A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE T-SQUARE CLUB

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

In view of the rapid development of the "T-Square Club Journal" from a local organ devoted solely to the club's interests, and expressing the opinions of its members, into "T-Square", a review whose contributors are beginning to write from every part of the United States, and even from Europe, the Executive Committee feels that the Club should no longer claim the publication as its own. The following resolution passed by the committee on January 13th, 1932, places the seal of official approval on the separation of the journal from its parent body:

Resolved that the publication be released from its connection with the T-Square Club, and that a vote of appreciation be given to Mr. Howe, Mr. Levinson and to the various members of the Club who have contributed material.

I wish to add to that of the committee the expression of my own appreciation of the devoted efforts of the editors in making "T-Square" a magazine of which we are all justly proud, and offer my personal thanks to those who have contributed to it. At the same time I must disclaim any great part of the credit for making it a success and venture to suggest that the only fault to be found with its editorial policy is that it has given me as president of the club more space in its columns than I deserve as a private citizen.

It is inevitable that I should speak at this parting of the ways in a dual capacity as titular head both of the T-Square Club and of its magazine. On behalf of the editors I therefore tender to the Executive Committee and members of the club sincere thanks for their constant support and encouragement and assure them that the part played by the old and honored name of the club in making the success of the magazine possible will not be forgotten. In spite of the present separation "T-Square" will remain always in fact the child of its father, and I dare say without fear of future disappointment that it will continue to be worthy of its heritage.
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FOR ALL MAY RAISE THE FLOWERS NOW FOR ALL HAVE GOT THE SEED

FRANK LLOYD WRIGHT

IT IS a weakness of our American system that any inept, unsupervised individual with something of the instinct of the salmon, may get a fortune in a few years. With no culture, but what will and desire, power over men. He gets himself "fixed" with "makin's", so no one of his quality could do in any other country.

His ability to sell lends him in an incongruous self-made shell. His ability to use his power is all out of drawing with his ability to administer it as his money systematically comes alive and goes on, itself working, to multiply itself.

He knows nothing of the real meaning of what he now gagers. He does not know what art is, but he knows what he likes. It is ready-made. The country is free.

So here is the cultural weed.

It goes to weed. And more weeds by way of "ready-made."

Exaggerated power is aggravated by such ready-made culture as he can (or will) provide.

The salesman is . . . . "Success."

Now, salesman cuts salesman. In architecture—

and it is the culture most important to him—it is his counterpart that sells him to his way of similar success.

It is only ready-made culture that he will buy.

And, to him, that is European. Europe, themselves come and find this out and soon become expert salesman in the American scene by the American method.

This salesman job we call propaganda. The propagandist at the present moment is the "internationalist."

Is architecture "modern" because after-the-action some formula to follow any individual initiative and overtaking it, so they imagine, may thus manage to ride the initiative to death? How much is being written and how little built and how little sense in cause or contra shows clearly why the straight-line and flat-plane (both abstractions), and the curved surface added to make of the whole another abstraction, have come to be expedient "modern."

Why is the formula expedient? Is it in order that the original impetus—selection—may be now "improved" as modernist—or modernism—and function as the inevitable new, not, or at, to make a "movement?" A movement of this sort depends upon the obvious and easy for the nearsighted near-great, the smaller and small men to play up for selfish purposes in small ways to again kill such initiative as lives, or might live, in our architecture.

A "movement" is usually exploitation, not initiative. Taking all this together, it becomes personal to me because the cause of an organic architecture runs well beyond the yard-stick and plain-plaster by which buy-bodies, in their extremity, obscure a simple issue as "modern."

A few in their bonnets!

They are doing some harm, I believe, and unless there is enough vitality in the great cause of architecture itself to rebuke and shake them off, they intend doing not only more but all the harm there is in them. It may not be so much in the long run, but it discourages all true creative initiative meantime.

But trust the reactionary after-ego—anyone's alter ego—to make the great small, the little big and both of not much consequence so far as his own ability goes.

I said doing harm.

Let's be specific.

Poor Japan, who eagerly copies the latest in Western haberdashery or art—impartially—not knowing what either is all about, and . . . gets kicked out!

I loved Japan and reverently took off my hat to its nativity when asked there to build a building. The Japanese are Oriental, not Occidental, hard as they may try to be Occidental. They are trying pitifully hard, but there is a chasm between the races where art is concerned wholly in favor of the Oriental.

Yet, all the internationalists buoy over there encouraging that ambitious, insatiable nation to believe and stabilize itself by an aggravating architectural version of the Derby hat, kimono and Boston gaiters. Tokio is becoming a profane sight in consequence. To anyone who loves these sensitive, ambitious people who call Tokio capital, here is deplorable butchery.

The East still thinks the West knows what it is about and promptly gets after whatever is after the West, too quick to grab and fall in line. Japan's national weakness.

Some day the East will learn that the West itself is a formula-chaser or an imitator, instead of a culture builder. Any formula derived from its experimental civilization can only be a brand, or a fraud, on the East.

The Japanese will some day wake to curse the abuse

regardless of climate or environment, and they were trying to see it, whole, as the right thing. Not quite so gullible as the poor Japanese where the West is concerned, they were suspicious.

The students had gathered there and invited me to tell them if that was "modern architecture."

I said the equivalent term might mean that it was, probably did. But it wasn't architecture at all where they were concerned, because it ignored their natures, their climate, and the character of their environment.

A cheer went up, and smites broke out. They were relieved. As I told them why, in more detail, the sky cleared for a moment.

But propaganda is at work there. They have no models otherwise. They have no one directly to stimulate their imaginations along lines natural to them, unless Luis Costa or Arquita.

What are they to do?

Here is our own nation.

Eclecticism, a form of self-abuse too long practiced, has rendered us impotent. Such architecture as we have, we got that way. We are prostitute to any
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THE EFFECT OF THE REGIONAL PLAN ON URBAN ARCHITECTURE

ARTHUR KALLET

The architect seldom plans the setting for his structure. As a rule, neither side nor neighboring buildings are subject to control, and frequently the limitations imposed on him are such that he must leave one or two of the four faces of his building blank, so that some day his design, modern perhaps, can be joined on one side by a Gothic office building, and on the other by a Greek bank. Far too many buildings have all of their claims to exterior beauty concentrated in one face.

After the passage of New York's "set-back" law, considered by many an unjustifiable curb on the freedom of architectural expression, low buildings on interior lots still had to be boxes with one side decorated, but the designers of tall buildings had gained a degree of freedom, at least for the towers, which the law had permanently exposed to the light.

While it cannot be said that the zoning laws requiring set-backs do not impose artificial limitations on the architect, in general such limitations are of a lesser order than those imposed by the requirement that almost every private building must return the largest possible profit to the builder. Greater individual variations are possible within a prism of unlimited height than within a prism of limited height surrounded by a pyramid, the form imposed by the zoning laws. This ceases to be true, however, when the maximum profit mandate alters the prism only, by adding ornamental window designs and decorative cornices. Under the restrictions of the zoning laws in New York City, greater freedom has been shown in the treatment of structural masses in the city's business buildings than ever before.

It was not for aesthetic reasons, however, that set-back requirements were invoked: the desire of builders to transform steel and stone into the greatest possible amount of leasable space, it was necessary to set the public welfare. This meant no more building and hence no more shoppers and no more ancillary traffic and transportation than the existing street system and present and prospective transit lines could support. It also meant more adequate light and air both in the streets and in the buildings.

Insofar as the congested areas of large cities are concerned, the Regional Plan of New York has now proposed zoning regulations which go far beyond present limitations. Since these proposals would bring about vast changes in urban architecture and make the metropolis of tomorrow far different architecturally from that of today, it is necessary to point out the basis of the proposals. The Regional Plan found, after careful study, that those who had set the terms of the compromise between the profit rights of land owners and the public welfare in the original set-back law, had evaluated too conservatively the needs of the public, and the hazards of over-building.

It should, perhaps, be explained here that to the makers of the Regional Plan the term "public welfare" included the welfare of the whole group of property owners and builders. When the value of a building declines, either because it is deprived of adequate light by a new skyscraper erected close by, or because over-building in the area has lowered its accessibility while glutting the market for rentable space, the owner of that building is one of those injured by too lax restrictions.

The problem of controlling building in New York is not complicated by any lack of available space. In the city alone, and in the metropolitan region as a whole, there is enough space to take care of all of the needs of the population for hundreds of years to come. Furthermore, from the point of view of the builder, which buildings place upon streets and transit lines, it was not necessary for the planners to consider limitations upon height, since only floor space, and hence approximate total bulk, affects the streams of human beings and goods pouring into and out of a building.

On the basis of careful studies, the Regional Plan staff decided that the maximum bulk of a building in the most densely built-up areas should not exceed more than the equivalent of about 18 stories on the total area of the plot. Building would be limited, however, to 80 per cent of the plot, 20 per cent being reserved as open space in inner and outer courts. Set-backs also would be required. This would result not in endless rows of solid 18-story buildings, but in many slender towers on broad, low bases. There might be towers 100 stories or more in height, but they would not be a detriment to neighboring buildings since the bases of the towers would cover two, or even more blocks.

Nothing could be less desirable than to have a large area built up solidly to a height of 18 stories. It would make little difference in its effect on traffic whether a building's casement were concentrated in 18 stories straight up from the ground or almost entirely in a tall tower on a small percentage of the plot; so long as the bulk is the same, the effect on traffic is the same. Rows of 18-story buildings would, however, mean dark streets with little access of sunlight except in a few upper stories, while tower buildings would have adequate light in all stories and direct access to the open air in most of the stories on all four sides.

The limitations on business buildings which would be
imposed under the zoning ordinances advocated by the Regional Plan, summarized briefly, are as follows:

1. A definite ratio between the maximum permissible bulk of a building and the size of the plot, this ratio varying from 50 cubic feet per square foot of plot in the open reservation areas to 114 cubic feet of building per square foot of plot in the central areas. There is no limitation on bulk under the present New York City zoning resolution.

2. No limitation on height of towers covering 20 per cent of the plot area, provided the maximum bulk is not exceeded. This compares with towers on 25 per cent of lot area without limitation of bulk as the maximum permitted in New York City at the present time. A builder wishing to construct a building of great height would have the choice of using either the provisions for assembling a large area and putting most of the bulk of the building into a tower, or of purchasing the air rights over neighboring low buildings.

3. Twenty per cent of interior lots and 10 per cent of corner lots in the central areas to be left entirely free of building. This open space may be in either exterior or interior courts.

4. A height before the first set-back not greater than 60 feet on interior lots or 80 feet on corner lots. Present zoning permits a height before the first set-back which may be as much as 90 stories in some districts. The first set-back in the Empire State Building is at the sixth floor (73 feet).

5. Towers set back on all sides to assure adequate air and light to themselves and their neighbors alike.

6. Open space provided at the rear of buildings, except where they run through from street to street.

Height before first set-back, 60 feet; towers limited to 20 per cent of the area and set back on all sides: these are drastic limitations. But, just as the laws prohibiting robbery and assault give the normal individual greater freedom to carry on his normal pursuits, so these restrictive zoning proposals would give the architect a freedom far exceeding what he has had before.

In effect, the proposed regulations would permit him to design a structure complete on all four sides, except perhaps for a five-story base. This is indeed freedom. Even with buildings of moderate height, we could begin to think of whole structures and cease thinking of fronts.

Although the proposals of the Regional Plan are based on economic and social, rather than aesthetic considerations, there is reason to believe that building restrictions formulated by an architect thinking chiefly in terms of architecture, would not be greatly different.

In the October, 1931, issue of the T-Square Club Journal, Lee Laurie, writing of the genesis of the design by Bertram Goodhue for the Nebraska State Capitol, says of Goodhue, that while working on the design he was "happy and excited, as he had been... whenever the bounds of his design were those imposed by his own imagination, rather than by the needs and desires of owners and donors."

What type of building resulted when the bounds of his design were imposed only by his own imagination? The Nebraska State Capitol is essentially a broad, low base, surmounted by a tower covering only a small part of the base. The Regional Plan proposals lie in this same direction, though they do not limit the towers to so small a part of the base.

The Empire State Building provides another example of the trend of architectural design when certain limitations are removed. The zoning regulations for the section of Fifth Avenue on which the building is located would permit a base 185 feet high before the first set-back. Since the building fronts on three streets, with other buildings in the same block on only one side, the problem of adjoining buildings was relatively unimportant. Yet, the architects chose to have the base only five stories high before the first set-back—about half the permissible height.

To achieve proper scale for his building as well as pleasing form is a task which the architect can accomplish under ordinary conditions in large cities, where he must contend with both the builder and the neighboring buildings. Under the proposed zoning regulations, however, the right of proper scale would in large measure be restored to him. He could be sure, too, that whatever builders might do on neighboring plots, so long as they were bound by the same regulations, his building would be seen. Too many fine structures in New York City are about as accessible to view as a fine painting sandwiched between other paintings in a closet.

To bring about a realization among both the general public and builders of the tremendous long-time importance of accessibility and the availability of light and air as factors affecting the value of buildings and their rate of depreciation has, for many years, been one of the aims of the Regional Plan of New York. While the proposed regulations represent the culmination of this effort, much will have been accomplished even if the proposals are not immediately translated into statute. As an unofficial body, the Regional Plan Committee has always believed that the creation of a better public understanding of the factors involved is the best available means of improving the planning and building of cities. This public, such a large part of which travels on overcrowded transit lines, and works in offices with windows permanently in the shadow of neighboring buildings, will be quick to understand the need for greater limitations on building bulk.

A word should be said concerning the incidence of the Regional Plan studies on types of residential building. Here, the factor of congestion of traffic and transit facilities becomes most important, but congestion in terms of space available for recreation becomes vastly more important, as does the availability of sunlight and daylight in the rear of the building. The job for the architect, again, both new limitations and new opportunities.
WE ARE ENTERING UPON A NEW ERA

LE CORBUSIER

IT is the definite promise in what we have already achieved in architecture which compels me to discuss its future—though not after the manner of H. G. Wells and Jules Verne! A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush. The time is ripe. The elements of which we have to take stock are present facts. The old order is changing; we are entering upon a new era. An irresistible social upheaval promises that certain things are dead, and others are born in their place. The change is so tremendous that we can only regard it as the beginning of a new cycle in the history of the human race.

So far as architecture is concerned, we must consider it as bound up with the intimate life of the individual and his attitude toward the rest of the world. Architecture is the expression of the functions of innumerable individuals, classed, or classifiable, with their traditions. It stands for the individual and for society as a whole, for man as a unit and for mankind, for the inner consciousness both of the individual and of the community. In a word, the house and the town, architecture and town planning, are all one.

Architecture has literally lost sight of the fact that it has yet to solve the problem of the modern house and we shall see why. Town planning simply does not exist, because we have not yet learned to consider man today as the product of the modern age. We cannot plan our towns because the value of the human being in the new scheme of things has not yet been defined; for less has his destiny been realized or appreciated. We are completely drawn out of the new era, and the wastage of human effort goes on unchecked. Harassed as we are by the results of our own folly, we are at our wits' end and unhappy. We have sacrificed comfort, health, and wealth in the blind and purposeless pursuit of humanity. Yet we need only look around us to realize that wealth and happiness are not synonymous. The mechanization of life has given us, and plunged us into slavery. I am dragging architecture into this discussion of human happiness because I assign to it a definite role: the liberation of the individual. I say that there is no such thing as modern architecture, because real modern architecture can have nothing to do with tradition—the teachings are false, mendacious and mischievous. Traditional architecture has become the enemy of mankind.

What has happened is that a hundred years of mechanical industrialism, which have laid everything waste, bruised everything, destroyed everything, are coming with full hands to bring us the mature fruits of the process—modern technique, powerful tools, precision, teamwork. Architecture, which is the supreme achievement of organization, can today harmonize the results of experience.

There, then, are the essentials: (1) Architecture is concerned with the problem of housing; (2) architecture should bring a sane judgment to bear upon the erroneous conception of modern comfort; (3) architecture of today cannot lean upon that of tradition, and the teachings of the schools are dangerous; (4) architecture must make use of modern technical processes, with all their possibilities and in all their consequences, and with all their efficiency. Nothing of tradition will remain. Everything will be new. There will be a new organization of the human race and a new stage set. In this newly won harmony relationships will be new, the dimensions, the processes, the daily routine. Knowledge, ethics, and esthetics, all are one, expressed in architecture: a new unity.

You may tell me, "There is nothing new in all this, and presently it will all come about, little by little, quietly. We shall get around to everything in time." I do not agree. I fear that the opportunity will pass. The hour of destiny strikes but once for men, cities, races.

Ever since 1870 Germany has been experimenting, drawing the east of Europe into active adventure after her. Cities have been built and organized. A whole population has been spiritually energized by the one word, "Bauhaus!"

France since 1870 has remained coldly immovable. Only her chosen few work prodigiously. The entire country has succumbed to old age on every side, in her farms, her villages, her cities, her capital. The post-war period of reconstruction found her unprepared for the task. True, her factories are models of their kind, but the devastation of the invaded regions has led to nothing but architectural defeat. Why? In the people there is lack of that spiritual urge to build; among the officials, national and municipal, everywhere, sterility. If, however, that spiritual urge for building is presently to begin it will be because a great decision has been taken— to act.

I am at this point that America appears at once so disturbing and yet so admirable. About 1900, when I was a young man, America was regarded as a far-off country suitable only for emigration, a place where people were intent on making money, with no time to waste on the intellectual discussions for which Paris was the magnet and centre of the world. American architecture! Nobody knew anything about it. One thought vaguely of rude shanties, and towns awaiting the future, of cities laid out like a chess-board, with streets stretching out into the unknown.

Thirty years later the United States is dominant, ready to lead the world. Manhattan and Chicago are great examples of the new era, and French artists tell of their deep emotion at the sight of American skyscrapers. Such is the reward of decision and energy. I attach to the decision to act a primary importance.

I absolutely refuse to admit, nevertheless, as many as lightly do, that Manhattan and Chicago possess the architecture and town planning of modern times.

No, and again no! I recognize the sublime virtue which is "to do", but I think doing is only the beginning, the first and crudest stage—the shoving-off. Everything still remains to be done to achieve dignity, which results from balance, proportion and, at last, from a quality of high disinterestedness born of consummate skill.

...I WILL ADMIT NOTHING BUT A MAJESTIC ARRAY OF PRISMS, PERFECT IN FORM AND ASPECT, RISING INTO SPACE, AND HAVING AN INDESTRUCTIBLE REASON FOR THEIR EXISTENCE...
disorder. Our ignorance has a devastating effect on the fundamental organization of the town, which we must
revise.

The foundation of life is the home, in which we should live. This means devoting the same care to
one’s body as to one’s work, and providing adequate
nourishment for both mind and spirit. The correct
way to live is to arrange the twenty-four hours of the
day harmoniously. This involves drawing up a definite
time-table for our activities and, in order to give them
full scope, they must have a suitable setting. It is only
by entirely new architecture and town planning that
we can hope to create such a setting.

Our day should not be divided simply between sleep
and work. We must conquer the machine, subject it
to our will, and make it work for us. We must limit
our activities until we are creating that which is suffi-
cient only for our immediate needs; working shorter
hours, and manufacturing less. In this way we will
create more leisure for ourselves. If we had any free
time on our hands under present conditions, we should
become machine-like, every one of us, for our towns are
not planned for leisure, and obviously must be
reorganized.

Both factory and office entail sedentary work, standard-
ization, physical and nervous strain. This must be
overcome by a daily period devoted to physical culture
for the recuperation of both mind and body—not
physical culture in playing fields on the outskirts of the
town, but sports enjoyed on lawns surrounding the
houses; that is to say, when we have provided space
for our laws.

I propose to consider the dwelling as the primary and
fundamental element of the town, and build houses
on only 14 per cent of the available land, reserving
86 per cent for our parks and playing fields. This
will be the green city, and in it the density of population
would be 1,000 souls per hectare (a hectare is 4.47
acres). This new city will be the reverse of the garden
city favored by the moderns. Since the garden city is situated in the suburbs and so extends
the area of the town, it creates a transport problem,
but in the new city, with the area of the town
this problem will be done away with entirely. The
time spent in traveling from home to factory will be
saved, and spent in the recuperation of physical and nervous
energy.

The density of 1,000 people to the hectare is based
on an allotment of 128 square feet of dwelling space
per person. This is supposed to be a maximum and will give
wonderful scope alike to bachelors and large families.
The different kinds of dwellings needed in the
heart of the new city will be provided by allowing com-
plete liberty in house planning, but always making full
use of the progress in modern technique.

We must immediately discard the traditional type of
house and allot to each inhabitant a soundproof
living room, with plenty of light. For lighting, modern
technique suggests that the entire façade of the build-
ing be made up of double sheets of glass, lightly held
together by metal frames. This double wall forms the
front of the building, which contains at least twelve
undivided floors suitable for habitation. The walls are
airtight and have no windows to open. Between these
double walls circulates a continuous current of air, con-
trolled both as to speed and temperature. This air-
jet neutralizes the effect of the outside temperature, which varies from -40 to +40 degrees Centigrade,
according to the season, making these airtight apart-
ments completely weatherproof.

Indoors we have what I shall call "exact respira-
tion"; that is, air circulated by a central plant through-
out all the blocks of flats in the town. This pure air,
of a given temperature and humidity, would be sup-
plied at the rate of 60 liters per minute per person (or
about 3,000 cubic inches). Even when the sun blazes
through the glass walls in Summer the air indoors
remains as fresh as a sea breeze.

The "exact respiration", which could be applied
equally well to blocks of flats in Moscow, Suez, Rio de
Janiero, New York or Paris, is constant, day and night.
Nor would it be unduly expensive; in fact, it would be
dearer in the end than our present methods of heat-
ing and ventilation. By this simple means we can solve
the problem of bringing pure air of the right tempera-
ture into the heart of our cities. As we should sleep
and work under ideal conditions, we should enjoy a
maximum of comfort.

Another important feature of the new town planning
is the sound-proof character of the modern city. The
types of noise recently introduced by wireless, phon-
eographs and jazz, which have become a veritable night-
mares, will be stopped and absorbed by the hermetically
sealed double panes of glass.

Let us now consider our reform from another angle.
The era of horse traffic has been succeeded by that
of the motor, which has brought with it automobiles,
trucks, trams, cars and underground railways. I con-
tend that it is impossible to accommodate all these
in one unit and run at only about ten miles an hour
in the towns. Even at this pace the pedestrian is run over.
While technology and industry are crowding the city
with machines of marvelous speed, capable of sixty
miles an hour, by an absurd paradox we are denying
ourselves the full advantages of these wonderful
acquisitions.

We are forced to classify our speeds, therefore, and
make a definite distinction between the pedestrian
and the vehicle, which should never be allowed to
meet. The only solution is to restore to the pedestrian
the surface of the city, all the surface, the earth.
Put the pedestrian on the ground, giving him a net-
work of avenues running in all directions in the midst
THE MYTH OF BUILDING LAWS

IRVING H. BOWMAN

ONE of the chief reasons why buildings cost more today than they should is that most cities are embattled with antiquated building laws. This is not the fault of the legislators, aldermen or building commissioners; they shouldn't be expected to be scientific; it is the fault of the architects who have been technically trained and who have or should have at their finger tips the latest fire and strength test data of the U.S. Bureau of Standards who have been doing such commendable work with new materials. These architects turn a deaf ear and a blind eye to the work of the technical research workers and accept their respective building codes without question just as they accepted the axioms of their fathers.

This non-feasance of architects in such an important phase of their service results in a waste of two billion dollars per year in the United States (Bureau of Standard's estimate). This is inexcusable and concerted action by architects can remedy the unfortunate condition. We cannot understand why they refuse to take advantage of the veritable wealth of information which the U.S. Bureau of Standards has collected and placed at the disposal of any one who is interested.

The work of educating building departments in their respective communities and keeping their codes up to date might well be one of the most important functions of the various chapters of the American Institute of Architects.

The first glaring fault in the various building codes now existing is their work of uniformity of requirements. It is obvious that building codes cannot be exactly uniform in requirements throughout the U.S. because of varying local conditions, but they can be uniform in essentials. A wall of a given material is safe in one city it certainly should be safe in another. The next item that could be remedied easily is the lack of uniformity of arrangement. It is possible to make the arrangement identical in all codes. The resulting saving in time required to search for various provisions would be worth the trouble of rewriting the building codes of all cities. There are hundreds upon hundreds of architects and contractors who have contracts for work in other cities and this lack of uniformity in arrangement requires them to almost memorize the code in question in order to understand the requirements.

The purpose of building codes is often lost sight of by many architects and contractors in their daily race to finish "the job" on time. They should remember that "building codes are remedial statutes under the police power, whose object is public safety." Their provisions should be broad enough to permit the use of materials or methods of construction not as yet known or in practice which would attain the purpose of the code. "It is not the province of building codes to specify best materials or methods of construction." This would not, as is commonly done, entail expenditures unnecessary to attain the purpose of the code.

Authors of building codes should remember that unless they allow the greatest possible freedom in design within the natural limits of safety, they will stand in the way of progress and hinder rather than help the hundreds of scientists working on building materials who are trying to increase building economies and reduce costs of maintenance and operation of buildings.

Above all building codes should prescribe the purpose to be attained in the various phases of construction rather than the specific methods of attaining them. They should not be specifications, for that is the work of the architects and not the work of legislators or police executives. The last but far from the least point to be kept in mind is that the administration of building codes should be entrusted only to technically qualified persons with years of experience and good judgment. They should be given complete authority and should be as disassociated from political machinery as possible. School teachers do not lose their jobs when a new administration comes into power and neither should executors and authors of building codes. By this suggestion we do not mean that a commissioner should stay in office until he dies because obviously every man has a peak of activity and interest in life usually reached before middle age has settled too far on his shoulders and then he begins to drop off, some what, taking a somewhat retrospective rather than progressive viewpoint.

Today, the progressive architect attempting to build with new materials or with old materials used in new ways, is confronted with a code which says that he shall present his case to a jury of city councilmen supposedly led by the commissioner of buildings. The jury of councilmen may be composed of lawyers, insurance brokers, stock brokers, lumber dealers, coal dealers, butchers or bakers, all interested in the welfare of their communities truly enough but not interested enough to realize that they should not judge that which they lack experience with which experience is necessary to qualify them as jurists. While many should have the progressive architect four years in research to develop the proposed construction, the butchers, bakers, and candlestick makers, will not hesitate to qualify themselves as jurists and veto or

(Continued on page 15)
A COOPERATIVE DWELLING

R. M. SCHINDLER

Program: A cooperative dwelling for two young couples.

Location: Lot facing east with slight slope towards the southwest, eight miles from the center of Los Angeles.

Layout: The ordinary residential arrangement providing rooms for specialized purposes has been abandoned.

Instead each person receives a large private studio; each couple, a common entrance hall and bath. Open porches on the roof are used for sleeping. An enclosed patio for each couple, with an out-of-door fireplace, serves the purposes of an ordinary living room.

The form of the house divides the garden into several such private rooms. A separate guest apartment, with its own garden, is also provided for. The kitchen is planned for both couples. The wives take alternate weekly responsibility for dinner menus, and so gain periods of respite from the incessant household rhythm.

Structural Scheme: The house is constructed with the architect's "Stahtile" system.

A reinforced concrete floor is placed on the ground. Low wooden frames and reinforcing rods are placed on it. The concrete wall units are poured between them in a horizontal position and finished on the top surface. After the concrete has set they are filled up by means of a tripod with a block and tackle, easily handled by two men. Adhesion between wall and floor is prevented by a coating of soft soap on the floor before pouring the wall slabs. The wall slabs are graduated in thickness toward the top in order to save material. The form work requires a three-inch space between the wall units. This is either filled up with concrete or left partly open for glazing. The system provides a reinforced concrete wall, finished on both sides with a minimum of form work. A layer of insulating material could easily be introduced for colder climates.

The resulting wall has all the repose of the old type masonry wall, without its heavy, confining qualities. It permits air and light to filter through the joints, wherever they are kept open.

In this particular instance the ceilings are all made of exposed redwood timbers and shiplap covered with composition roofing. They are supported on one side of each room by the concrete walls, and on the other side by two wooden posts. All partitions are non-supporting screens composed of a wooden skeleton filled in with glass or with removable "Insulite" panels. Clerestory windows between the two ceiling levels maintained throughout the house provide a cooling air current right under the roof and permit the sunlight to enter from all sides. All doors are double-acting with pivots fastened to floor and lower ceiling.

Architectural Scheme: Each room in the house represents a variation on one structural and architectural theme. This theme fulfills the basic requirements for a campers' shelter: a protected back, an open front, a fireplace and a roof.

Each room has a concrete wall for back, and in front a large opening fitted with sliding doors. This opening is protected by an overhanging eave, carried by two cantilever beams crossing the rooms. These beams serve at the same time as supports for sliding light fixtures, and for movable partitions.

The shape of the rooms, their relation to the patios and the alternating roof levels, create an entirely new spatial interlock between the interior and the garden.

Materials: The traditional building scheme, by which the structural members of the house are covered with layers of finishing materials,—lath, plaster, paint, paper, hangings, etc., is abandoned. The house is a simple weave of a few structural materials which retain their natural color and texture throughout. It is the beginning of a building scheme which a highly developed technical science will permit in the future. Each material will take its place openly in the structure fulfilling all architectural and structural requirements of its place in the organic fabric of the building.
UNIVERSAL ARCHITECTURE

Buckminster Fuller

Introduction: Behind closed doors in all parts of the world—but especially in U. S. A.’s industrial centers, such as Chicago, Detroit, N. Y. C., Boston, Cleveland, etc.—eleven and artificious "shelter-minded" promoters, foragers with capitalists, industrial leaders, and technologists. Each group joyously fosters its supposedly unique vision of the extraordinarily fruitful potentialities of the inevitably high-industrialization of shelter reproduction. Each group (of the rapidly increasing number of its kind) arbitrarily, carelessly, or ignorantly, regardless of the source of its daze-like awareness of the coming sunburst of universal shelter industry—selfishly re-creates the world-to-be-sought tactic-attendant upon, and syphilitic to, the birth of industry's first children—waving, transportation, utilities—etc.—and ever less imposing upon its latter children—radio, television, etc.: and, at last, impotent of its own unique structure of its own and, greatest, child, life-enriching UNIVERSAL ARCHITECTURE—the quicksand practices of Dr. Business and his divide-deplete-commercialization, the erodable "Experts," were adequately anticipated, as indicated in the following discourse (thanks to the uncompromising progressiveness of the T-Square Management) of quicksand and encouraging import to the growing host of radially dominant, universally minded, pioneering designers.

There have been so many partial representations of the ideas involved in the following article by various scribes, as the many unit ideas contained therein have by editors been deemed progressively "timely"; when asked to provide an article for T-Square (in my mind probably the most constructive potential on the currently apparent architectural-publication-horizon) it seemed that it might be worth while to submit this essay, which most interestingly was written five years ago, (the same year as E. Howard and Marx’s Paris Flight, long before earth was broken for such landmarks as the Chrysler Building, Empire State, Bank of Manhattan, Palomar Building, in the East, and Woolworth Building was still the largest in the world); before the Bremen, Europe, took the seas; or the great stock market rise occurred, with its subsequent panic two years later; before Hoover had been elected President; and last, but not least, before the introduction of the model A Ford.)

The article was submitted in 1929, and has italicated clarifications recently appended, but, in the main, seems still quite adequate, and in no wise merits changes. Though its writer has since frequently been asked to deliver over 300 lectures on this subject at such universities as Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Dartmouth, Columbia, Carnegie Tech, etc., and before many art institutes, clubs, scientific bodies, etc.—the subject matter having also been amplified by widespread and all manner of publications, (a partialanthology index of which may be obtained from the T-Square editor, being too voluminous to include in this article) it is interesting that he could find no editor who was willing to recognize this article, as first written, or for two years subsequent to that time. The first article on the subject was published by Mr. C. J. Bullen in the Chicago Evening Post Art World, November, 1928.

Following the essay are certain notations representing a partial list of what are termed "Universal Conditions" of the industrially reproducible architecture, as postulated by the writer from out his philosophy, and unanimously accepted by a volunteer designing association, approximately fifty in number, now active in New York City under the title of STRUCTURAL STUDY ASSOCIATES, within whose "universal conditions" all their group concern must center and where every implication becomes a constant test of their development. Problems such as a five-year longevity shelter unit, suitable for immediate industrial specialization and decoration in Rusia, in due consideration of its elemental and organization limits, for supplementation of their first five-year, heavy-industries, development plan are being worked by the STRUCTURAL STUDY ASSOCIATES with present indications of practical results, representing an extraordinary advancement of the ideas embodied herein. The essay of 1927 follows.

ARCHITECTURE ABANDONED IN RECREATIVE ART OF HOUSING DESIGN

In 1929 there will be exhibited models and drawings by European and domestic architects of note, at Marshall Field’s and Mandel’s in Chicago in their respective Modern Decorative Art Exhibitions this coming fall [This exhibition never matured, but was composed of the first models of Groupopus, Organizer, Reformer, Miss Koido, etc., and Field’s "Utopian Style" (1931) as International School, an aesthetic mode developed by European designers in appreciation of American Industrial Building, through the advantage of a 2,000 mile perspective. This "Utopian Style" has been codified in European Schools, such as the Bauhaus, and is reincorporating itself into this country, from which it sprang, as an aesthetic, static, and static—of the original architectural science. Instead of this exhibition, Marshall Field’s, in spring of 1929, exhibited the first model of the writer’s so-called "Dymaxion House," named by Marshall Field’s advertising counsel the "Dymaxion House." as pioneered by new scientific architects.] These models will be indicative of local progressive trends of functional revelation of materials in this art, as developed, to date, in various geographical centers. They seek only to reveal the materials in a more honest way than in the past. As they represent surface simplification of established architectural, cubic form (Earth’s fundamental cubic geometry having been completely abandoned in contemporaneous physics, for radially spherical relative growth concept, it is typically paradoxical of a feudal aging society, that man still endures his dominant physical activity, "building," from ignorant tradition). They do not invoke basic functional change consistent with the broadest and clearest concepts of structural and mechanical truth.

There will also be exhibited what might be termed a Universal Design as it bears on geographical material stamp. (Referring to the Dymaxion Model.) This is the premier exponent of the newly evolved philosophy of "Externalization," in recreative art, applied for the first time to industrially to be fashioned housing. Its plan is developed progressively from the inside out, as opposed to the destructive and limited present-day methods of designing from the outside inwards. It is a synthesis, in appearance, of the American skyscraper, the oriental hexagonal pagoda, with the structural strength of a superstructure, and the lightness and delicacy of the finest of the oriental regional design. Its structural tenants follow herewith:

Music, literature, drama, and the graphic arts are now created on a reproducible basis of a vast and invisible scale, world encompassing, for the great new patron of the arts, the public, the human family of individuals, as opposed to the simply produced small works of art for the precious and vain self-aggrandizement of the feudal baron, or his modern counterpart of political, business, or gang-dealing, grabbing, hoarding, or exploiting properties of the commonwealth.

Architecture, because so large a problem, devolving about the spending of vast amounts of money, with all the jealousies and suspicions thereto attendant, and because the hotbed of revelation of unassisted habit, subject to a thousand tailors’ compromises, is the sole surviving glory of the historic tyrants’ beneficent building.

The industrial, quantity reproduction, principle is indeed the simplest exponent of the real meaning of the Christian era of human progress: unselfish creations as opposed to selfish, with the original of the first named unconfined in its satisfaction of the needs and desires of humanity by the eonastic infinite patience of any one man’s vanity. The art of human housing design is at last to be freed of the tailoring stigma by a reproducible design.

That the entirely new start involves discard of practically all the old materials used in archaic housing (not mechanical accessories) was inevitable. The very efforts of the old, material and property owners to impose the all brick, all wood, or all concrete house represent an influence which has greatly retarded progress in housing, as would be attempts to make all
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH: RICHARD J. NEUTRA

RICHARD J. NEUTRA was born in Vienna in 1892, a year or so before the first great manifestations of a dawning new architecture—the Columbian exposition of Chicago, with Louis H. Sullivan's experimental Transportation building, and the manifesto of modern architecture which Otto Wagner publicly announced in Vienna. His father had spent his life casting and turning machinery parts; his older brother was studying to become a mechanical engineer; so that at the age of five the small Neutra had decided likewise to become an engineer, and was drawing books full of graphically proposed schemes for perpetual motion, or correct longitudinal and transverse sections of steam-engines. He had even conceived, in considerable detail, the idea of a flying-machine, not an airplane, which should traverse the ether between earth and moon, and his engineer brother enjoyed exhibiting him to friends from the Polytechnic College of Vienna. When he learned to read he slid with Jules Verne through the sea in a submarine, or penetrated to the center of the earth, or traveled upward among the stars; and when the book was laid aside and his feet discovered themselves back on Vienna soil, he would try to improve the design of bicycles. Every thought he freely expressed in drawing, rather than in writing. In due time he graduated with distinction from high school, as later from the Polytechnic College. The thorough Austrian training of a "humanistic" high school enables him still to read a Latin author, and occasionally to enjoy a piece of Greek prose. Otherwise, he was interested in physics, in physiology, and in mathematical chemistry.

Having nerved himself for the wonderful world of modern architecture, he turned to the Polytechnic College of Vienna and learned its three greatest subjects: engineering, in which the curriculum was completely classical, and to philosophy in a seminar of the University of Vienna. He made several journeys to Italy and Dalmatia, coming back north always laden with ideas about open-air architecture, and measured drawings of such layouts. He still esteemsthe achievements of the hellenistic and the Constantinian periods, since these embody a world outlook not entirely foreign to the modern.

But in architecture his ideal had come to be Otto Wagner, who pierced the spirit of the art nouveau, found the way to clear-cut design, and spent his life fighting reaction and conventional eclecticism. At that time he designed a steel-frame house, an assembling building of the new sort. He had small belief in ornamentation. He was happy to meet Adolf Loos, and became his friend and first student.

Then war intervened. As an officer of field artillery Neutra was maneuvering guns on the battlefields of Montenegro and Albania. Through more than two years of this contempt the unevenness of warlike measures grew. At last he fell ill of tropical malaria, and for eighteen months was hauled from hospital to hospital. Nevertheless he found time and energy to design buildings for a steam laundry of the fortress Trebinje, for a soldiers' recreational center, and for the naval administration of the Albanian seaport Shingin.

The breakdown of the Empire caught him in a Slovakian hospital, now fought for by Hungarians and Czechs. Hindered and tormented by both armies he escaped to Switzerland, where the Austrian officer and architect became an odd-job boy in a great Zurich nursery garden. But there were plants, trees, landscaping, to arouse his deep interest, and after nine months of work with these he developed into an able landscape gardener and a friend of Gustav Anemann, gifted landscape director for the firm.

Then followed graduate study with Professor Karl Moser at the Zurich Polytechnical Institute, and a trip with Moser into French Switzerland. Meanwhile he had found work with a firm of architects, and designed a colony of workers' dwellings which won a competitive prize.

He returned to ruined Vienna, where there was no building, where life was largely an effort to keep from starving, and here with the Quaker mission he helped distribute food and clothing. A telegram from Berlin stopped this interlude; he went there for work with different architects, and then was summoned to the old imperial city of Luenkenwalde to design a municipal forest-cemetery—a considerable project involving manipulation of the forest-clearing, harmonious replanting and the construction of a crematory, attendants' dwellings, etc. In Luenkenwalde he attended also to the execution of small dwelling colonies, served as municipal architect for the control of private building, and was then invited by Eure Meendesohn to join him and R. P. Henning in the planning and construction of the Berliner Tageblatt building, which houses the largest newspaper in Germany, and the first steel construction of its kind.

Certain Levantine bankers desired a proper business center for the Mediterranean port of Haifa, and announced an international competition for its design. To Meendesohn and Neutra, although their general ideas frequently diverged, went the first award (1927). For ten years Neutra had wished to study building in that most completely industrialized country, the United States, and this he was now able to do. Working efficiently and systematically in offices small and large for four years, he studied at the same time their organization and methods, and then set down what he had learned in "How American Builds" (1928). This book, expounding the resources and the needs of an industrial order which by necessity lead to a new international architecture, became something like a textbook in its field. It was not an artist's manifesto, but a moral evaluation of this new way of building, which the author believed necessary to the height of achievement in American Architecture.
LET US KNOW WHAT IS BEING DONE
ELY JACQUES KAHN

It has been particularly entertaining to read, during the last year or so, the analyses of the so-called modern style and to find repeated time and again the theory that functionalist, if in the alpha and omega—the purpose and climax—of all architecture, the amazing story was told a few days ago, in which Ray Hood was the hero. It appeared that in the coming exhibition of modern architecture to be held at the Modern Galleries in New York, Hood had been particularly honored by an invitation. One of the gentlemen in charge protected at a model which had been prepared and suggested that, horror of horrors, it indicated decoration. He proposed politely that before it was too late Mr. Hood might eliminate the absurdity. The distinguished connoisseurs from Europe showed no ornament, of course, and Hood, it is said, indicated his feeling that possibly if he had a little more time at his disposal he might add some more.

Just why Hood should be dictated to by reason of a theoretical study of someone in Europe leaves one gasping. Fundamentally, Hood’s final result will be of exactly that value that his intelligence, ingenuity and artistic skill will make possible. He is an American, lives in New York and is doing important work here, and the result will be valuable in direct proportion to his abilities. The fact that he is sympathetic with contemporary work of other men, be it European or American, is merely part of his mental equipment.

What develops in these countless discussions, stories, stories, learned articles, is that the so-called functional elements—cast-steel slabs, lines of windows, bare walls, are merely more rigid conventions. So often, one discovers in careful study of the new designs that, apart from a few thoroughly clear solutions, many of the men who have scrambled onto the latest bandwagon are merely thrombing their noses at the men working along the road and are repeating words and more words that are more insulting than illuminating.

There is surely one basis on which men of reasonable intellect agree, and that is honesty. There is no question but that the light of discussion has made the stodgy work of a generation before more difficult to repeat. There is ample opportunity to attack the present status of domestic architecture, the insistence on precedent, the false glories of fake antiques, the whole clamping of surface architecture. The purists who assail those men who do not subscribe to a complete acceptance of the so-called international style ignore the fact that a pitifully small fraction of the country is interested in them, and a still smaller group is inclined to be patient with their pretensions. There are two possibilities of the approach to a new consideration of architecture. One is by provocation, the radicals assume that by being valuable they will be influential and, in direct proportion to the extent they irritate people, they will drive them to fine solutions, noble buildings, in the new manner. The second is to let the principles of design. Too many of us are accustomed to work in the manner that our training and experiences make agreeable. We see fine examples of recent work, in which someone has done the job which we are trying to do better than we can do it, we are impressed and stimulated. The photographs of the Berlin Exposition of 1931, in this very magazine, are fascinating—once a look ahead to Chicago in 1933, hoping and praying that someone will profit by the example. It is equally true that we are not sympathetic to the situation that Chicago should or could follow in full measure, these principles. In the first instance, our designers are not trained to think as abstractly as some of our gifted connoisseurs abroad. The public is not ripe, either, though to be sure a really fine piece of work needs little background to insure its intelligent consideration.

One comes to hope that instead of bickering over the fine distinctions between various groups those men who are earnest in the development of the arts will try to be more modest in their conception of their particular interests. There is too much talk of the prejudices of this or that man—too much loose talk as to how certain work is done. I am thinking of one statement in a recent number of this same journal in which the remark is calmly projected that today the democratic commercial buildings is a container, decorating the shell of a structure determined by the builder. Any accurate knowledge of the facts would be an insult to the very inn of such an assertion. Anyone who has followed the planning of the Radio City, as one outstanding example, would realize how the most keen consideration of the practical factors which will make these buildings a success, purely as functioning buildings; the opening of the steel, in direct proportion of the windows, the planning of the elevators, the handling of infinite matters of detail, have been worked so thoroughly by the architects in charge that one cannot even imagine that they are being told what to do is completely at variance with the truth. This is merely one case, and many more might be cited.

Buildings designed by the misguided commercial architects may, or may not, be worthy, architecturally, but it is ghastly in assuming that all architects are merely hired decoration, in direct proportion to the basis he is called to recognize such

(Continued on page 33)
EXHIBITION OF MODERN ARCHITECTURE

THE Museum of Modern Art announces an Exhibition of Modern Architecture which will open on February 10, 1932. The Exhibition will continue at the Museum until March 28th.

The Exhibition is composed of the writings, drawings, and photographs of executed works, which have been prepared specially for the Exhibition, the latest world developments in modern architecture.

The following architects will represent America:
Raymond Hood, New York, suburban Skyscraper Apartment House, five stories, New York, Urban Multiple Dwelling for Christie-Forest property; Frank Lloyd Wright, Spring Green, Wis., Private House; Bowman Brothers, Chicago, Apartment House; Richard Neutra, Los Angeles, School.

European architects represented include: Le Corbusier, Paris, Private House; J.J. P. Oud, Rotterdam; Private House; Otto Harder, Caxel, Germany, Housing Development for Minimum Wage Earners at Cassel; Walter Gropius, Berlin, "Bauhaus" School at Dessau; Mies van der Rohe, Dessau, Germany, Private House at Brinn, Czechoslovakia.

The Exhibitions, of the direction of Philip Johnson of Cleveland, has been in preparation since December, 1930. After its closing in New York the Exhibition will make a three years' tour of the United States. Included in present in the definite itinerary are the following cities: Philadelphia (Pennsylvania, Monday, March 20 to April 8, 1932); Hartford, Los Angeles, Buffalo, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Cincinnati, Toledo, Rochester, Worcester, and Cambridge.

BIOGRAPHY. RICHARD J. NEUTRA

(Continued from page 30)

In 1930, following the Brussels assembly of Les Congres Internationaux d’Architecture Moderne, to which he was American delegate, Neutra was interested to suggest invitations to lecture in Tokyo and other Japanese cities, and made a housing research journey through parts of China, southern Asia and northern Africa. Returning again through Latin, Nordic, and Slavic Europe he spoke to audiences of leaders in the new architectural activity in the principal cities. Back in the United States he lectured in the New School for Social Research at the time of the opening of its new building, addressed diverse metropolitan and university audiences.

For a number of years has it been Neutra’s happiness to arouse and interest promising ones of the new generation of architects. When he was summoned by Mies van der Rohe to the Bauhaus in Dessau, there to erect for a short term his kind of American influence. To the young men of that school he was a helpful and stimulating teacher, as he is in every instance to the group which he touches.

These are serious students whose hearts, like his, are set less upon their personal careers than upon the cooperative ventures which he is contributing to function honestly and accurately in its socio-economic frame.

UNIVERSAL ARCHITECTURE

(Continued from page 21)

(This indicates housing production requirement of 150 million families, A.D., approximately $200 million per year, which is 10/4 times Ford’s auto production, who says we are over-produced? Our dilemma, if there is any, is not one of a static generality of over-production, but of selfish over-imposition of specifically inadequate, below standard, or obsolete forms and organizations. Patent monopolies having selfishly diverted progressive forces for sale of static harvest. Paternalism, or political omnipotence, having come its inevitable cropping. Nothing is more important then another but nothing is comparable to thought, which creates, compels, and articulates all apparent, relative-liquidity, “things” or “thinkings.” Patent law, a political patent, protected as a general principle developed to give temporary advantage and encouragement to inventive and scientific beings, has paradoxically developed Gurdjian’s influence in the intellect on the basis of the “Bally” type, excelsivili of pioneering initiative, and clumsily and presently operating, only in professional manner, within patent limits of “Big Business.”

The whole picture is so large that none need be particular of their present business or properties. There is room to quake for all hands in this last but most important to be considered of reproductive arts. It has promise not only of housing but of providing the divest dividend of all business in general realizes that its greatest stock in trade is its tactical serviceshiness, and not a material inventry.

At the high points of each great progress, has it been realized that materials in themselves signify nothing and can be without the will and the creative universe of the intellect or soul. It is just for the lack of any material impendence. This is the great overriding principle of all humanity, when business in general realizes that its greatest stock in trade is its service of art. The loss of the present of the intellect or soul. It is just for the lack of any material impendence. This is the great overriding principle of all humanity, when business in general realizes that its greatest stock in trade is its service of art. The absence of the present of the intellect or soul. It is just for the lack of any material impendence. This is the great overriding principle of all humanity, when business in general realizes that its greatest stock in trade is its service of art. The absence of the present.
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