Typifying the manner standing seam sheet copper roofing may be used over multiple dwelling entrances to impart warmth and color... and to accentuate the structure's individuality.

**Anaconda Copper**

THE AMERICAN BRASS COMPANY, General Offices: Waterbury, Connecticut
Subsidiary of Anaconda Copper Mining Company • In Canada: ANACONDA AMERICAN BRASS LTD., New Toronto, Ont.
The logical interpretation of exterior-interior design—goal of Don Hatch, New York Architect, whose residential practice is represented by five houses in this issue—implies a contract that gives the Architect full authority. Hatch calls it Complete Service, whether personally given or through collaboration with other designers, decorators, and landscape men, and he maintains that this practice is to the best interest of the Client as well as the Architect.

Given a commission for Complete Service, the Architect can marshal the factors that will govern or affect the design, plan for the proper relation of all elements of the new building, avoid compromises that would injure any single part, and continuously coordinate the design and execution. Hatch’s procedure has been to familiarize himself with the requirements of the client, the character of the site, and the expenditure allowable, prior to the first study sketches and models. With these studies he is painstaking. When his client clearly understands and approves the building and furnishings proposed, precise working drawings are started and exacting specifications are written. Hatch then supervises all stages of construction, landscaping, and decorating.

Before starting to design the Desert House near Palm Springs, he inquired about the living and entertaining habits of the client: the number of members of the family, servants, and guests to be provided for; hobbies and preferences of these people; annoyances the client had experienced in other houses in the past; and what the client wanted in this winter home. Hatch then studied many photographs of the unusual site, determined the vistas, and made his first sketches and models. The hues of the desert wild flowers suggested a color.
THE CLIENT FOR WHOM DON HATCH DESIGNED THIS WINTER HOME HAS ACQUIRED 160 ACRES OF DESERT NEAR PALM SPRINGS, SURROUNDED BY THE PICTURESQUE SANTA ROSE MOUNTAINS. THE DESERT IS A MASS OF FLOWERS FROM NOVEMBER TO MAY AND THE DESIGN TAKES ADVANTAGE OF UNUSUAL VISTAS. A DRIFT FENCE PROTECTS THE FORMAL PLANTING OF DESERT SHRUBS BETWEEN THE LIVING TERRACE AND THE SWIMMING POOL (SEE PLOT PLAN)

THE ARCHITECTS' FIRST CONSIDERATION WAS TO ORIENT THE HOUSE FOR SUN AND PREVAILING WINDS.
THE WIDE, SUNNY LIVING TERRACE. (SAMUEL GOTTSCHO PHOTOS, COURTESY "TOWN AND COUNTRY"

TWO MORE FAMILY BEDROOMS AND A MAID'S ROOM ARE ON THE SECOND FLOOR, OTHER SERVANT ROOMS BEING LOCATED IN THE BASEMENT BENEATH THE TERRACE OF THE GUEST WING. NOTE THE TANKS FOR STORAGE OF THE RAINWATER FOR HOUSEHOLD USES, FED BY LEADERS FROM THE LIMESTONE ROOF GUTTERS. IT IS A BERMUDA CUSTOM TO PUT ONE GOLDFISH IN EACH OF THESE TANKS! SALT WATER IS PUMPED UP FOR THE SWIMMING POOL AND FOR WATER CLOSETS.

A RESIDENCE IN BERMUDA — BY CARL LANDEFELD AND DON HATCH

OCTOBER 1941
THIS VIEW OF THE CIRCULAR GAME ROOM, THE GUEST WING, AND LARGER MASS OF THE RESIDENCE BEYOND, IS FROM THE SOUTHWEST WHERE A FLAGSTONE WALK LEADS TO THE BOAT LANDING. THE ENTRANCE GALLERY AND COMFORTABLE LOGGIA ON THE WEST SIDE ARE SHOWN BELOW. THE SHUTTERS ON THIS HOUSE ARE A NECESSITY, FOR PROTECTION DURING THE STORM SEASON. THEY ALSO PROVIDE AN EFFECTIVE COLOR NOTE FOR CONTRAST WITH THE DAZZLING CORAL LIMESTONE OF THE WALLS AND ROOF. THIS NATIVE MATERIAL, QUARRIED ON THE SITE, IS CUT ABOUT THE SIZE OF CEMENT BLOCKS, LAID WITH MORTAR AND RENDERED WITH LIME. INTERIOR FINISH, PLASTER BOARD AND PLASTER OVER WOOD FURRING STRIPS.
FROM THE ARCHITECTS' DRAWINGS, THE INTERIOR DECORATION WAS COMPLETELY DESIGNED BY MARY HOWARD, NEW YORK DECORATOR, BEFORE SHE VISITED THE HOUSE. EVERY PIECE OF THE FURNITURE WAS CAREFULLY SELECTED TO SUGGEST THE INFORMAL TEMPO OF SEMI-TROPICAL LIVING AND THE SUCCESS OF HER ARRANGEMENT IS EVIDENCED BY THE PHOTOGRAPHS HERE. PASTEL TINTS EMPHASIZE THE SIMPLICITY...
THE CIRCULAR GAME ROOM IS LIGHTED FROM A COVE AT THE CEILING LINE. LAMPS ARE GENERALLY USED ELSEWHERE, AS IN THE SPACIOUS LIVING ROOM ACROSS-PAGE AND THE MASTER'S BEDROOM BELOW. IN THE WHITE AND GREEN DINING ROOM (BELOW, ACROSS-PAGE) THERE IS AN EFFECTIVE ALCOVE OF FROSTED MIRRORS FLANKED BY LIGHTED NICHES CONTAINING FIGURINES. THE FURNITURE IS WARM GRAY
TO DEMONSTRATE NEW USES
OF GLASS IN HOMES, HATCH
DESIGNED THE NOW FAMED
PITTSBURGH PLATE GLASS
COMPANY HOUSE FOR THE
NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, IN
THE "TOWN OF TOMORROW."
IT WAS BUILT OF CONCRETE
POURED IN PLYWOOD FORMS,
WITH INTERIOR PARTITIONS
OF NATURAL COLOR PLY­
WOOD. GLASS BLOCK ON THE
STREET SIDE AND PLATE
GLASS ON THE GARDEN SIDE
ADMITTED MAXIMUM LIGHT
THIS HOUSE ALSO WAS CAREFULLY STUDIED IN SKETCHES AND SMALL-SCALE MODELS BEFORE CONSTRUCTION. THEN WHEN THERE WAS A DEMAND FOR ADVANCE PHOTOGRAPHS, THEODORE CONRAD, JERSEY CITY MODELMAKER, WAS COMMISSIONED TO BUILD A COMPLETE MODEL, AT ONE-HALF INCH SCALE. HIS REMARKABLE SKILL IS ATTESTED BY THE TWO SMALL PHOTOS OF THIS MODEL SHOWN AT THE RIGHT.
scheme (redwood, dark blue, black brick, and white asbestos roof) and the sudden violent temperature changes dictated a house that might be readily opened or closed, heated or cooled, lighted or darkened.

A trip to the site, 160 acres in a valley of the Santa Rosa mountains, confirmed the architect’s earlier impressions. He checked on building materials available there, studied the elusive beauty of the desert, and its difficult vagaries as well. Returning to his office, he completed the sketches and models and made final selections of interior finishes. This definite picture of the house won the client’s approval. Working drawings and specifications were then prepared, and on another trip to Palm Springs the plans were let out for bidding.

“The client was definite in his desires but not biased,” Hatch recalls. They agreed on a house of glass screens in a redwood frame, resting on a broad platform of dark blue wood blocks patterned in four-foot squares with white maple strips. Corrugated glass was used where privacy was desired, plate glass for unbroken view. One concrete slab supports the house and terraces, and the white asbestos roof extends with broad eaves to shade the glass screens. The dark blue floor of dyed redwood also absorbs glare. The clerestory provides special ventilation and its overhang conceals fluorescent lighting. The forced-air heating system also has provision for a cooling coil. Hatch often favors forced-air systems because of their possible utility for cooling in summer.

In association with Carl Landefeld, Hatch designed the Bermuda residence shown on pages 620-625 for socially-prominent New York clients who owned Perot’s Island, in the Riddles Bay section across the bay from Hamilton. Their first concern was to choose the best site and exposure, then to design with proper precautions against the storm season, the rather constant humidity, threat of semi-tropical insects, and seasonal changes. Water for drinking and other purposes had to be provided, trees and shrubs brought to the island, and the various units and services of an independent estate provided. Again the architect spared no effort in the preliminary stages, making a complete model of the island and the buildings proposed to acquaint the clients with the design. In this way costly changes after work was begun were eliminated. Construction followed the traditional methods of Bermuda—coral limestone being quarried soft on the site (it hardens with exposure to the air) for walls.
and roof—and the style suggests the British colonial work on the other islands. The shutters, necessary for the storm season, are not as sharply silhouetted against the walls as the photographs indicate. Loggias, terraces, and sheltering masses of oleanders, hibiscus, and other shrubbery invite outdoor living.

A commission of an entirely different sort came to Hatch when he was chosen to design the “Bride’s House” for the “Town of Tomorrow” at the New York World’s Fair. It was intended to be a low-cost house that also could be maintained at minimum-cost. As the building was primarily an exhibit, manufacturers supplied a profusion of materials but Hatch points out that the same design could have been executed more simply for a client intending to occupy the house. The plan features a “sun pocket” on the south where the occupants can enjoy the sun in winter, sheltered from winds; or by opening the doors behind the pocket and shading the pocket with an awning they can have a cool retreat in summer. All the rooms are well-ventilated and brought closer to the outdoors by a window-height planting border at either side. This unusual decorative element can be lighted at night from the roof overhang.

The house was built of black brick and asbestos siding with redwood trim, a black composition roof, and projected steel sash. The terrace was of cement flagging with grass joints, and the serpentine wall at the front of black brick. On the interior, redwood plywood, left natural color, was used, with a cork floor in the living room and a red-toned industrial asphalt tile floor in the entrance porch and bedrooms.

Two designs for the suburban house that must afford privacy from street traffic, but at the same time give the occupants a sense of indoor-outdoor living, were produced by Hatch for his Glass House at the New York World’s Fair and for a suburban home in Connecticut, of which the model and plan are shown (pages 630-631). The house at the Fair was a frank expression in poured concrete glass block, and plate glass. But the character of the site and the desire of the client to adhere to the traditions of the
Connecticut countryside suggested a modification of the exterior of the second house. In both, the street front is on the north side, naturally lending itself to a formal treatment, while the garden fronts on the south are open and invite comfortable informal living. Again the "sun pocket" makes its appearance and lends interest to both designs.
THE "BRIDE'S HOUSE" ALSO WAS DESIGNED FOR THE "TOWN OF TOMORROW" AT THE NEW YORK WORLD'S FAIR, TO DEMONSTRATE PLANNING FOR LOW-COST, LOW-MAINTENANCE. IT WAS UNUSUALLY OPEN ON THE SOUTH, FOR WINTER SUN AND SUMMER BREEZES, THE SERPENTINE WALL AND WINDOW-HEIGHT FLOWER BEDS GAVE SPECIAL INTEREST. AS IT WAS AN EXHIBITION HOUSE, A VARIETY OF MATERIALS WAS USED. NOTE BLACK BRICK AND ASBESTOS SIDING.
UNIT FURNITURE OF MULTIPLE USE, WHICH MAY BE ARRANGED IN A GREAT NUMBER OF COMBINATIONS, WON FOR EERO SAARINEN AND CHARLES O. EAMES THE COMPETITION PRIZE FOR LIVING ROOM FURNITURE. EXECUTED IN HONDURAS MAHOGANY, THE CASEWORK IS FINISHED ON THE BACK SO THAT ANY SIDE MAY FACE OUTWARD. THE LAMP IN THE TOP PHOTOGRAPH WON FOR PETER PFISTERER THE PRIZE IN THE MOVABLE LIGHTING EQUIPMENT CATEGORY.

ORGANIC DESIGN IN HOME FURNISHINGS

EXHIBITED SEPT. 24-NOV. 9 AT MUSEUM OF MODERN ART

OCTOBER 1941
MARTIN CRAIG AND ANN HATFIELD WON THE ONE-Room Apartment Furniture Competition. They designed the mirrored birch vanity and bench (left above). A frame hung from the wall supports the three-drawer, gray-toned walnut unit and mirror (above right). Bedroom unit winner designed by OSCAR STONOROV and WILLO VON MOLTKE. EMRICH NICHOLSON and DOUGLAS MAIER won honorable mention for living room seating (lower left). The birch chair (lower right) and the three-legged coffee table are CRAIG and HATFIELD designs. Fabrics on all the chairs won the fabric prize for Marli Ehrman. (ALBERT FENN photos courtesy BLOOMINGDALE'S)
LAST OCTOBER THE MUSEUM OF MODERN ART, DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL DESIGN, ELIOT NOYES, DIRECTOR, INAUGURATED AN INTER-AMERICAN COMPETITION FOR THE DESIGN OF FURNITURE, FABRICS, AND LAMPS. TWELVE DEPARTMENT STORES THROUGHOUT THE COUNTRY SPONSORED THE COMPETITION TO DISCOVER GOOD DESIGNERS, ENGAGE THEM TO CREATE A BETTER ENVIRONMENT FOR TODAY’S LIVING. CONTRACTS WITH FURNITURE MANUFACTURERS WERE OFFERED COMPETITION WINNERS. A SPECIAL DIVISION OF THE COMPETITION WAS HELD FOR DESIGNERS IN LATIN-AMERICAN REPUBLICS WHO CONCENTRATED ON OUTDOOR FURNITURE, AND UTILIZED NATIVE WOODS, TEXTILES, FIBRES, AND HIDES.

“A design may be called organic when there is an harmonious organization of the parts within the whole, according to structure, material, purpose.” ELIOT NOYES

WINNERS IN THE COMPETITION FOR FURNITURE FOR OUTDOOR LIVING WERE HARRY WESE AND BENJAMIN BALDWIN. THEIR TEA WAGON (ABOVE) IS OF TUBULAR STEEL WITH PNEUMATIC TIRES, REMOVABLE TRAYS, WICKER BASKET. OSCAR STONOROV AND WILLO VON MOLTKE WON THE COMPETITION FOR BEDROOM FURNITURE, THEIR GRAY WALNUT COMBINATION CASE SHOWN BELOW IS FLEXIBLE, INTERCHANGEABLE, AND MAY BE MOUNTED ON INTERESTING STRUCTURAL BASES. THE LEFT UNIT HAS STORAGE SHELVES BEHIND CUPBOARD DOORS; THE CENTER UNIT HAS OPEN SHELVES, OR SLIDING TRAYS IF DESIRED; THE RIGHT HAND UNIT HAS A TAMBOUR FRONT CONCEALING SHELVES BEHIND. ANY ONE, TWO, OR THREE OF THE UNITS MAY BE USED.
FIVE PRIZEWINNERS FROM BRAZIL, ARGENTINA, URUGUAY, AND MEXICO ARE REPRESENTED BY FURNITURE INTRODUCING NATIVE WOODS, TEXTILES, FIBRES, AND HIDES. WHEREVER MANUFACTURING FACILITIES EXISTED, THE FURNITURE WAS PRODUCED IN THE DESIGNER’S HOME COUNTRY. IN SOME CASES NATIVE MATERIALS WERE IMPORTED AND THE FURNITURE MADE HERE. THE CHAIR FOR OUTDOOR LIVING (UPPER LEFT) WAS DESIGNED BY BERNARDO RUDOSKY, SAO PAULO, BRAZIL. AT THE UPPER RIGHT IS THE DESIGN OF ROMAN FRESNEDO, MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY. THE CHAIR UTILIZES LEATHER STRAPS ON STEEL FRAMES. THE CHAIRS AND SMALL TABLE IN THE LOWER PHOTOGRAPH REPRESENT THE WORK OF MICHAEL VAN BEUREN, KLAUS GRABE, AND MORLEY WEBB, OF MEXICO CITY. MADE OF PRIMAVERA WOOD AND WOVEN MECATE TAPE, IT IS ONE OF A GROUP OF DESIGNS FROM MEXICO. OTHER PRIZEWINNERS INCLUDED JULIO VILLALOBOS, BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA; XAVIER GUERRERO, MEXICO. (ALAN RICHARDSON PHOTOS COURTESY MODERN MUSEUM)
BEYOND THE PORCH THE GRAVELED DRIVE WIDENS BEFORE THE DOUBLE GARAGE, WITH 16-FOOT STOCK DOOR

RESIDENCE IN CONNECTICUT
DESIGNED BY ANTONIN RAYMOND, ARCHITECT

Before making the first sketch toward design of a home for Mr. and Mrs. J. Delano Hitch and family, at Westport, Connecticut, Architect Antonin Raymond persuaded them to list their "likes" and "dislikes" in a house. To the architect, the most important considerations were to locate the house to best advantage on the property, as regards view and orientation, and to design for utilization of the stock sizes of stock materials, effecting a major economy in construction. The result is that the house is largely open on the south, facing the view and sunshine, but has few windows on the north side which faces the road. This has measurably reduced heating cost in the winter. Edwin Harris, Jr., head of Raymond's New York office, collaborated in the design and superintended construction. The contractors were Thompson & Hawley, of Bridgeport, Connecticut. The clients' lists served as a basis for discussion with the architect, then later as the house was studied and there were further conferences it became apparent that the clients were going to get what they wanted—in some respects more than they had expected.

Likes were cross-ventilation, well-lighted kitchen shelves, plenty of electric outlets, (Continued on page 644)
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GROUND FLOOR

FIRST FLOOR
The inviting doorway and hall window are protected from weather by a simple porch. Finished in 1/4" plywood with floor of oak, the hall seems spacious but is actually no wider than required by its utility as entrance hall and passage. The stair is well-lighted by a window above (from which the lower photo was made). The same window affords a view, through the house from the front door, of the valley at the back of the residence.
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(Continued from page 637)
maximum light and sunshine, electric lights in closets, conveniently-located telephone outlet plugs, white (not colored) bathrooms, walls that could be painted or papered if a change is desired, and possibly a Japanese Style room. The clients also said they were fond of outdoor sports. They added they would want room in the house for formal entertaining (up to 12 people) and informal parties of 25 to 35 people.

**DISLIKES** were small dark closets, any rooms so dark that lights would be needed in daytime, picture moldings, radiators of any kind, central overhead lighting in the dining room, bathroom basin hardware that spots when wet, heating pipes that creak, doors that won't latch, rats, and drafts!

It was agreed that the house must contain a hall with coat closet, living room, dining room, library or study, kitchen and pantry, laundry, back and front stairs, playroom in the basement, ample storage space and garage in the basement, master bedroom, four other bedrooms, and maid's room, all with ample closets, and with three bathrooms. A two-story house with a basement was expected, though not required. Mrs. Hitch offered more detailed specifications for closet and pantry space, as well as a list of furnishings already in her possession for the principal rooms.

Confining the area to two levels, as pictured here, Raymond gave the clients larger rooms than they had expected, segregated the guest room, united the service portions with the garage, and made the “basement playroom” important by establishing an intimate relation with the family sleeping rooms. Both library and study were provided, the maid's room could be used for two, an extra bath was provided, and one of the principal features of the upper floor is the large terrace, a feature that the clients had wanted but had not expected within the budget.

There are refinements in plan and details that are typical of Raymond's deftness and his thoughtful planning. For instance, the roof was designed with a continuous ridge line and eave line, though the house is shaped to the hillside site. At the same time, the eaves project most on the south side, less on the east and west, and least of all on the north. This projection is such that the winter sun will fill and warm the rooms, all of which open to the south, but the eaves will shade the windows of the main floor in summer when the sun is higher.
The New York City Tunnel Authority presented a challenging opportunity to the architects of the city when it held its recent competition for the Mid-River Ventilation Building of the Brooklyn-Battery tunnel. What a chance! Here was to be built a structure of considerable bulk and height at the very front door of New York, off the north end of Governor's Island. Here was a building to serve a necessary and practical use (certainly not a use to be ashamed of), a building which at the same time would form an important element in the view from Battery Park, from Governor's Island, or for anyone coming down the East River on a boat or passing by the lower end of Manhattan Island. No finer site for an important and exciting piece of architecture could be imagined. And the program was a model of program writing, short, definite, and to the point. Nevertheless, as one studies the program a doubt creeps in. It is not a design for a building for which the Authority is searching: it is merely a facade. Everything else is determined, every structural column set, every piece of mechanical equipment, every duct put in a definite place which must be preserved. Here is no opportunity for a great creative three-dimensional imagination to take a need and transform it into significant form. Instead there is merely the opportunity to take basic forms and sizes already determined and drape around them an exterior surface.

Further study reveals a second basic difficulty in the way of real architectonic creation, for in the very forms of the basic structure established by the program there is an unfortunate duality. Few forms are more regular or suggest more continuous treatment than an octagon; yet here a basic octagonal shape bears at two of its sides, opposite to each other, taller separated exhaust duct structures reaching high above any other necessary portion of the building. Now this is a fundamental architectural error. A creative mind steeped in the meaning of architectural form would realize at once that any such combination of regular octagon and two higher accented sides was a contradiction in terms impossible of any satisfactory frank solution, and would either have developed some system of equalizing the height of the structure or else have abandoned the regular octagon in favor of some plan shape more expressive of the dual height. Evidently the architects were well aware of this difficulty. There were but two possible general choices within the strict cubic limitations and the dictated forms of the program. One was to erect a parapet at the top of the octagon high enough to include the total height of the two duct stacks, thus concealing a functional form in the building for the sake of giving meaning to the octagonal plan. The other choice was to stress the higher stacks and conceal the regularity of the octagon by various systems of setbacks in plan or curves or other elements which necessarily break the scale of the total mass.

The jury evidently felt itself in the same quandary, giving the First Prize to a regular octagonal scheme with a unified skyline, and the Second Prize to one which had emphasized stacks, and intermediate corner treatments. In these two designs the qualities of the two basic partis are developed perhaps to their highest points. The First Prize design does everything possible to monumentalize the structure, setting its louvers between tall, deeply projecting piers with tops which apparently splay up against an interior, thinner wall, carrying
its octagonal top unbroken around, and departing (we hope consciously) from any attempt to express either the basic purpose of the building or the steel structure which is its framework. One feels almost an admiration for the proud disdain of this refusal to be bound by any such mundane things as steel columns and for this desire to produce instead the likeness of a great buttressed masonry tower.

The Second Prize design, No. 37, takes absolutely the reverse attitude. Here is the clear geometry of steel, the simple brick faces framing corners of louvered metal in prismatic shapes. Here below on the first floor are steel and glass windows in continuous bands to flood light into the lower working floors, and large doors to admit machinery. There is in the junction of the octagon shape below the louvers and the prismatic shape above possibly a certain awkwardness, but it is the awkwardness of geometrical intersection only and not of any ill-thought-out artificial expedients. I only wonder why the walls at the east and west sides are channeled whereas those to the north and south are unbroken, for the channeling is not deep enough to produce from any distance strongly marked light and shade and, for me, the channels destroy the geometric quality the rest of the building so eminently possesses. And with all the possibilities in facing materials available why were these surfaces 120 feet and more high and 50 feet wide made of brick? Stone or marble, treated of course as facing and not as structure, or terra cotta in large slabs might have had the quality of monumentality needed. Nevertheless, in its clear composition, in its simple expression of a steel-constructed building, in its frank avowal of its purpose through its prismatic louvered sides, this design of all those premiated seems to this reviewer by far the most distinguished.

Some of the other designs seem to ape office building or skyscraper types of twenty years ago with little, if any, advance evident over many of the designs submitted in the Chicago Tribune competition. They are skyscrapers, but skyscrapers reduced to miniature scale, as though the

THE BRICK-AND-GLASS VENTILATION BUILDING DESIGNED BY THE TUNNEL AUTHORITY, PRIOR TO THE COMPETITION HELD AT THE INSTANCE OF THE FINE ARTS FEDERATION (HEADED BY JAMES C. MACKENZIE) IS SHOWN (LEFT) IN AN ELEVATION AND TWO PHOTOGRAPHS OF A STUDY MODEL, FILED WITH THE CITY ART COMMISSION TO RECORD THE DESIGN
No. 32—First prize design ($2,000) is by McKim, Mead & White. No. 37—Second prize design ($1,000) is by Archibald Manning Brown. Both were among the seven invited competitors. The others were not premiated by Jurors Paul Philippe Cret, George McAneny, James H. Dugan, Robert Kornacher, and Eric Gugler, Chairman. The Tunnel Authority, conscious of the prominence of this building in New York Harbor, obtained RFC funds for a competition (approved by A.I.A.) for the exterior design.
designers were dazed by the whole problem of scale. This is not to say there were not other more imaginative, more exciting designs among the fifty-seven submitted. I have seen only those to which the jury saw fit to award prizes or mentions. Let us not forget that the design was actually for a façade to be hung on a dictated structural steel framework built for the purpose of ventilation. Listen to the jury report analyzing the First Prize design: "The depth of the reveals where openings for ventilation are required had an important effect upon its decision. These deep reveals make angle views seem solid and they add to the interest in light and shade. The building does not cry out with the suggestion that it is merely for the removal of bad air... Recommendation is made that the sculpture be restudied and the piers be somewhat deepened." (The italics are mine.) Of the Second Prize the jury says, "A straightforward solution of the problem, accentuating the function of the structure; economical to build and of good mass and outline." (Italics mine.) What more can one say? Is ventilation a shameful function? Are deep reveals the answer to a steel-framed structure? Or is steel framing itself somehow, again, a shameful thing to be concealed or lied about? Can it be that the jury felt that the whole underlying building system was a mistake and that the structure should have been designed from the beginning as a solid masonry monumental tower? Can it be that all the attempts of forward-look-
ing architects, critics, and teachers to instill the idea that architectural form must, to be valid, flow naturally from function and structure have gone for naught?

Why should a distinguished jury state as its reasons for its first award those very qualities in which the design contradicts the building's function and structure? This is a question much deeper and more important than the decision of this single competition. I think the answer is to be found in what I can only call the “frustrated monument complex” which runs deeply through the subconscious minds of architects and lay people alike. We should be building monuments, expending money and effort on structures built for themselves alone, either to satisfy our aesthetic sense, to memorialize great ideas and people, or to express our civic and national pride. Monuments such as these should be solid and sculptural. Yet we rarely have the opportunity to design such buildings, and our frustration in this desire leads us astray again and again into an attempt to contradict essential architectural integrity by trying to make monuments of utilitarian structures. Only a false monumentality, a contradiction of all the qualities which seem to me to make for good architecture, can result. Utilitarian buildings may be monumental in the true sense of the word, like the best of the T.V.A. structures, but such true monumentality can only come from the complete acceptance of functional demands and structural systems and their expression in the most forthright manner; it can never come from the attempt to confuse the issues. We should be proud of our great tunnels, proud of their necessary functions, proud that we have the means of ventilating them. We should be proud of our command of structural steel, eager to assert its qualities and to create that special kind of beauty which may result from its geometric perfection. Yet against the frustrated monument complex of the jury any attempt to express this pride, any attempt to build a beautiful structure which should be in its very essentials a ventilating building with a structural steel framework, was hamstrung at the outset. The program made impossible any radical form imagination; the frustrated monument complex apparently kept any integrated frank solution of the problem from sympathetic consideration. With this double hurdle can we wonder that the final result is imitative, superficial, play-acting?
A REPLY

The manuscript of my September article, "A.R.P. and Our Office of Civilian Defense," was sent by PENCIL POINTS for comment in Washington. The comments received from James P. Kirby, O.C.D. Information Officer, were forwarded to the author. While PENCIL POINTS was able to make corrections in designation and reference pointed out by Mr. Kirby, time and distance prevented the publication of any reply on the other points raised before this date.

I was very interested to read the comments on my article made by Mr. Kirby of the Office of Civilian Defense. I am grateful for his correction of errors in designation and in certain other particulars for which I apologize.

Mr. Kirby makes certain points which I think require an answer. He says, First, that I "set up a sharp dividing line between Protection and Voluntary Participation, when in reality the two are rather closely connected." That was not my intention. On the contrary, as I have endeavored to make clear throughout all my writings on the subject of Civilian Defense I see any tasks in connection with this as organically inter-related. Any sharp division which may appear implied in my analysis is partly due to the very incomplete description of the structure of the O.C.D. which I had to refer to as it appeared in the press and partly due to the dissection of this structure which seemed necessary for the purpose of a particular set of specialists, in this case the readers of PENCIL POINTS, as a preliminary in trying to arrive at some idea of the form that their contribution might take within this framework. Such a dissection was merely what I believed to be a reasonable, analytical device and was not intended as an arbitrary interpretation of the O.C.D. program.

Second, Mr. Kirby says that I assume "that the O.C.D. is going into the question of air raid protection in a very complete manner and evidently anticipates that it will be carried to a point where this office would be responsible for determining types and standards in material and allocation of manufacturers to produce same. To be perfectly honest, the entire matter of air raid structures occupies a very low priority in our plans. Our progress in this matter has been limited to the issuance of instructional data on air raid shelters." Mr. Kirby's interpretation appears to be due to my concentration on such things as seemed most directly connected with the purposes of the readers of PENCIL POINTS. For this reason I cited certain equipment in preference to, say, that of first aid or fire-fighting. It should not be assumed because of this that I attach a predominant importance to these items insofar as they affect the whole O.C.D. program. My principal concern was to suggest application of design capacity to such parts of the O.C.D. program where they may best be put to an immediate use. I may implement such items as I then enumerated by quoting from an article since published by the head of the O.C.D., Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia. He mentions the following activities in his survey which seem to demand the participation of specialists in Planning, Design, and Construction: "reports of damage, classification of buildings, i.e., comparative safety of good buildings, rescue squads...organized mainly among men in the building trades, demolition squads, repair squads." The mayor continues by mentioning besides these activities, special situations requiring the services of designers, i.e., mobile kitchens, the study and planning of air raid shelters, supervision of the lighting problem. He goes on to say: "enumerating these tasks so rapidly conveys no hint of the preliminary planning, the study, training and co-ordination of information involved in each division...." In this particular, Mayor La Guardia's view of activities to be covered comes close to my surmise.

Third, Mr. Kirby says, "The vastness of our country precludes any uniformity in methods for the application of details for shelters (here Mr. Kirby misses all that is included by implication which might be fire-fighting, first aid equipment, etc.) nor will it be centralized under national control as it probably has been in England...." On this point he appears to be contradicted by his chief in the same article, which is quoted above. Mayor La Guardia says: "Our immediate problem involves not only the training of auxiliary firemen (and here by implication may be included other A.R.P. activities) but also the procurement of emergency equipment in enormous quantities...."

"...standard specifications have been prepared at several factories which are ready to turn out pumps and other emergency equipment...but there are other angles to consider. To avoid the turmoil of hundreds of separate cities bidding against each other for a multitude of individual equipment design the United States civil defense has requested all communities to wait for:

1. The adaptation of standard specifications.
2. A national plan for the acquisition of such equipment."

This quotation from Mayor La Guardia states succinctly the main theme of my article, with which Mr. Kirby finds fault, and, I feel, vindicates my assertions.

The difference in size between the United States and England, on which Mr. Kirby makes a point, is in connection with the subject matter, perhaps more of a superficial distinction than a basic difference. The possibility of establishing uniform standards today surely depends on the character of industrialization. This consideration transcends the question of mere physical differences in land area. In this sense the difference between England and the United States is much reduced. Both are highly industrialized countries. The real difference lies in the fact that in the United States industrialization and mass production has been carried to a much greater point of development, and therefore the standardization advocated is made much more possible here. If one further considers the difference in the two situations established by time, it becomes apparent that the actual war experiences of Spain and England can be turned to account here while the United States is in a preparatory stage and can serve to bring relief from unnecessary wastages and strains to the citizens of the United States should they face war, which the others were not able to escape.

SERGE CHERMAYEFF
ARCHITECTS AND DEFENSE

IN THE FORCED EXPANSION OF THE NATION'S INDUSTRIAL PLANT TO PROVIDE SPACE FOR MORE MEN AND MORE MACHINES TO WORK IN DEFENSE OF AMERICA, ARCHITECTS HAVE HAD A SHARE. NEW INDUSTRIAL FORMS EXPRESSIVE OF THE STEEL, GLASS, BRICK, AND FABRICATED UNITS UTILIZED IN THIS ACCELERATING PROGRAM BEGIN TO STAND FORTH. IN THIS PORTFOLIO OF DRAWINGS AND PHOTOGRAPHS THE EDITORS HAVE SOUGHT TO INDICATE SOME OF THE NEW TRENDS AS WELL AS TO REFLECT THE EVIDENCES OF THE ARCHITECTS' INFLUENCE IN A FIELD OF DESIGN THAT CAME WITHIN PURVIEW OF THE PROFESSION LESS THAN FORTY YEARS AGO. YET THIS IS A PROGRAM HARDLY BEGUN, IF WE ARE TO DECENTRALIZE AND REBUILD OUR PRINCIPAL INDUSTRIES; IF ARCHITECTS ARE TO PLAY THEIR RIGHTFUL PART IN BUILDING AMERICA.
PERSPECTIVE OF THE NEW AIRCRAFT BUILDING FOR THE RIVER ROUGE PLANT OF THE FORD MOTOR COMPANY,

KELSEY-HAYES WHEEL CORPORATION, SMALL ARMS MANUFACTURING PLANT, PLYMOUTH, MICHIGAN, AND
FLEETWINGS, INC., AIRPLANE PARTS MANUFACTURING PLANT, BOTH DESIGNED BY GIFFELS & VALLET, INC.

OCTOBER 1941
Albert Kahn, of Detroit, has been saluted as the architect who has contributed most to the creation of modern industrial architecture. In examples of his work shown here we can see his masterful organization; logical assembly of factors for production. The plant above has been completed at Lockland, Ohio, for Wright Aeronautical Corporation. It consists of a 37-acre machine shop (the largest one-story manufacturing unit) with air-conditioned offices at front, and foundry.

Kahn adopted a similar parti for Curtiss-Wright propeller plant at Caldwell, New Jersey.
KAHN'S HANDLING OF GLASS AND STEEL IS DRAMATIC. REPRESENTATIVE OF HIS SUCCESS WITH THESE MATERIALS IS THE DETROIT TANK ARSENAL (ABOVE). THE IMMENSITY OF THE ARSENAL, 520 FEET WIDE AND MORE THAN A QUARTER-MILE LONG, IS INDICATED BY THE PHOTO, WHICH SHOWS ONLY ONE END OF THE PLANT AS PICTURED IN THE ARCHITECT'S PERSPECTIVE (RIGHT). THE BUILDING AGREES IN ARCHITECTURAL TREATMENT AND ITS LARGE SCALE WITH OTHER STRUCTURES DESIGNED BY ALBERT KAHN, INC., FOR THE EXISTING PLANT

EQUALLY FRANK IN EXPRESSION IS KAHN'S PLANT FOR THE CITY MACHINE & TOOL COMPANY, TOLEDO

OCTOBER 1941
THE PLANT OF THE TAYLORCRAFT COMPANY (ABOVE) AT ALLIANCE, OHIO, ALSO WAS DESIGNED BY ALBERT KAHN, INC., ASSOCIATED ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS. THE SAME OFFICE IS HANDLING SCORES OF OTHER JOBS COMPARABLE TO THIS, REPRESENTING AN EXPENDITURE OF MANY MILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE. ALBERT KAHN IS Meticulous in giving credit to his organization for accomplishments that have made his name known around the world among engineers and industrialists, as well as architects. Interesting to the student of structural forms is the Republic Aviation Plant (below) built by Turner Construction Company at Farmingdale, L. I. Monitor system is expanded to illuminate ten acres of working space under one roof. Windows are continuous.
GORDON B. KAUFMANN, LOS ANGELES, WAS THE ARCHITECT OF THE NEW VERNON PLANT OF THE ALUMINUM COMPANY OF AMERICA, A PERMANENT-MOULD FORGE FOUNDRY AND PLANT WHICH IS AN IMPORTANT UNIT (IT HAS GROWN 455 PERCENT IN AREA SINCE THE START OF THE WAR) OF THE ALUMINUM COMPANY'S $200,000,000 EXPANSION PROGRAM, WHICH THE COMPANY DESCRIBES AS "EQUIVALENT TO TWO DECADES OF PEACETIME GROWTH." THE PLANT SERVES THE ACTIVE WEST COAST AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY.

LAMINATED WOOD ARCHES OF TEST BUILDINGS, LEXINGTON, KY., SIGNAL DEPOT—WILSON, BELL & WATKINS

OCTOBER 1941
EPPE & KAHR, ARCHITECTS & ENGINEERS, OF NEWARK, NEW JERSEY, DESIGNED THE ONE-STORY, FIVE-ACRE PLANT (ABOVE) FOR OTIS ELEVATOR CO., AERONAUTICAL DIVISION, AND THE DEFENSE PLANT CORP.

THE EXPANDED AIRPLANE STARTER PLANT OF JACK & HEINTZ, AIRCRAFT PARTS CONCERN OF CLEVELAND, IS BY WILBUR WATSON & ASSOCIATES, CLEVELAND. THIS FACTORY OF BRICK AND GLASS IS AT BEDFORD, OHIO.

REPRESENTATIVE OF SMALLER INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS COMPLETED RECENTLY AND PRESSED INTO SERVICE FOR SECONDARY DEFENSE CONTRACTS, IS THE CHARLESTON TRACTOR & EQUIPMENT COMPANY, DESIGNED BY FRANCIS GEORGE DAVIDSON, ARCHITECT, CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA, FOR MANUFACTURE AND DISPLAY.

“FULTON STREET—1942”

Encouraged by the removal of the Fulton Street elevated structure in Brooklyn, N. Y., the Downtown Brooklyn Association recently sponsored an architectural competition and building exhibit, “Fulton Street—1942,” which afforded an excellent public relations opportunity for architects and architectural students.

To acquaint the public with the proposed rehabilitation of the street, the Association sponsored a competition for architectural students at Pratt Institute, Brooklyn. Purpose of the competition was the improvement of the block near the Borough Hall. The improvement had to be practical commercially, but the form was left to the student to decide.

How the students solved the problem may be seen from the winning designs presented on this and the following page. Mayhew Seiss, who was graduated last June, won the first prize of $250 awarded by the Association. Second prize winner of $50 was Daniel Chait, a second year student. Honorable mention was given to Ralph Larsen, who was graduated with a certificate last June.

Judges of the competition were Francis Keally, of Githens & Keally, New York; Robert E. Blum, President, Abraham & Straus department store; Thomas A. Swift, Executive Secretary, Downtown Brooklyn Association; C. C. Briggs, Su-

(Continued on page 676)
The parti which won second prize is shown across the top of the page. It was developed with particular emphasis upon the detailed stores. Circulation on the first floor was entirely directed to assist the merchant in giving maximum display area. The practically new bank was completely refaced, and incorporated into the new structure quite in the same manner as that suggested by the first prize design. Donald Chait, prizewinner.

The designer receiving honorable mention kept the bank building in its present form and developed a very direct circulation through the block to the bus station which, in all three prize-winning designs, was placed on the street back of the block in question, and away from the heavy traffic of the plaza. Designed by Ralph Larsen.

Slee & Bryson, Brooklyn architects, submitted this before-and-after presentation at the Brooklyn exhibit.
Across the top of the page is the solution of the problem as designed by Lorimer Rich, C. C. Briggs in his design (center) created a photographic supplies store to supplant the existing building. Koch & Wagner, Brooklyn Architects, took four existing buildings and combined them into a single structure.

To impress upon the public the need for the services of the architect, the Association also asked six architects to submit plans and sketches of new buildings and proposed alterations to old buildings on Fulton Street. Each architect was given an existing building on the street and asked to submit sketches of his proposed solution for the problem. These are shown with this article.

The Association reported that the 5,000 visitors who saw this exhibit were made better acquainted with the nature and value of the services of the architect. As a result of the exhibit, several property owners have already inaugurated plans for extensive remodelling of their places of business, the Association stated.