of products. Some of these are real good salesmen and can almost make an architect feel that he has made a horrible mistake by specifying anything but the material they represent. As to their others, I make it a practice of never approving a manufacturer's article through one of his representatives. If I wish to stay with a concern and sometimes are not very conscientious about what they guarantee. Therefore, we always refer them to the contractor, having the contractor make requests for a substitution, stating why. A great many times a contractor has had experience with the material and if he hasn't, be, as well as the architect, can investigate the matter further.

Yours very truly,

Aaron G. Alexander.

Editor,

Specifications requiring certain materials or equal are absolutely logical and good business. Requirements for "or equal" are properly used. It is foolish for an architect to sit tight and allow no substitutions where the excellence of the work is not affected. The number of specifications possible to make a substitution or equal, is in any case and with ordinary supervision, unauthorized substitutions, so far as my experience goes, are few. Requests for substitutions are frequent, but these come not so much from contractors as from salesmen in various lines who naturally wish to dispose of their goods.

Complaint is made that materials specified are not always used over the work. This complaint is valid only in part. Where the specification concerns materials such as Portland cement, lead and oil paint and the like, which may be specified by name, the manufacturer should be given wholly upon the fact that his particular material is specified, but see to it that he sells the job. My experience is that contractors prefer to work according to specifications, where little or no difference obtains between them and what might be substituted. Where substitutions are of advantage to their customer, this is forthcoming and very seldom do they attempt to substitute, without approval, taking the risk of rejection of work into account.

The most common source of trouble is not substitution of materials, but of subcontractors. Here price rules the selection and incompetent workers and unreliable subcontractors combine to spoil perfectly good materials. If it were possible to require a statement in bids of subcontractors proposed, an architect would have a better basis for predicting the good results. If the words "or equal" would have a meaning and substitution should not be permitted without notice.

Hoping these few words will find you enjoying the same summer weather as here, I am,

Very truly yours,

(Sgd.) Arthur Peabody, State Architect, Madison, Wisconsin.

The Pencil Points Press, Inc., New York, N. Y.

Gentlemen:—

The writer has with much interest read your editorial in the July issue of PENCIL POINTS entitled "Substitution." It, undoubtedly, presents to your readers, in a practical way, a subject that must be of unusual importance.

Certainly, it is interesting to the manufacturer of quality material used in the building industry, and, certainly, it should be of interest to the architect as well as the client.

Definiteness in all matters pertaining to building construction brings the most satisfaction.

If the architect, at the very beginning, sells his ability and his integrity to the client, then, this ability and integrity become a part of the plan, a part of the specifications, a part of the construction work, and, lastly, a part of the building itself.

If the architect lacks definiteness in deciding upon the material to be used, it makes a job half done and introduces discussions regarding what and how and when, and this ends in an unsatisfactory job.

Procrastination, the chief of time, in a building operation where there are a whole architect and a client and numerous building trades, becomes also the thief of money, because it largely increases the number of hours that all parties concerned must give to the operation in question. This item alone, undoubtedly, would more than pay for a competent clerk of the works.

The chief difficulty then, is to find a way to reimburse the architect for the time that he must take to see that the material determined upon and specified is actually used in the building.

That the architect should be adequately paid, for complete supervision, goes without question.

That adequate supervision would in the end be beneficial to the client, financially and otherwise, and to the industry in general, we also believe is unquestioned.

(Continued on page 113)
Pyramid at Tikal, Guatemala.

Restoration of the Great Pyramid at Tikal, by Alfred C. Bossom.
Mr. Bossom shows in this design an application to present-day conditions of his study of the Great Pyramid at Tikal, shown on the opposite page.
THE MAKING OF A MODEL OF THE PARTHENON
FOR A PAGEANT

THE very artistic Greek pageant given at the Bal Bohème of the Arts Club of Washington featured Ictinus' and his fellow craftsmen's submission of a model of the Parthenon to Pericles for his approval. The representation was carried out by means of a large model of the historic building and the architect and his assistants, the slave porters, and attendant soldiers were represented by members of the Washington Chapter of the American Institute of Architects and the architectural students of George Washington University. The model was made solely for this occasion and its construction may prove of interest to the general reader and furnish information to those having similar problems.

The restriction as to weight and limitations of transportation demanded considerable study. As the ball room was large and the procession of some length, the actual size of the model had to be considerable. It had to be carried some distance on the shoulders of the slaves of the evening, and had to be light in weight. As it was a most temporary performance, its cost in material and labor had to be light. The cheapest, strongest, and most available material was beaver board, but the problem of the columns, the most prominent characteristic of the design, was most difficult. To have them turned in wood or cast in plaster would have increased the weight so much that rapid handling would have been impossible. Paper mailing tubes were decided upon as the proper material. How to give the necessary entasis and secure the columns was the next problem. It was finally solved by cutting a V-shaped slot down the greater part of one side of the tube columns. By inserting the top in a pattern, to insure all of the top diameters being the same, the spring of the cardboard formed the entasis, and the two sides were then secured by gummed paper. The capitals were cast in plaster with bottom lugs the size of the top diameters and slipped in place when the model was assembled. The type and size of column having been determined by the material at hand—the size of the mailing tube determining the module—drawings for the building were laid out with the aid of "Bahman." The total length of the building was six feet, the supporting box some ten feet long.

As the elevators of the ball room limited the sizes of the parts, it was finally planned to prepare the model in four sections; first the box, or podium, on which the paper structure rested (this was made in two parts as the total length was ten feet); second, the stylobate and steps in a single piece, with wood circular blocks for securing the bases of the columns, glued in place; third, the cella constructed intact and extended up to the roof forming the chief structural or supporting member; fourth, the entablature, pediments and roof made in a single unit and the plaster capitals secured to this piece. This was a mistake, they should have been secured to the cardboard column shaft. The cross braces of the roof were let down into the walls of the cella, but the final assembling was handicapped by the roof having been glued on. It should have been omitted during construction and secured only after the model was completely assembled.

The box or base mentioned was made in two parts, of composit board, as illustrated in the sketch on the opposite page, and was spliced together at the ball room. On this rested the stylobate constructed of the same material. The steps, however, were made of wood strips cut to the proper size. On this stylobate were drawn all the necessary axes and construction lines and of these it was found there could not be too many. This drawing of construction lines and axes was carried out in the entablature, both face and soffit, carried up through the frieze and on the roof surfaces which facilitated the assembling and were of value up to the moment of painting. The cross braces of the roof were let down into the cella walls as mentioned, but failed to be fastened laterally, on account of inaccessibility, a warning which the final result warrants being given here.

The columns and cella and all parts not easily accessible were painted in the studio and a single light coat given the remainder, and the final coats "on the job," for experience proves nothing can be moved without finger marks or chafing scars. The base was painted a grey tone (with a flat quick-drying wall paint), the columns graded up from grey to buff and the entablature and roof a warm ivory tint. The plaster capitals were left white. The model was carried upon a stand with short legs. To this stand was secured the carrying handles 16 feet long, spliced in the middle, and was attractively draped with Pompeian red fabric with green garlands hung between each bearer position. The legs were simply to nailed to the handling bars and cross braced. After the model was finally assembled, it was lifted to the carrying stand and on the slippery dancing floor the stand skidded and the finished model dropped three feet. This tore out practically all of the glued base blocks. A few minutes' work, however, brought all the displaced parts in place, but the roof being secured prevented the cross bracing being again securely fastened to the cella walls, so after the jar, the entire weight of the roof came upon the columns.

The night of the pageant came. The bearers carefully lifted the model to their shoulders, the procession formed, the pageant moved. The presentation ceremonies were over; the bearers and the model passed into the anteroom. One side was lowered too quickly, and so struck the floor heavily. Slowly the model collapsed and the wreck was a more complete one than the historic explosion made of the original building. Tremendous applause marked the desire for an encore, but the ruined model forbade it. So this brief description serves both as an example and a warning.

—William Partridge
THE PENCIL GUILD

The members of the office of J. Williams Beal, Sons, of Boston, have recently formed The Pencil Guild, an organization to be devoted to the furtherance of their professional and social interests. The activities of The Guild will include visits to work under construction and completed jobs in order to profit by a comparison of the effect of the executed work with the drawings, and the inspection of building material plants to study the best uses of materials. On the social side there are planned monthly luncheons to be addressed by speakers of prominence, and occasional excursions in which wives and friends will participate.

Enthusiasm for the future runs high, especially as the organization's brief existence already counts a highly successful banquet at the Boston Architectural Club and an all day outing which included visiting several buildings and a lobster dinner to mark the transition to an afternoon of ball-playing, swimming, and dancing. Plans are already completed for a lively initiation of new members and a trip to New Hampshire. Something always in the offing is the scheme of things.

Officers elected are as follows: President, Lloyd M. Hendrick, Jr.; Vice-President, Victor R. Provost; Secretary-Treasurer, F. Leslie Ford. Social activities will be in charge of a committee consisting of Thomas F. Bundy, John A. Bigelow and Charles W. Jones. The professional phases of the Guild's work will be cared for by a committee composed of William E. Thompson, Jr., Frederick C. Rau, and Robert T. Gidley.

Victor Pedrotti has returned to New York and taken up his residence at 136 MacDougal Street. Since decorating "The Mill", the interior of which was shown in the January issue of this magazine, Mr. Pedrotti has carried out interesting decorative treatments at 236 West 56th Street, and at the "Club Inspiration". Mr. Pedrotti's spirited decorations are executed with freedom and ease and are highly effective.

Columns for the Model of the Parthenon Constructed from Mailing Tubes

Construction of Compo Board Model of the Parthenon used in the Pageant given by the Arts Club, Washington, D. C.
HERE we are again, back on the old treadmill! The members of the Pittsburgh Architectural Club strutted their stuff in grand style in our July issue and so far as we can judge, from reports already in hand, everybody who is not on his way to Florida is planning to move to Pittsburgh, now that it has been made clear to all and sundry that all the days are sunny and that the stories of Pittsburgh weather are no more true than the accounts of strange doings in Winsted, Conn. But the other Clubs have fallen down, down, down. We thought to get out of our summer stent by inviting someone else to do the work. It didn't work!-So once more we have marshalled our paste pot, our scissors and our secretary so that this famed forum of fun may not fade entirely ere succor arrives.

We have oiled up our spy-glass and are scanning the horizon anxiously for the next victim. Wouldn't you think that the Architectural Club of Los Angeles, or Chicago or St. Louis, or somewhere or anywhere else, would jump at this chance to get four pages of nice white space in PENCIL POINTS to do with according to their whim? The answer is, we would. Every club and atelier has the talent to produce your resounding and melodious pages of sketches, verse, summer foolishness or what not! Write your own ticket and compound your own ingredients in such fashion as pleases you best. Surely all the enterprise and pep is not confined to Pittsburgh, enterprising and peppy as those fellows surely are, and have proved themselves to be. Remember, we make all the engravings. Just send in your rough material (not too rough) and we will do the rest.

RUDOLPH J. NEDVED recently gave a very interesting illustrated talk before the Architectural Sketch Club of Chicago on his travels in Europe. He exhibited, in addition to his lantern slides, about 50 sketches and rubbings of some of the high spots of his trip. Judging from the very high quality of these, Mr. Nedved's spare time must have been very energetically employed.

Mr. Nedved won the Foreign Traveling Scholarship of 1924. While in London he decided to join forces with a fellow student of architecture, with the result that now there is a Mrs. Nedved—Mrs. Elizabeth Kimball Nedved, one of whose water colors is reproduced on page 107.

R. W. R., Sir:—Add events leading to tragedy,—this persistent parade of synthetic ellipses. Why not such a circle? Both are similar, for given the major and minor axes, the line of circumference for an ellipse can not vary; neither the circle,—the radius of which is its comprehensive description. Substitution of linked or annealed various arcs can never satisfy the normal eye, and why deal them? Strange to say most of these aberrations spring from "Engineers", hard baked for accuracy we would think. Thus the circle is ever the control, and the ellipse is always so governed. In hope of random assault on arches as perpetrated by some of our greats in "perspective", here is the same truth for proper construction of the semi-circular; any other variety we shall be happy to illustrate in outline. Doping out a way of drawing an ellipse instrumentally with compasses is a sport for an asylum for the semi-conscious. However, there is an elaborate apparatus on the market, which we think does the trick.

Gregory Parable, A.I.A.

This diagram, sent to us by Gregory Parable, is explained above.
Mr. Luis Canedo Gerard, Apartado No. 4 Bis, Mexico City, Mexico, is anxious to secure a copy of the November 1924 issue of Pencil Points to complete his files.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY EXTENSION ATELIER.

The members of the Columbia University Extension Atelier met with the Electrical Engineering students of Columbia and held their annual dinner at Castle Inn. This was the first attempt at Columbia University to bring the students of architecture into closer contact with the students of the various building trades. This gathering of about eighty offered a splendid opportunity for the future architects and engineers to discuss liberally their mutual problems. Greater interest was added by the presence and talks of Mr. J. V. Van Pelt, our critic, and Professors Curry, Hehre and Balmford. A very attractive program was drawn up by Mr. Edward Hurley.

It is hoped that the future dinners may have representatives from more branches of the building trades so that the discussions may be more general and of even greater value.

RAYMOND P. HUGHES,
Secretary, Columbia University Extension Atelier.
WE GET lots of amusing things in the mail and here is one from Samuel N. Hannaford of Cincinnati, Ohio, accompanying a renewal subscription. When a man writes a poem as well as a check we feel distinctly complimented.

To Tommy Dolan:

The hand of time stays not for man
It passes all too soon.
And I just realized the fact
That soon it will be June.

But now I find I have some time
To do a do or two,
And while I’m making out some checks
I’ll mail one out to you

So that my subscription may run
Along some more
And monthly be delivered
Promptly at my door.

AND this is anonymous!
To R. W. R. Rah! Rah!
Five years cracking
Here and There and This and That

That Letter

“What is the Answer??
The draftsman, over forty
Is itchy, sore distressed,
He wonders what will happen
To him, with all the rest,
And yet he dares not scratch them
Or chase his fleas away.
Now when we’re bit, we catch them,
And crack without delay.
Chorus (muchly)
Now, when we’re bit, etc.

Ah! dear Faust, I knew thee well.

MEPHISTO, Act I.

PENCIL POINTS:

I am enclosing a copy of a drawing by Mr. John J. Wade. The drawing was submitted in an humorous competition to select an architect to remodel a building for the local atelier.

This occurred about two years ago but the original came to life only a few days ago and I am sure that its humor can be appreciated just as well now as then.

The building was called the Rectagon and at a later date the atelier assumed the same name. It is a live organization and I can promise you that you will hear much more of it in the near future.

We would be more than pleased to see this drawing reproduced in PENCIL POINTS and hope you can find space for it.

Very truly yours,

W. Newell Reynolds, Sous-Massier, Atelier “RECTAGON,” Buffalo, N. Y.
Rendering by Joseph McCoy. Municipal Auditorium, Minneapolis. Croft and Boerner, Architects and Engineers.

Water Color by Elizabeth Kimball Nedved, Chicago, Ill. "Corpus Christi." Etching by Lee Fuller, Los Angeles, Cal.
Doorway and Window Details. This is one of the plates from Part II of “Good Practice in Construction,” by Philip G. Knobloch, now in course of preparation by the Publishers of PENCIL POINTS.
THE SPECIFICATION DESK
A Department for Specification Writers

SPECIFICATIONS
By W. W. Brach

PART X

SPECIFICATIONS FOR EXCAVATING AND GRADING

IN the June and July issues were set forth the General Conditions and Supplementary General Conditions incidental to the construction of a “Consolidated District school house.” The following specifications will be found separated into Divisions in such manner that a general contract can be entered into for the entire work or one of the divisions removed from same and let independently.

Now follows:

DIVISION B. EXCAVATING.

NOTE. The Contract and General Conditions of these Specifications, including the Supplementary General Conditions, govern all parts of the work and are parts of and apply in full force to these specifications for Excavating. The Contractor shall refer thereto as forming integral parts of his Contract.

ART. 1. SCOPE OF WORK.
(A) THE ITEMS Under this Division include:
1. REMOVALS.
2. STRIPPING.
3. EXCAVATING.
4. PUMPING.
5. SHORING.
6. BACK-FILLING.
7. GRADING.
8. SURPLUS MATERIAL, Disposition of.
9. TRANS-PLANTING.

(B) OMISSIONS. Final grading and dressing of top soil, together with sodding, seeding and planting, will be included in Division Z, Landscaping.

ART. 2. REMOVALS.

(A) BUILDINGS at present on the site, including two residences and a garage, shall be taken off the premises or razed by the Contractor and all parts of same shall become his property, to be removed from the premises at his expense. Thereafter, all the Owner will first take away all portable furniture, and lighting fixtures.

(B) ALL TREES AND MINOR STRUCTURES, including stumps, roots, walls, paving, fences, foundations, walls, cisterns, cesspools and privy vaults, shall be removed, if any are found within the area to be excavated.

C) EXISTING BASEMENTS and wells, cisterns and cesspools, if any extend below the level of the bottom of the excavation, shall be filled in with clean earth or sand, thoroughly filled and tamped solid; but, if such previous excavations occur under new foundations, the Contractor shall notify the Architect and follow his instructions.

ART. 3. STRIPPING.

(A) THE TOP SOIL, if of black earth, shall be removed to a depth of 8" over the building site and for a space 20' 0" wide all around the building, or to property line, if less distant than 20' 0". All black soil shall be piled on premises where directed. Wherever the present grade is higher than the new finished grade at the building, the depth of stripping shall be extended to 8" below required finished grade which shall slope 1' 0" in 20' 0", unless otherwise indicated.

ART. 4. EXCAVATING.

(A) IN GENERAL. The Contractor shall excavate the site of the building (leaving 2' 0" space beyond it on all sides) as required for basements, walls, footings, piers, areas, pits, etc. to depths shown on drawings. Trenches for footings of walls, piers, etc. shall have bottoms of full width. If carried deeper than required, trenches shall have excess depth filled with same concrete as specified for footings, without extra charge. In no case may filling under foundations be done with earth or sand. Bottoms of all excavations shall be left level, free from rubbish, and reasonably smooth.

(B) INSPECTION AND SOIL TEST. No concrete for footings may be poured until the Superintendent has had opportunity to examine the surfaces to be covered. He may then order the concreting to proceed, or may order the surfaces to be placed in better condition, or may order a test of the bearing capacity of the soil made by the Contractor at the expense of the Owner, after which the bottom of the trench shall again be prepared at directed depth and submitted for inspection as before.

ART. 5. PROTECTION.

(A) BOXING TREES. All trees and shrubbery endangered by operations under this contract shall be carefully and adequately boxed with good planking.

(B) PUMPING. Trenches and all other portions of the work shall be kept free from standing water by pumping or other adequate means. Inlets to sewers, properly strained, may be used for such drainage as soon as available.

(C) SHORING. The Contractor shall provide all sheeting, shoring and bracing required to maintain earth walls of excavations or for the protection of streets, alleys or adjacent premises.

ART. 6. FILLING.

(A) BACK-FILL. No foundation walls may be covered by back-fill until the Superintendent has had opportunity to examine them and to determine whether or not sub-surface drainage is to be installed. All back-fill shall be of earth or other approved material from this excavation, placed in 8" layers, well tamped and settled with water.

(B) OVER DRAINS. A sub-surface drainage system is not part of this original contract. If required, the fill over same shall consist of clean, broken stone or gravel 3" to 3' dia. Joints shall first be covered with pieces of galv. iron or broken tile and care shall be taken, in placing the fill, to prevent injury or displacement to same or to the tile.

(C) UNDER FLOORS AND WALKS, any necessary filling shall be done to bring sub-surface to proper plane to receive cinders and well compacted and left level and free from rubbish. No frozen material may be used nor filling done during freezing weather. If the surface thus provided be not approved or if other areas on which cinders or concrete are to be placed be adjudged unfit, the rejected material shall be removed to such depth as directed and the same shall be refilled as above provided. If the rejected material be of earth or fill of old standing, the Contractor will be given an extra order covering extra work as provided in Art. 13 of Div. A.

ART. 7. GRADING.

(A) AROUND BUILDING. The Contractor shall grade evenly around the building to lines given on plans up to a height 8" below finished grade lines, for a distance of 20' 0" all around, using only approved material from this excavation for the purpose. Any deficiency in grading material as well as final fill will be supplied and placed under Div. Z.

(B) DISPOSITION OF EXCAVATING MATERIAL. All material from the excavation and all waste and rubbish from graded surfaces and from building operations remaining after back-filling and grading are completed shall, as directed by the Architect, be distributed about the premises or removed from the site.

ART. 8. TRANS-PLANTING.

(A) CERTAIN TREES AND SHRUBS on site, as indicated on plot plan, shall be properly removed, cared for and re-planted on premises by experienced men, where directed, and later properly tended until in safe growing condition.

DIVISION C. CONCRETE WORK.

(Artist’s Note: In Part II, Div. C is “Foundations and Masonry” and Div. D is “Concrete, Plain and Reinforced, other than Foundations.” Such separation of concrete work is desirable in many instances because, if one wishes to let an independent contract for slab work, it is still well to combine the Excavating, Masonry and Foundations in a single contract. For this typical school building specifica-
tion, however, we will assume the concrete combined with the other masonry and in a general contract. This will avoid duplicating the concrete specifications.

NOTE: (Here is repeated the note immediately preceding Art. 1 of Div. B.)

ART. 1. SCOPE OF WORK.

(A) THE ITEMS under this Division include:

(1) ALL CONCRETE FOUNDATIONS, including reinforcement of same.

(2) ALL CINDER FILL under concrete floors.

(3) ALL CONCRETE FLOORS in main building and boiler house.

(4) ALL CONCRETE TRENCHES and covers of same, if of concrete.

(5) ALL CONCRETE STEPS AND STAIR SLABS.

(6) ALL CONCRETE AND TILE ROOF SLABS.

(7) ALL CONCRETE FLOOR FINISH AND BASE.

(8) ALL CONCRETE PLATFORMS at entrances.

(9) SUCH OTHER WORK as is herein set forth.

(B) OMISSIONS. Exterior walls and drives will be included in Div. Z.

ART. 2. GENERAL DESCRIPTION.

Note: Under the headings of this Article, there is given for convenience of Contractors a brief mention, not necessarily complete, of the work included in this Division, full description of which will be found in the following specifications beginning with Div. Z.

(A) CONCRETE FOOTINGS shall be provided under all walls, piers and columns of main building and boiler house and under boiler stack; reinforced, where so indicated.

(B) CONCRETE FOUNDATION WALLS shall be provided extending from footings to bottom of cut stone base course; also concrete dwarf-walls in basement as shown.

(C) WATERPROOFING. Exterior walls below grade shall be waterproofed on the outside. All walls below grade shall be rendered impervious by the admixture of 8% of hydrated lime or other approved integral waterproofing added to the concrete in accordance with Maker's directions.

(D) FLOORS AND PLATFORMS resting on earth shall be of plain concrete.

(E) TRENCHES shall have concrete floors and walls, rabbeted for covers as detailed. Covers shall be of reinforced concrete where so indicated.

(F) COLUMNS shall be of reinforced concrete as detailed.

(G) REINFORCED CONCRETE LINTELS shall be provided for all openings in concrete and brick walls, except where steel lintels are particularly called for.

(H) ALL ROOF SLABS shall be reinforced concrete as shown and detailed. Certain of these shall have tile cores where called for.

(I) ALL ROOF SLABS shall be of reinforced concrete as shown and detailed. Certain of these shall have tile cores where called for.

(J) REINFORCED CONCRETE STAIRS shall be provided in boiler room and in main entrances.

(K) FLOOR FINISH. Finished troweled surface of cement mortar shall be provided for all floors except where terrazzo or wood is specified.

(L) CONCRETE BASE shall be provided in connection with all concrete-finished floors in all plastered rooms.

ART. 3. CEMENT AND LIME.

(A) ALL CEMENT shall be fresh Portland, of approved brand, capable of meeting the test requirements, and delivered in original cloth bags bearing the brand and name of the Maker.

(B) A TESTING ENGINEER, or a reputable testing laboratory, selected by the Architect, shall be employed by the Contractor who shall include in his contract price a sum equivalent to $— per 1000 bags to pay for such testing.

(C) TESTING. All cement shall be tested before using. All tests shall conform to the latest standard specifications of the American Society for Testing Materials and reports of same made in duplicate to the Architect. No cement may be used except by such tests to comply with said specifications. The Contractor shall therefore submit his first samples from local stock immediately after signing contract and the Architect reserves the right to release for use any cement after reports on the 7-day test, together

with tests for which insoluble residue, loss of ignition and chemical analysis reports have been submitted and found satisfactory. The 28-day tests shall be made in these cases where called for. The Architect may also, for the purpose of expediting construction, release for use cement in storage which is certified by the appointed testing-engineer for laboratory.

NOTE: A TESTING ENGINEER shall be named as above called for. For purposes of testing the above sample shall be taken from each 60 bags at random and properly tagged. Failure of any one of the samples to comply with the requirements will be, if so judged by the Architect, cause said cement to be rejected and for which the Contractor shall be paid for such car-lots or bins from which such sample was taken.

(E) NON-STAINING CEMENT shall be white Portland of a brand approved by the Architect and guaranteed not to produce stains in contact with Bedford stone.

(F) CEMENT STONE and CRUSHERD CONCRETE in finished, damp or caked bags will be wholly rejected. All cement shall be properly stacked in water- and weather-proof sheds with floors 12" above ground. Each shipment shall be labeled for identification. Cement from warehouse shall be tagged to indicate satisfactory test. Cement delivered from warehouse without test-tags will be rejected.

(G) LIME shall be approved mill-hydrate or fresh wood-lime in open bags. No caked lumps or other objectionable source will not be accepted. Lime shall meet all requirements of the standard specifications of the American Society for Testing Materials. Hydrated lime shall be delivered in original packages bearing brand and name of the Maker and shall be stored as specified in preceding paragraph.

ART. 4. AGGREGATES.

(A) SAND shall be "torpedo" or equal, composed of clean, hard, strong, durable, uncoated grains and shall be free from injurious amounts of dust, lumps, soft or flaky particles, shale, alkali, organic matter, loam or other deleterious substances. It shall range evenly in size from fine to coarse, none passing a No. 100 sieve and none remaining on a No. 10 sieve.

(B) CRUSHED STONE AND GRAVEL shall be clean, hard, strong, durable and uncoated, free from injurious amounts of soft, friable, thin, elongated or laminated particles, alkali or other deleterious matter. It shall range evenly in size from fine to coarse. For plain or mass concrete, it shall pass a 2" ring and be retained on a Y₂₄" ring; for reinforced work, it shall pass a ¾" ring and be retained on a ¾" ring.

(C) CINDERS shall be fine, clean, soft and free from an excessive amount of unburned coal. Cinders from gas-plants or other objectionable source will not be accepted.

(D) WATER shall be fresh, clean and free from salt, earth, dirt and sewage.

(G) FLOOR FINISH MATERIALS shall be as required to produce the surface specified and of color selected.

(H) SAMPLES of all sand, crushed stone, gravel and floor finish material shall be submitted to the Architect and contractor may not be used without his approval. Such approval before delivery shall not operate to prevent subsequent rejection of such materials as are not up to specification.

ART. 5. REINFORCEMENT AND BUILT-IN MEMBERS.

(A) ALL REINFORCING BARS AND RODS shall be re-rolled rail or new billet stock in rounds or squares meeting all requirements of the American Society for Testing Materials. Bars shall be deformed, of full length required and accurately bent to details.

(B) CHAIRS of approved pattern shall be used where called for or where necessary to retain reinforcing members in proper position.

(C) STEEL WIRE FABRIC shall be triangular mesh of catalog description shown on drawings or equal cross-sectional area of other make, if duly approved.

(D) BEAM CLIPS AND INSERTS for various uses shall be provided where called for and of approved material, make and pattern.

(E) ANCHORS for floor strips shall be galv. bent clips of approved make and design, to properly fit the wood strips.

(F) IN GENERAL, all reinforcing material and inserts shall be free from paint, oil, dirt, scale and excessive rust.

(G) SHOP DRAWINGS. The Architect's drawings shall show the disposition of reinforcing members and their size, arrangement and typical details. The Contractor shall develop these into complete setting diagrams and shall
prepare details and schedules showing each structural and reinforcing member in exact position and spacing, exact location of doors and windows, locations of water, steam, gas, and electric lines, businesslike, it is no reason for one writing General Conditions to others.

Perfection in an architect's superintendence is no more possible than in any other phase of the service he renders. If he can get his superintendents, his architects, and his clerks-to-themselves he can, of course, better his supervision but it is obvious that the quantity of supervision needed varies as the size of the work being done so that the amount of a single clerk or too large for one man to handle in this capacity. Our "conditions" must meet all other conditions.

In other works, that is, because an architect or superintendental of the architect has the same right to have it assumed that he is supervising to the best of his ability that the contractor has that he is living up to his contract. Wherefore, if the contractor insists on something improper a day or a week after it should have been observed, who shall suffer, the man who did it, the man who is paid to watch him or the man who is paying? Why not the first of these? And here is the other case in point: An addition to Par. D of Art. 3 of the clause which invites criticism.

Future, I will cite two instances. A company had installed a new brick yard and was offering common brick below their competitors' rates. Their brick was alleged to be inferior and I was asked to inspect it at the yard before the contractor would buy it. I saw that every condition was all right but the brick delivered were not. I have had similar experience with gravel and cement. If the architect is so business-like to put their orders in writing, then they are entitled to the oft-repeated criticism on that score.

In that case, it might be well for them to remedy that defect in their practice by having their superintendent (or of my superintendents also) carry memo-books containing carbon sheets so that orders can be written on the spot, if advisable, and duplicates sent to office file. As a matter of fact, the two paragraphs (D of Art. 5 and C of Art. 6) are perfectly consistent, both as to the issuance of written orders by the architect or of oral instructions by the architect or his superintendent. Under the head of "Instructing for which the specifications do not demand writing, would come such items as: Request to crowd a certain bit of work in readiness for others.

Suggestion that certain undesirable mechanic be fired. Suggestion that certain material be brought on ground faster. Demand that certain materials be unloaded with greater care. Warning that certain features must be better protected. Request that some individual be on the job at a certain time. Suggestion that certain work be held back until architect or owner can be consulted. Etc. etc., almost ad infinitum.

In fact, it is because there are so many of these things to be said and done and because the line between those which do not require record and those which do is so hard to draw, that one can easily get the habit of not keeping notes enough. It is a dangerous habit because, without a note to the contractor or, at least, a mention of the more important things, his remembrance of that of his foreman, is not likely to correspond with that of the architect or his representative. Therefore, on all properly conducted operations, the contractor must have written orders for everything which is of sufficient importance to make a matter of record.

If architects (some architects) insist upon being unbusinesslike, it is no reason for one writing General Conditions accordingly.

In conclusion, Mr. Gowen and I seem to agree here, except as to the manner of expression. If I knew how to force contractors to get advance rulings on all matters which they consider inexplicently difficult, I would surely incorporate it. But, when one is constantly dealing with new architects on a considerable building program, it simply can't be done.

5. Yes, a clause should be inserted, as Mr. Gowen suggests, obligating the owner, through the architect, to furnish all necessary information in ample time to avoid hindrance to carrying out the progress schedule.

6. I find nothing in Par. C of Art. 4 (which I think Mr. Gowen intended in place of "B") excepting the architect from responsibility for his acts, except that the second word "such" was accidentally omitted from the last sentence: "The Architect's approval, in such instance, does not make him or the owner responsible for errors in such documents nor for any other unauthorized deviation from the terms of the contract." It was probably this omission which invited criticism.

7. Mr. Gowen's compliment is appreciated.

8. 9. This is the only part of Mr. Gowen's letter wherein we really disagree. Perhaps such a difference of opinion would be lessened if I had introduced definitions differentiating between an architect's orders and his instructions to contractors. If, as Mr. Gowen states, everyone knows that architects cannot be counted upon to be sufficiently business-like to put their orders in writing, then they are entitled to the oft-repeated criticism on that score.
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Electric Refrigeration for Residential Apartments.—New publication dealing completely with use of Coltex with information for the architect and specification writers. Drawings, specifications, etc. 60 pp. 8 1/2 x 11. Delco Light Co., Dayton, Ohio.

Uteca Imperial Boilers.—A new catalog covering boilers and radiation. Much useful information included. Catalog of printings and insulations, etc. 8 1/2 x 11. 36 pp. Uteca Heater Co., Uteca, Napoleon, Ohio.


A. C. E. Steam Trap, Catalog "A."—Describes this specialty with its application in modern buildings. W. B. Con- noy Inc., 250 West 33rd Street, New York City.


Austral Windows.—AIA File 37-C, Catalog No. 28, illustrating complete line with detail drawings, weather strip details, etc. 48 pp. 8 1/2 x 11. Austral Window Co., 161 Park Avenue, New York City.

The New Finger Writes.—A brochure on the subject of hydrated lime as used in modern building work. Published illustra tively. 48 pp. 8 1/2 x 11. National Lime Association, Chicago, Ill.

Everything for the Fireplace.—Portfolio with illustrations of fireplace and fireproof fixtures and accessories, including Glow-Hot, electric heater, a feature Standard filling size, 8 1/2 x 11. Colonial Fireplace Co., 4692 Roosevelt Road, Chicago, III.

Type F-18 Electric Dumbwaiter.—Data sheet illustrating and describing this item of equipment. Detail drawings showing installation. Warner Elevator Mfg. Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

Aqua-Silk, the New Waterproof Shower Curtain.—Promotional folder with color samples describing this new material for the well appointed bathroom. Crane Co., Chicago, Ill.

Knife Switches and Accessories.—Catalog No. 25 showing this in full complete. 22 pp. 8 1/2 x 11. Frank Adam Electric Co., St. Louis, Mo.

Brass Pipe for Water Service.—Bulletin B-1 monograph of the advantages of brass in water lines, including data for architects, engineers and contractors. 8 1/2 x 11. 32 pp. The American Brass Co., Waterbury, Conn.


Basic specification for Tile Work.—A most valuable document for all architects, draftsmen and specification writers covering the entire question of setting and laying tile of all kinds. Complete and detailed specifications for all types of work under all conditions; ample space for memoranda. 40 pp. 8 1/2 x 11. Associated Tile Mfrs, Beaver Falls, Pa.

Architects' and Engineers' Built-up Roofing Reference Series, Vol. 1.—Plat roof specifications. A valuable document for all craftsmen engaged in the specialty. 16 full page blue prints, specifications and descriptive text. 8 1/2 x 11. The Barrett Co., 40 Rec ord St., New York City.

Plastering Specifications.—Specification folder covering standard forms for the construction of the specification writer with 16 full page blue prints, specifications and descriptive text. 8 1/2 x 11. The Barrett Co., 40 Record St., New York City.

Wall and Ceiling Handbook.—Data on wall and ceiling construction for the residence. 16 pp. 8 1/2 x 7 1/2. Bost-wick Steel Co., 12 W. 43rd St., New York City.


Inges.—Attractive little booklet published as a tribute to the memory of Jeanne Auguste Dominique Ingres, the great French artist. Photogravure illustrations of notable drawings. Canson & Montbrero, 461 8th Ave., New York City.
Win-Dor Casement Window Operators.—Catalog No. 5 describing modern casement hardware, sectional drawings and standard half size details. 14 pp. 8½ x 11. The Cramton Window Co., 1259 Polk Blvdg., Chicago, Ill.

Quality Centrifugal Pumps.—Specification folder, loose-leaf, containing complete data on all types of pumps. 8 x 11. Chicago Pump Co., 2330 Wolfram St., Chicago, Ill.

The Cutler Mall Chute.—Illustrated booklet describing the Cutler Mall Chute, four letters from the upper stories of buildings. 12 pp. 8 x 10. The Cutler Mall Chute Co., East New York, N.Y.

Dahlstrom Condo Base.— Covers subject of electric wiring distribution in the modern building. Full size details covering all applications. Specifications: 8½ x 11. Dahlstrom Metallic Door Co., Jamestown, N. Y.

Metal and Glass Products.—Illustrated data sheet showing variety of glass construction and other items of interest to the architect. Standard filing size. Wm. A. Daunt Co., 110 East 42nd St., New York.

Modern Mosaic and Terrazzo Floors, Publication A.— Brochure with 34 full page color plates showing various patterns of floors suitable for various types of buildings. Distributed on demand, complete specifications and complete data on the subject. 60 pp. 8½ x 11. Cloth binding. L. Del Turco & Bros., Inc., Harrison, N. J.

Drawing Materials.— General Catalog No. 11 covering everything in the drafting-room with trade prices. Fully indexed, cloth bound, 460 pp. 8 x 9. Eugen von Aachen Co., 166 West 29th St., N. Y. C.

Theatrical Lighting Equipment and Effects.—Catalog and handbook covering line of specialties, technical data on the latest addition data. 76 pp., full page plates of exteriors and layouts. Display Stage Lighting Co., Inc., 344 West 44th St., New York City.

The Dunham Handbook No. 214.— Covers subject of radiation and all other matters pertaining to the modern heating plant. Sectional drawings and typical layouts. Many of these pictures are hand-picked. 144 pp. C. A. Dunham Co., 230 E. Ohio St., Chicago, Ill.

Equipment and Supplies for Architects, Engineers and Contractors.—Illustrated catalog showing full line of everything required in the drafting room. 128 pp. 6 x 9. Electro Sun Co., 161 Washington St., New York City.

Published by the same firm, Drafting Room Furniture. Illustrated, technical information. Wood, metal, concrete, and other specialties required in the modern drafting room. 40 pp. 5 x 7.


Bathroom Accessories, AIA File No. 23.—Handsome and useful document setting forth for the architect and specifier writer complete line of accessories for the modern bathroom, together with color plates showing different surfaces: layouts, drawings to scale, instructions for installing fixtures and complete specifications. 36 pp. 5½ x 11. The Fairfacts Co., 631 Petroleum Securities Building, Los Angeles, Calif.

Lighting Service for Banks and Insurance Companies.—Catalog No. 125 illustrates the types of equipment required in the modern banks. Drawings showing layouts and installation of fixed and portable lighting units. Much technical data on modern lighting. 32 pp. 8½ x 11. I. P. Frink Inc., 244th Street & 11th Avenue, New York City.

Temperature Regulation.—Technical bulletin on subject of temperature regulation under all conditions. Complete technical data, charts, etc. 16 pp. 8½ x 11. The Fulton Co., Knoxville, Tenn.

United Storage Floors.— A new booklet on the subject of the modern garage with a special arrangement of floor space, illustrated with six pages of diagrams and her useful data. Standard filing size, 5½ x 11. Garage Expe., 1900 Bryant Ave., Louisville, Ky.

Examples of Work in Georgia Marble.— Loose-leaf portfolio containing 46 full page plates of exterior and interior details on heavy plate paper. Georgia Marble Co., Tate, Ga.


The Pergola Album No. 29.—Illustrating many types of pergolas. Designed to show those in use in country houses and grounds. 8 x 11. Hartmann-Sanders Co., Elston & Webster Ave., Chicago, Ill.


International Casements.— Attractive booklet on subject of windows for homes of distinction and character. Illustrations of excellent English and American domestic architecture, drawings and photographs, interiors and exteriors. 24 pp. 8 x 10. International Casement Co., Jamestown, N. Y.

Jenkins Valves.—Four convenient handbooks classified according to types of buildings. The series covers hotels, apartment houses, clubs, auditoriums, theatres, industrial plants, offices and loft buildings, banks and stores, public buildings, schools, churches and community houses. Jenkins Bros., 40 White St., New York City.

The Regulation of Temperature and Humidity.—Complete catalog, handbook and specification guide, showing in detail the entire line of Johnson Temperature Controlling Devices for all types of buildings. 64 pp. 8½ x 11. Johnson Service Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

Published by the same firm, The Sanitary Disposal of Waste in hospitals, also Blue Print with complete instructions as to layout for all types of buildings.

PERSONALS

Francis R. Wegg, Architect, has severed his connection with The Hubbell & Benes Co., and is now associated with John H. Graham & Co., 1610 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

Hudson & Munsell, Architects, have removed their offices to 631 Petroleum Securities Building, Los Angeles, Calif.

Cramer & Wise, Architects and Engineers, are completing the firm of Cramer, Bartlett and Wise, at the same location. 124 West Fourth St., Room 507, Los Angeles, Calif.

Harry Sims Bent, Architect, has opened an office at 2410 West Seventh St., Los Angeles, Calif.

W. Ray Oberlin and J. Frank Newlon have formed the firm of Oberlin & Newlon, Architects, 6654-6859 North Diamond St., Mansfield, Ohio.

William N. Bowman Company, Architects and Engineers, has removed its offices to 612-619 Insurance Bldg., 14th and Champa Streets, Denver, Col.

Harry Ooteuck, architect, has removed his offices to 154 East 61st St., New York, N. Y.

Arthur L. Acker, Architect, has removed his office to 629 Petroleum Securities Building, Los Angeles, Calif.

Samuel Biderman, formerly with Lang and Witchell, has opened an office for the practice of architecture at 927 Athletic Club Bldg., Dallas, Texas.

M. W. Somervell and J. L. Putnam, Architects, have removed their office to 904-905 Commercial Exchange Building, Eighth and Olive Streets, Los Angeles, California.

Ralph C. Flewelling, Architect, has opened his new office at 1218 Taft Bldg., Dallas, Texas.

Robert L. Harris, Architect, has removed his offices to 516 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.

Clarence W. Hunt, winner of the Le Brun Traveling Scholarship for 1925, sailed on June 16th for England. He will also visit France, Spain and Italy.

Wm. C. Lauritzen, Architect, has removed his office to 690 Eighth Avenue, New York, where A. W. Webster, Architect, will be associated with him.

Munroe Walker Copper, Jr., Architect, has removed his office to 4500 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

Ollivier Viong, Architect, has opened an office in the Scher Building, Palm Beach, Florida.

COMMENTS ON "SUBSTITUTION"

(Continued from page 99)

If the client reposes full confidence in the integrity and in the ability of his architect, then it should not be difficult for the client to construct the item for himself, his architect may, with the client's knowledge, construct the item, and then deliver the finished article, which is the subject of this letter.

Very truly yours,

THE FAIRFACTS CO. INC.

(Signed) S. D. Baker.
A Free Employment Service for Readers of Pencil Points

Other items on page 124

Wanted: Superintendent capable of writing specifications for small office, doing a good grade of work both commercial and residential. Also two good general draftsmen and one designer. Permanent position if satisfactory. Location Miami, Florida. Give full particulars in first letter. Address Box Miami care Pencil Points.

Wanted: Competent Architectural draftsman, salary sixty to eighty dollars per week, according to ability. Submit samples of work, together with references and outline of experience, also photograph. P. O. Box 274, West Palm Beach, Florida.

Architectural Draftsman desires permanent position in the North or East. Box 100, hold B.S. and B.S. degree. Two years' architectural training. Two years' experience in architect office and six years' experience in teaching mechanical and architectural drawing in the high schools of Texas. I can letter, trace, draw details, perspectives, etc. Salary $40 per week to start on. Address H. H. Wright, San Angelo, Texas.


Assistant Professor of Architectural Design. Must hold master's degree in Architecture from approved college or have had equivalent European training. Address, stating age, salary and record: Frederic Child Biggin. Head Professor of Architecture, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Alabama.

A prominent Fifth Avenue Decorating Establishment has a position for an ambitious draughtsman who has a grounding in architecture and ability in drawing ornament. Box 101, Pencil Points.

Wanted: Experienced architectural draftsman to act as designer and head draftsman for architects' office handling large volume of general work. State references and salary. Box No. 103 care Pencil Points.

Experienced man to take responsible charge of Architectural Draughting Room for large firm of architects. Highest class commercial work. Location—Middle West. Will arrange for interview. Also—High class men as squad leaders and designers. Address Box 104 care Pencil Points.

Specifications and Superintending: Position wanted with Architect who needs a man for specification writing, superintending, checking, etc. Man who appreciates design and understands the value of co-operation between the artistic and practical branches of the work. Over 20 years' experience. Box 100 care Pencil Points.

All around architectural draftsman wants some work in his spare time for either construction or artistic work; moderate charges. C. A. Weber, 537 Garden Street, Hoboken, N. J.

Position wanted, anywhere, by thoroughly experienced and absolutely accurate cast stone draftsman, aged 33, capable of handling the largest of jobs by himself. Box 102 Pencil Points.

Young man desires position with building construction company. Thorough training and experienced in drafting, estimating and general construction. Will go anywhere in the United States. L. Albert Royston, Md.

Young man would like tracing to do at home. Has had four and a half years experience, two years for technical illustrator, one year, mechanical detailer and tracer. Box No. 105 care Pencil Points.

Young man, seventeen years old, would like a position in architect's office—no experience. Salary no consideration. Box 106 care Pencil Points.

Designer wishes consulting designing, especially Gothic Church work and Church furniture. Box 107 care Pencil Points.

Wanted: Superintendent in New York to represent architect at building as clerk of works. Write giving experience and salary. Box 108 care Pencil Points.

SCHOOLS

The Cleveland School of Architecture

Offers a general course (leading to a degree) established by The American Institute of Architects—Cleveland Chapter—cooperating with the Cleveland School of Art and Western Reserve University.

Classes are limited in size, permitting maximum attention to the needs of the individual student.

"The advantages an open man in the field of architecture" are vividly expressed in a quotation from the late John M. Carrere in our circular. Address the Director, CLEVELAND SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

1146 Juniper Road - - - Cleveland, Ohio

BEAUX-ARTS INSTITUTE OF DESIGN

126 East 75th Street, New York, N. Y.

Nominal Fee for instruction in ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN, SCULPTURE, INTERIOR DECORATION, MURAL PAINTING COMPOSITION.

In cooperation with other educational institutions

courses in SCULPTURE IN ALL ITS BRANCHES AT THE INSTITUTE.

Instructor founded on the principles of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts of Paris:

Circular on Application.

FRENCH GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE

100 SELECTED PLATES

PRICE $6.00

A selection of 100 plates from the archives of the French Government Commission of Historic Monuments. The original work was compiled early in the twentieth century by a committee of eminent archaeologists and architects who were charged with the responsibility of placing before the world the most interesting portion of the voluminous collection of measured drawings, renderings and photographs which had been accumulating since the commission began its work in 1830. Five volumes of 100 plates each were published under the title, "Monuments Historiques," and to these were added two volumes of the cathedrals of France, bringing the total to 650 plates. These volumes have long been out of print and therefore were made unavailable to the majority of designers. In selecting subjects for the present book the editors have endeavored to choose examples that are best suited to become inspirations for use in designing office buildings, schools and other buildings, rather than churches, though to the church architect, the material should also be of great value. There is a short foreword and brief description of each plate, written by John V. Van Pelt, National Builder.

Should you return it in five days your money will be refunded

The Pencil Points Press, Inc.

19 East 24th St., New York
HOW TO SKETCH EVERGREEN FOLIAGE

The study of foliage might well begin with evergreens. They are relatively easy to manage, as their foliage usually conceals trunk and branch structure. However, their contours are important and should be carefully indicated with light lines at the outset.

There are two general methods of treating foliage. One employs light and shade effects and imposes the problem of so designing the lighted and shaded areas as to define the structure of the tree as well as to create a pleasing pattern. The other method practically ignores light and shade. It relies upon the decorative value of the tree shapes.

Cedars are valuable in landscape effects because of their decorative silhouettes. It is natural, therefore, to render them in this manner. When placed against a dark background, however, they must be light in tone and rendered in light and shade as in the lower drawing on this page.

Try building up the tree masses with stroke groupings like these shown. Combine broad strokes with thin, sharp lines for evergreen character.

This is No. 5 of a series of Pencil Lessons prepared by Ernest W. Watson. Write to us if you wish proofs of Lessons 1, 2, 3 and 4, additional proofs of this page, and proofs of lessons which are to come. Write, too, for Free Samples of Dixon's Eldorado and Dixon's "Best" Colored Pencils.

DIXON—PENCILS, Dept. 167-J, Jersey City, N. J.
Day and Night Fuel Economy
Push Button Control
of Temperature

Since 1885 this company has been equipping all classes of buildings with fuel saving automatic temperature regulation. Practically every worthwhile improvement in automatic temperature regulation has been this company's invention and development. The Johnson System of Temperature And Humidity Control has long been regarded as the utmost in possible perfection, and thoroughly efficient. Now The Johnson System has been brought to the very final step of complete temperature regulation: the addition of the DUAL THERMOSTAT: day and night temperature adjustment by a single push button control.

The DUAL THERMOSTAT
IN THE JOHNSON SYSTEM OF TEMPERATURE AND HUMIDITY CONTROL

At the end of the day, the building manager presses a push button on the wall of his office. The heat in all of the rooms vacated for the night is shut off, or lowered to the very minimum: and the heat only for those rooms to be used at night is left on.

Next morning, pressing the same push button restores ALL of the rooms in the building to normal heat for the day. The great night time fuel saving possibilities, the certainty and valuable convenience furnished are readily appreciated.

The fact that this company recommends the DUAL THERMOSTAT is sufficient assurance that it is totally practical and reliable. However, it is having ample success in the many installations already made to furnish further endorsement of its value. A Johnson Service Company engineer will gladly call with details: as applied to your particular type of building: and with a working model to demonstrate.

JOHNSON SERVICE COMPANY
Main Office and Factory: MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN
AUTOMATIC TEMPERATURE AND HUMIDITY CONTROL SINCE 1885

TWENTY-NINE BRANCHES:

ALBANY
ATLANTA
BOSTON
BUFFALO
CHICAGO
CLEVELAND
CINCINNATI
DALLAS

DES MOINES
DETROIT
DENVER
GREENSBORO, N. C.
INDIANAPOLIS
KANSAS CITY
LOS ANGELES

MINNEAPOLIS
NEW YORK
PITTSBURG
PORTLAND
PHILADELPHIA
SEATTLE
SAN FRANCISCO

SALT LAKE CITY
ST. LOUIS
CALGARY, ALTA.
MONTREAL, QUE.
TORONTO, ONT.
VAN COUVER, B. C.
WINNIPEG, MAN.