President "Skeet" Pitts has given me the privilege of substituting for him this month. First, I want to urge that you read, in this issue, a brilliant definition of "professionalism" written by President Pitts. In our current search for new frontiers, when we are trying to be all things to all people, it is refreshing to be reminded that our first responsibility is to concern ourselves with the safety, welfare and comfort of our clients.

Perhaps my most rewarding experience, since being a member of the official family of T.S.A., is the privilege of visiting many of the chapters throughout the State. It is stimulating to observe a new optimism. I find a real effort to create better architecture. There is a desire to improve and expand our services to the limit of our skills. There is a sincere concern for the total physical environment of our communities and a feeling of responsibility for the welfare of the people.

I find a willingness to take a more active part in our professional organizations, a desire to discuss our mutual problems and a real effort to improve our exchange of information through discussion groups, intra-office communication and seminars. There is a search for new functions, new building techniques, new materials, etc.

I believe that our profession has made remarkable advances in this past decade, I also believe that there are new horizons of service that we must seek. President Pitts has charted a very excellent course that each one of us must strive to follow . . . we have a goal.

Phil Will, President of the A.I.A., says, "what we do today will come back tomorrow, either to haunt or to fulfill us." I am convinced that we are capable of meeting the challenges of the atomic age and that we will triumphantly move to a higher plateau of service to our fellow man.
No one layman or professional can see the whole picture of ethical demands on our many professions. Individuals in their varied lives catch sight of only segments of these demands. The complete circle is what we generally term a PRINCIPLE. The foundation of all professions and the success of the practitioners are completely dependent upon a respect by all for these segments of ethics that compose the circle.

It is of utmost importance that all people understand the dangers of professionals relaxing their posture or diluting the relationship between expert and layman. The National Institutes and Associations of all professions have long recognized this, and have adopted Mandatory Standards of Practice. It is the privilege and responsibility of professionals to know these Codes of Ethics and to conduct their practice in exemplary ways so that all will recognize the protection that is afforded the layman by exposure of fraud and incompetence through high standards.

The real ability to render professional service depends upon the capability of the practitioner, and a high level of quality can only be achieved and sustained in a climate conducive to ambition, education, and development. There exists in America such a climate, which must be preserved. Opportunities for professional service and demonstrations of specialized skills occur today which are far beyond the fondest dreams of the past. This has been a gradual development resulting from a profound attitude and a plowing-back of knowledge and experience into the professions by successful and dedicated people. The very word PROFESSION bears testimony to much training and skill, carries responsibility and denotes a position of trust and admiration.

This fine climate for professional development does not exist solely for the benefit of the practitioner—but rather as an exceptional circumstance in our contemporary life where the layman has come to demand, and can obtain, the highest order of service from the professions. We exist in a very competitive society, where the best today is inadequate tomorrow. The professions accept this challenge as necessary and fundamental. To protect this climate and to continue this development, each layman and each professional must respect all segments of ethics that they encounter—for only in this way can we preserve the full circle of ethical standards which are so essential to our PRINCIPLES.
The Aging are looking to us to suggest means of adding richness to their later years. If our goal is only quantity of shelter, we will have fallen short of what others expect of us. If our goal is to only establish standards of room sizes, door widths and floor finishes, we will have so limited our vision that mere shelter is all the Aging can expect. If we hope to go beyond these more easily attainable goals, then we must constantly relate our work to whether it satisfies, or minimizes, the demands created by fundamental human desires.

If we are to attempt to meet the greater challenge, we must think of creating places to live that will go far beyond mere shelter and into the more difficult realm of creating an environment that will be intellectually stimulating, emotionally satisfying and, possibly, even spiritual. Memories and familiarity can offer a substitute for these values in a house that has been lived in for a lifetime, but how to accomplish them in the design of new housing should challenge the wisdom of all of us.

There are weaknesses in our present approach to solving any of the problems of the Aging. We live in a time of specialization. When there is more to know than any one man can know, this can be rationalized as being essential to our times, but we must not allow the advantages of such a specialized world to blind us to the fact that at least some of the things that we don't like about it are due to a corresponding lack of generalists—due to the failure to keep any area of specialty in the proper perspective.

Other groups are concentrating on such specialized problems as mental health, changes in the body and economics—working on them as if they were isolated problems and could neither affect, nor be affected by, our conclusions on housing. Our progress could conceivably be hampered by the onesidedness of otherwise valid decisions reached on the basis of independent development. If our programs are to succeed, they must propose action that supplements the programs others will suggest.

Nor should we be satisfied to relate our studies to only the problems of housing the Aging. We must also understand that such housing is just one part of the problem of providing better living conditions for everyone, for even if we were successful in working out programs that would increase our construction of new facilities by ten times, it would still be necessary to look to the existing housing supply for the bulk of our accommodations. Many of the houses being built today will be our problems ten years from now, and only when we can say that this is no longer true can we really hope to solve the specialized problem of housing for tomorrow's Aging.

But the weakness of specialization is not the only danger in your becoming an expert in housing. There also seems to be a tendency for a specialist to rely more and more on facts, rather than wisdom, as a means of justifying the importance of his particular interest, and this seems to often lead to attaching an unreasonable significance on statistics. If you are so inclined, you must recognize that collections of numbers, by themselves, cannot solve problems. Kepler did not discover the laws governing the movement of the planets by taking many measurements and then squaring and cubing everything in sight.

If, in planning new housing, the decisions are made only on the basis of an inventory of the errors of the past and a tabulation of the frustrations of the present, we will inevitably fall far short of what otherwise might have been accomplished. Our responsibility as physical and social planners is to see not only what people know about or even what they think they want—our responsibility is the much greater one of providing them with a vision of what they might want if they knew that it was possible to have it.

In the field of housing, statistics are useful only if they reflect human values; and this is almost impossible since they are impersonal by their very nature.
For instance, it would require no imagination on my part to design a statistically perfect shoe for all of you in this room. All I would have to do is merely measure every foot and take an average of my numbers. I could easily prove the shoe was correct, but I doubt if it would ease your pain to know that I had taken your pinch into consideration.

When planning is done on the basis of statistics, it will inevitably lead to the creation of such standards as an average area per tenant, average cost per dwelling unit or the average area for storage in any one-sized unit. To creative planners, such facts are of no value, and often their only use is to give short-sighted critics a basis for rejecting a scheme as providing more than the minimum authorized by law. One of the peculiarities of a democracy is that the word can have distorted meanings. There is nothing democratic about making everyone live in the same size room with the same wall and floor finishes, and if all of our deliberations lead us to statistically establish a set of minimum standards—standards that will inevitably harden into a goal that all architects are expected to achieve if they are to be considered skillful planners—if this is what we hope to accomplish, then we may as well confess to those who are waiting that all we have to offer is shelter.

But probably the most serious weakness inherent in the statistical approach is that it overemphasizes "reason" and minimizes the importance of "emotion". Ever since the "scientific" approach was conceived, emotion has been discounted as being something that could not be trusted. As a result, we have been trained only in "how" things can be done, and we seldom give enough thought to "why" these things should be done. We know how to split the atom, and that's remarkable, but splitting it to kill off half the world is not so remarkable. In suppressing our emotions, we have suppressed our ability to "feel" something than it is for us to "know" something.

In planning our new buildings, the statistical approach would tend to attach more importance to the number of steps between the front door and the bus stop than it would to the trees and pleasant curves that might make such a walk a pleasant experience rather than merely an efficient trip. If we are to aim at providing an environment that will permit each person to continue to grow as an individual by encouraging a natural and independent life, we must look beyond those things that can be tabulated—we must look to those things that can contribute beauty and meaning to a life rather than just make it more convenient.

And this brings me to my third concern about our approach to designing new buildings. I am concerned about the degree to which our age worships usefulness and convenience as being all-important. Any housing we propose will at least partly fail to solve the total need if our goal is only to make it a little more convenient, a little more efficient, a little cheaper, a little more useful than that which was built last year.

These qualities, as essential as they are, are not the qualities that inspire, excite or move men's souls. Language is our most useful tool, but this cannot begin to explain the effect on men of poetry. The pyramids had a usefulness, but it is not their function that has made them significant. When compared with many of today's churches, the Gothic cathedrals are colder, noisier and less efficient, but they have been able to inspire men in a way that today's more useful churches have not. I don't know that there is anything automatic about it, but apparently uniformity, standardization and monotony seem to result when we stress economy, practicality and utility.

Working towards these ends has done much to get us as far as we are today, but their further pursuit would lead to a dead end when we have once learned to be functional. If we are to go beyond our present knowledge of what good housing should be, it is the realm of happiness, peace and contentment that should be our goal from now on. The many valuable studies that have been made in the past should relieve us of any further concern over degrees of temperature, ramps and sill heights. Oh, this information needs better distribution, and this remains to be done, but it is now time that we go beyond the study of those things that can be measured with a yardstick or a stop-watch—it is time that we outgrow the pride and satisfaction that we now take in keeping the rain out and the heat in. If our society's aim is to store the Aging away, because they are beginning to bother it, then a building that is convenient, useful and efficient is enough. But if our aim is to encourage the continuing enjoyment and development of a full life, then we must go far beyond where we are now.

And because any steps beyond this get into areas other than the specialty of the architect and engineer, we must turn to others for guidance. Because we are getting into the intangible realm of joy, happiness, peace and creativity, we must turn to our religious leaders, our psychiatrists and our psychologists for help. We must admit that there is no single building type, no matter how clever the architectural solution, that will, in itself, solve all of the problems of the Aging. Our new buildings can be expected to do some things. We must be able to say that they have added beauty to the community as well as to the lives of the individuals living there. Our new technology should provide more physical comfort and safety. But we should recognize that there are other things that can mean equally as much if the lives of our Aging are to be full and satisfying.

The work of other groups during this Conference may add to what I am about to say, but granted that the pursuit of happiness is quite a chase at any age, it is my understanding that psychiatrists tell us that there are four things that must be satisfied if we are to have any
chance of leading a happy life. They are: (1) physical security, (2) emotional security, (3) social recognition, and (4) adventure. The designs of new buildings in the years ahead must lead to physical means of encouraging the development of these four elements as part of any of our housing.

To satisfy these needs in terms of planning and building is not easy. For instance, the problem of creating an adventurous environment seems impossible if we think of adventure in terms of climbing mountains, but, fortunately, such things are relative. We will have done much toward making adventure possible if we only build near public transportation. If we can provide access to the vitality and excitement of neighborhood shop and parks without their being exposed to the confusion and the hazards of traffic, we will have done even more, and if this access can be along pleasant tree-lined walks, we will have accomplished still more toward bringing some sense of adventure into their lives.

Also, our planning should encourage intellectual adventure as well as physical, and sufficient privacy should be built into our projects so that it is convenient to withdraw and read or listen or contemplate. It should certainly foster social adventure, for an old person suffers most from loneliness, and loneliness has been described as the state of mind in which one finds himself when he seemingly has forgotten, or been forgotten by, the people in his past life, and there seems to be little hope that there will be a chance to form new friendships in his future life. This can best be overcome by providing access to the life of the community and by providing facilities for communal activities. It is difficult to create adventure in architectural terms, but it is impossible to even think of adventure when you live only in a cell.

And too, social recognition cannot be accomplished by architectural means alone. Such recognition by today's society involves the whole system and process that tries to harmonize the interests of all elements of the population. In the pre-industrial societies the evolution of such patterns and systems was a slow process and harmony was almost automatically accomplished by making slight adjustments to traditional systems. Under these circumstances, the three-generation household was a feasible solution to most of the problems that we are now discussing. However, in a society that can be best described as worshipping rapid change—whether it is expressed in the desire to make this year's car look different, or whether it is modes of travel or making war—when constant change characterizes the world that we find ourselves living in, the Aging will inevitably find more and more things that are unfamiliar, and the traditional ways of doing things, that they once found so comforting, will have no longer been only slightly modified—they will have been upset.

To me, the cause of the problems of the Aging can best be summarized in the word "change", for, contrary to what they wish were so, they will increasingly find themselves living in an unfamiliar world. Some of our programs, such as urban renewal and highways, are partly responsible when they demolish the familiar overnight. Change is a function of the unknown, and the unknown is frightening to any of us, and the older we get the more frightening the change can be. Every change means a readjustment, and every readjustment means a new tension. Everyone must eventually limit the changes that he can accept or else the world will be in danger of becoming totally unfamiliar, and when this occurs, society is more inclined to reject those who can't keep up.

But the programs we develop can affect society's decision to accept or reject its Aging, but only if they result in a world of housing and a freedom of choice. Our programs should aim at encouraging every community to provide a variety of housing by stimulating the subdivision builders to provide approximately 14% of their houses with the Aging in mind, or encouraging the churches to build urban apartments, or the service clubs to build garden apartments, or private capital to build motel-type facilities, or anyone to build any combination thereof. Then, we trust, society will find other ways of solving the rest of the problems so that each individual will have a freedom of choice. Our working toward programs that will result in many choices is much more important than our working toward programs that result in the planning of perfectly designed one- and two-bedroom units that can be standardized and built many times in many locations as a universal solution.

Only when each individual can say "I had to move from my old house because it was no longer suitable for my kind of living, and I looked at many places and I chose to live here"—then, and only then, will society recognize any specialized housing for the Aging that our programs might build as being the answer. It is when one lives where one does because there was no other choice—it is then that resignation and rejection enter into the life of the Aging, and a stigma is attached to such living by society. Regardless of the beauty of the building and regardless of how many beautiful buildings there are, they will solve only part of the problem as long as either the person or society feels that it is some place for the Aging to be "put" or "sent". As long as there is such a feeling, then our nice, clean, new buildings will necessarily fail in their challenge of helping to provide the important ingredient of social recognition.

And not only should there be a variety of building types and arrangements, our programs should encourage a variety of management, and I hope that we will not spend too much of our time in considering who will build our facilities when we have so much to do in determining what to build. It is very unlikely, at least where smaller projects are concerned, that there will

(Please Turn to Page 12)
*ST. JOSEPH'S ACADEMY
BROWNSVILLE

This school serving 500 students, grades 7 through 12, is a study in significant form to meet the demands of a religious academy’s requirement that its physical environment should have an uplifting spiritual vitality. Cost of the 43,000 sq. ft. was $471,000.

ARCHITECTS:
CAUDILL, ROWLETT, SCOTT AIA
Houston

*DEL MAR COLLEGE
STUDENT CENTER
CORPUS CHRISTI

This completely air conditioned center contains a large lounge, dining room, snack bar, offices for several college departments, and meeting rooms. It is concrete frame and masonry walls, grey plate glass, redwood windows. Containing a total of 20,400 sq. ft., the center cost $263,000.

ARCHITECTS:
SMYTH AND SMYTH AIA,
Corpus Christi

architecture of merit in the past ten years

Presented on these pages and on the front cover as award winning buildings selected from the "Architecture of Merit" series are five excellent examples of buildings designed by Texas architects and constructed in this state during the past ten years.

In all, fifty-one buildings were selected by a jury of three prominent architects from other states. In addition, nine buildings constructed during this period received national recognition by awards from the American Institute of Architects. As space permits, The Texas Architect will feature all of these award winning Texas buildings during the months ahead.
in the past ten years

*WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S CLINIC
ODESSA

A clinic especially for ministering to the needs of women and children, this building, faced with a symbolic sculpture, provides offices for two obstetricians, two pediatricians, an independent laboratory, and a pharmacy.

ARCHITECTS:
PETERS AND FIELDS AIA, Odessa

FIRST STATE BANK
LONGVIEW

This pavilion type bank was designed to indicate an aggressive, modern banking attitude and to invite drive-in patrons. The interior is black brick walls, grey vinyl floors, white plastic against dark mahogany and bright blue plastic tellers' counters.

ARCHITECTS:
WILSON, MORRIS, CRAIN AND ANDERSON AIA, Houston
HOUSTON CHURCH

Contracts were recently awarded for additions to the Chapelwood Methodist Church in Houston which will include six classrooms, a Fellowship Hall for 500, library, kitchen and youth lounge. The original church received an honorable mention from the Church Architectural Guild and the Houston A.I.A. chapter. Architects are Hamilton Brown & Associates, AIA.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Construction has begun on the Coakley Junior High School for the Harlingen Consolidated Independent School District. The 35 teaching station school is a cluster type plan wrapped around central enclosed courts. Designed for an initial student body of 800, the school is expandable to accommodate 1,200 students. The roof of the building is made of pre-cast concrete arches. Cost for the 70,352 sq. ft. is $602,000. Bowman, Swanson, Hiestar, AIA, are the architects.

WAREHOUSE

An office, warehouse and shop building, designed by Kneer and Hamm, AIA, for Broyles and Broyles, Mechanical Contractors, is nearing completion in Ft. Worth. The 10,000 sq. ft. building will house the fabrication of plumbing, heating and air conditioning equipment and offices for the firm. It is steel frame and masonry construction and has a highly advanced inter-communication system.

HOSPITAL IN EL PASO

Now under construction and scheduled for completion in 1963 is the R. E. Thomason General Hospital (below) for the El Paso County Hospital District. The cost is $6,000,000. This 330 bed general hospital includes a large outpatient and emergency department along with units for Neuro-Psychiatric, Chronic Care, and Tubercular patients. The main building is seven stories and is planned for future expansion of three floors with 150 additional beds. Exterior walls are of precast concrete exposed aggregate panels and "solargrey" glass. Garland & Hilles, AIA, are architects; William H. Metcalf, Consulting Architect; Gordon A. Friesen Associates, Hospital Consultant.
Process of Architecture
an exhibit in Austin

"ARCHITECTURE IS THE ART AND SCIENCE OF BUILDING. ARCHITECTURE AFFECTS THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE, WORK, PLAY, WORSHIP IN IT. ARCHITECTURE IS A HOUSE, CHURCH, SCHOOL, FACTORY, PLAZA, CITY. ARCHITECTURE DEALS WITH EVERY CIVILIZATIONAL NEED OF MAN. ARCHITECTURE IS THE FACE OF A NATION."

With this prelude, a colorful architectural exhibit at Austin's Laguna Gloria Art Gallery demonstrated the process by which our buildings are built.

It showed the progress of a project through an architect's office from initial contact with an owner through completion of the building.

Phases of the architectural service explained and illustrated by material from actual projects were Programming, the organization of needs and estimates of space; Schematic Design, the conception of the design of the building; Design Development, a phase in which the final design and planning details are established; Working Drawings and Specifications, illustrating the documents used for actual construction; Contracting Methods, explaining how contractors are selected and illustrated by agreement documents; and Construction Administration, defining and illustrating the architect's responsibilities during the construction of the building.

Another portion of the exhibit displayed work from the offices of Austin architects and of students in the School of Architecture of the University of Texas.

A number of children's groups, conducted through the exhibit by Austin architects, were among the estimated 1,000 persons who saw the exhibit.

Sponsored by the Women's Architectural League of Austin in cooperation with the Central Texas Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, the exhibit has now been relocated at the University of Texas for the benefit of the students in the School of Architecture.

The many graphic reproductions and materials were furnished by courtesy of the L. L. Ridgway Co., Inc. In charge of the exhibit were Mrs. Don Edward Legge and David C. Graeber, AIA.
ever be too many enlightened sponsors who will pass up the economics available in standardization in any one project and provide a variety of units with different room sizes and arrangements in any one-size unit. Certainly, unless our programs can eliminate the pressures for minimum accommodations and maximum economies that seemingly are inherent in any Governmental program, it is more than unlikely that this will ever be the source of much variety to choose from. And so we need all of the different sponsorship of housing that we can get. We need all of the housing that the Methodists can build, the Rotarians can build, the Unions can build—so long as they all don't agree to build a universal solution, so long as our Aging will have a wide variety of choices. Without this opportunity to choose, social recognition—one of the four essentials of a happy life—will never come.

The third requirement of such a life is emotional security which is deeply involved with self-respect. To have self-respect, there must be the social recognition we have already mentioned, but there must also be what my friend from the Menninger Clinic, Dr. Prescott Thompson, calls "mastery"—one's confidence in his own abilities to overcome the challenges of the day. This can only be built into our planning if we give full emphasis to the smallest common denominator in the design of any of our new projects—the individual.

Here this is difficult primarily because it is all too easy to create the opposite feeling—that which is best described as being "institutional". An institutional feeling has been described as being one of large numbers plus sameness, and its result is to stifle the feeling of self, of personality, of individuality.

There are strong forces that push architects in this direction, and that is why we must not rely on habit or rules to solve our problems. Daily headlines remind us that we must not take chances with human lives, but fire and building codes, zoning regulations and subdivision restrictions do tend to force us toward more or less "standard" solutions. The selection of the interior materials for the convenience of the janitor accelerates us along this impersonal direction, and unless we constantly resist the tendency to consider our tenants as only faceless averages, there is no strong force working for individuality. In our world, the rational force of mass-production creates a product that has a uniform degree of quality. This may be desirable in pots, pans and automobiles, but it is deadly where the individual's emotional needs are concerned.

The remedy to the "institutional" feeling is variety. Variety is stimulating, and unless a person is exposed to differences around him, we have no right to expect him to be sensitive to other types of differences, and it is such sensitivity, after all, that keeps us from being vegetables. Too often we are content to allow only a different colored door, and still expect the person living there to take an individual pride in his environment.

There is one other source of emotional security that is often sacrificed to our over-riding concern for economy, sanitation and safety, and this is our tendency to build in much of the furniture. Built-ins are safer, and more sanitary, and they enable us to plan more efficiently and thereby we can reduce the over-all area and cut the cost. However, being fixed, they discourage variety, and, even more serious, they are new and bring no memories nor do they allow the individual to have a sense of possession. This, in spite of the fact that Simmons' study of all cultures has revealed that the ownership of things is one of the five basic drives that can bring satisfaction to mankind.

When we build cramped spaces that do not permit each individual to surround himself with the things he loves, we are rejecting one of the chief sources of emotional security. Too often we are content to provide a shelf for the display of a few things and maybe we plan a little larger clothes closet even though the space required for hanging clothes gets less and less. What is needed is space within the unit for the storage of boxes of letters, boxes of pictures—the place to store the many things that have meaning rather than just the most precious few.

Therefore, if we can allow our tenants to surround themselves with mementos of a lifetime of living, and if we can offer this variety of environment and if we can allow each individual a freedom of choice within the limits of his health and pocketbook, our new buildings will have made a real contribution to one's self-respect, and gone a long way toward providing at least some degree of emotional security.

And so we come to the problem of providing the need for physical security, and while architects can only supplement the work of the psychiatrist, sociologist and economist in solving many of the other parts of the problem of growing older, we are experts when it comes to providing the quality of shelter that will permit the satisfaction of man's first need. Too often, we are content to stop at keeping the rain out and the heat in and providing some degree of convenience without accepting the much greater challenge of creating an environment that can add substance to the later years of life.

With most builders of single-family housing having long since decided that mere shelter plus some convenience was more than enough and that anyone can draw plans, it appears that for the next few years the architect's chances to point the direction in new housing will essentially be in the field of group housing, whether clusters of cottages, garden apartments or multi-story buildings. And, as a matter of fact, with the population explosion bearing down on us, the average American's reaction against any form of communal living may soon have to be a thing of the past. There is much to be said for group housing. Some sort of accommodation that would provide beauty, dignity, comfort, convenience and companionship among those of similar interests can provide
many satisfactions that are not readily available in independent living. Whether such facilities are grouped physically or only administratively, only group living can permit bringing together the whole team of advisers that can mean so much to the peace of mind of any of us as we grow older.

In fact, group housing is essential in appropriate circumstances and most surveys indicate that older people who live in their own homes are not in as good physical health as those who live in large enough groups to justify dieticians and medical care. However, and this seems to be a very significant indictment of much that has been done in the past, the same surveys indicate that the mental health of those living independently was much better than that of the people living in institutions.

Therefore, we can take at least some comfort from our relative success in taking care of the physical needs of the people. But we also must admit that is looks as though we have been content to rest on our laurels after working out a few dimensions and making provision for a wheelchair. Our failure cannot be measured in terms of feet and inches, degrees of temperature or footcandles of light. In areas where scientific reasoning, logic and intelligence can supply the answer we have succeeded, and our people are healthier, warmer and better fed. Our failure has been in terms of happiness, dignity, self-respect and emotion. Our success has been in terms of shelter. Our failure has been in terms of environment.

There is one other thing to consider in our planning—the future. This might seem too obvious to need mentioning, and yet many buildings are obsolete before they are occupied. Usually this is due to an existing problem that is so pressing that both the architect and the Owner are inclined to discount the fact that it may be several years before the projects we are thinking about will be occupied and that the buildings will be in constant use for the next fifty years. This means that it is more important that our buildings satisfy the demands of future generations, and when our standards are based on the demands of past generations, we are in danger of building only problems for tomorrow's social planners. Only by continuously evaluating every rule, formula and custom can we hope to anticipate the future's needs.

Over the next few years, billions of dollars will be spent under any program we create. Each of us should be most concerned about the effect. Only if our cities are more beautiful and if our world is a more pleasant place will all of this money have been spent wisely. The final test of any of our plans will not be found in how much science can be applied to the life of the Aging, but rather how much life, joy, peace and creativity can be introduced into their lives by the application of such science.

We understand the world today better than any previous generation has ever understood its world. And man is free to make his own decisions. And we have today's problems because of yesterday's wrong decisions. These past decisions were not due to any biological necessity, but they were solely due to mankind's lack of wisdom in making the choices that he made.

We are not concerned about our choices resulting in bad housing, for we are able to distinguish between good and bad. Our problem is the much more difficult one of getting ourselves to the point of sensitivity to human values where we can distinguish between better and worse. The next years will offer us opportunities to find an answer to our problems. Only if we make our choices based on human values, will our programs result in a more delightful life for our Aging.

There is an answer, and while we should not expect to have solved all of our problems by the end of this week, we can at least hope to develop a background by which we can judge whether we are moving toward, or away from, such an answer. Right now, all that we know is that it lies somewhere in between the solution of 16,000,000 houses, which is so individual that it defies planning, and the institution, which requires so much planning that it denies the individual.
This handsome addition to Beaumont’s skyline, the first in thirty years, is the American Center, designed by Architects Harrell and Hamilton, AIA, of Dallas. The complex consists of a fourteen story Petroleum Building, a five story banking house, and a three story parking garage. The two main structures are separated by a landscaped court, but connected by a covered arcade leading to the garage. The development was recently featured in *Skyscraper Management*. 
THERE'S BIG BUSINESS FOR YOU IN MODERN CONCRETE FOR OUTDOOR LIVING

It's easy to build a reputation for originality that attracts a profitable clientele—when you work with modern concrete. That's because concrete can be formed, colored, textured or polished to create just about any special effects you have in mind. From textured terraces to lacy garden walls, versatile concrete is the modern material that literally inspires fresh ideas that sell!

A few examples of these selling ideas are pictured on this page. They are typical of the unlimited ways you can sell modern concrete outdoor improvements to today's homeowners. As never before, there's profitable business waiting for you now—in concrete for outdoor living.

PORTLAND CEMENT ASSOCIATION
110 East Eighth Street, Austin 1, Texas
A national organization to improve and extend the uses of concrete

Slump block barbecues, patios and swimming pools—three ways contractors find big business in modern concrete.

Terraces built of contrasting exposed aggregate squares are striking sales-winners.

Swimming pools of concrete fit any lot size, help you clinch more sales.

Circular play areas with adjoining broad patios sell fast to homeowners.

THE MARK OF A MODERN HOME...

concrete
A size and shape for every plan

Monarch glazed ceramic wall tile is the increasing choice of architects for public buildings. One reason is the rich variety of sizes and shapes possessing unique decorative qualities. Architects have an almost unlimited opportunity for distinctive treatments. Installation is even more economical with Monarch’s “Multi-Set” sheet mounting — an important factor in the face of rising building costs. Basic qualities of permanence, beauty, and elimination of costly maintenance, add to the trend. For full information, contact any showroom or the General Office.