The entry gallery of the Davis residence in Midland illustrates the atmosphere of comfort and dignity achieved in this Texas Architecture 1965 award winner designed by Architect Frank D. Welch, AIA.
Each year our citizens spend millions of dollars to travel and enjoy the visual delights of European cities and countrysides, only to return to our country to wallow with indifference, apathy or blindness in the mire of ugliness which surrounds us in the billboards, the overhanging signs, the automobile graveyards, honky tonks, desecrated river banks, overhead wires mutilating our trees, the ubiquitous aerial trapezes of traffic signs and the concrete spaghetti of the cloverleaf in the heart of our living spaces. The effect of a beautiful building can be no better than its surroundings.

In our America there is only one architect for every ten thousand people, and his voice can do little more than point the way toward a better environment.

But to this cause of creating a beautiful America, The American Institute of Architects calls to arms the American people and their political leaders. As architects we point the way to future fulfillment and dedicate our talents, our energy and our love toward the creation of a beautiful land for our children and our children’s children. This is our goal and our pledge!

ARTHUR GOULD ODELL, JR., FAIA
President of the American Institute of Architects
TEXAS ARCHITECTURE 1964
HONORED FOR DISTINGUISHED DESIGN

WALTER DAVIS RESIDENCE MIDLAND
ARCHITECT • FRANK D. WELCH
There is something very important about this house. It is important not only for the pleasure it must give its fortunate owners and the rightful pride of the architect, but for the lessons it teaches about what a good house really is. While the size and scale of the Davis residence may be much grander than the average, these lessons nevertheless apply.

Consider its appropriateness to its locale. Set in dry, treeless, almost desert-like west Texas, it turns its back to the unfriendly land and creates an oasis of its own, toward which, after the fashion of Mediterranean houses of thousands of years ago, it opens its principal rooms. What glass there is, then, is meaningful, affording pleasant outlooks always. It shows again, that "views" are not always distant, but may be close at hand. (Incidentally, this reminds one that "views" operate in two directions: to and from. This plan creates an ultimate privacy, a commodity rare in our society's tract housing togetherness.)

The organization of those classical functional elements of a residence, sleeping (private), living (public) and work (service), is simple. One enters and may go directly to the living area, to sleeping areas, or to work areas. Circulation is uncomplicated, leaving rooms free for their intended uses.

Then, these basic elements have been used in creating volumes that become shaped building blocks, visible outside, to help make the house look as it does.

Simplicity, restraint, dignity, and order spiced with a touch of boldness combine to create this pleasant atmosphere in which the most modern sofa lives happily with Chippendale chairs and bentwood beds.

Good houses, beautiful houses, houses that enrich lives need no clichés, no gimmicks, only knowledge, intelligence, sensitivity and imagination.

This living room demonstrates studied good taste; a comfortable, quiet way of enjoying the good things in life.
Organized after the fashion of centuries-old Greek and Roman houses, the Davis residence looks toward to a lush patio and walled gardens.

Sharp angles of roofs contrast with the curve of the wall and hard, straight lines. The ornate gates give an indication of the richness of the interior.
Efficient and handsome, the kitchen reflects good planning and careful detailing, an easy and pleasant place to work.

Splashing fountains of the entry court are a happy surprise and sharp contrast to the hot, arid climate.

Bedrooms are places to rest. Here, ease is built in. Furniture, carpets and art of many eras seem comfortable together.
The simplicity of the entry gallery creates a quiet, warm dignity.

The gentle curve of the entry court wall is found again in the uncomplicated patio ringed by "porches" that can really be used. The shapes that make the house are once again all visible. This is composition; this is design; this is caring that the potential of all the elements of the building are fully realized; this is architecture.
THE ARCHITECTS' WAR ON COMMUNITY UGLINESS

PAUL D. SPREIREGEN, AIA

Late in the fall of 1963, chairmen of several of the American Institute of Architects' national committees and members of the AIA staff met at the Octagon. These committee men and staffmen were representative of the AIA's efforts in behalf of community improvement and design. They met to formulate a program for confronting the spreading ugliness of American cities with a positive counterattack of architectural and urban design. This current interest is held by many professions, indeed by many citizens. It has been expressed at every political level, including the recent presidential election. In many ways this current concern parallels a similar concern which held the attention of the profession and the public just after World War I.

In 1917 the AIA published a book called City Planning Progress in the United States. Subsequent to the publication of this book, a series of articles were published in the AIA Journal over a period of several years on every aspect of community design—civic centers, housing, parks, playgrounds, roadways, bridges, schools, colleges, metropolitan and regional planning. The authors of these articles included such leading thinkers as Clarence Stein, Henry Wright, Lewis Mumford, Benton MacKaye, and Catherine Bauer.

The twenties were a fervent period for community planning and a productive period for urban accomplishment. Its ideological design roots lay in the Garden City movement of the turn of the century, in the conservation movement of the nineteenth century, and in the widely held social concern for the poor and under-privileged. The genius of this period lay in combining these ideals with practical building know-how, in the construction of a house as well as a community. In essence this group demonstrated that the American productive system could build beautiful cities.

The concrete results in the field of housing were Sunnyside, Long Island; Chatham Village, Pittsburgh; the Phipps Garden Apartments in New York City; the Hillside homes in New York City; and Radburn, New Jersey—to mention the more prominent. Privately financed, they became models of design and organizational skill. As a matter of fact, they were closely studied by experts from Sweden as models of community planning, housing, and new town programs.
Henry Wright's regional plan for the State of New York, also produced in the twenties, stands as the great document of regional planning, although it was not followed by an actual program based on its recommendations. The depression brought the private group-housing efforts to an end but saw the beginning of a wide-spread regional planning movement. During the depression, the lessons of the twenties and the City Beautiful period were the basis of the Federal government's Greenbelt towns, WPA projects, and regional planning studies. The most famous result of the series of Journal articles was the creation of the Appalachian Trail. Benton MacKaye proposed this in an article in the October 1921 AIA Journal! In the thirties MacKaye developed the multi-use programs of the T.V.A.

These accomplishments are not recalled here out of academic scrutiny. Rather they illustrate forcefully a most important point made by Robert J. Piper at the October 10-20 discussion, namely, that there are five elements which must be operating in any civic improvement undertaking. These five elements are: citizen participation; government action at all levels; professional competence; competent city management with proper codes and regulations; and proper financing. Spelled out more carefully:

**Citizen Participation** means the active support and involvement of the people of a city or town. Indifference is the biggest obstacle to civic improvement, more so than limited finances or government disorganization. For avid citizens can surmount these problems. So, too, hostile citizens whose interests are not being served can and will block the most powerful efforts.

**Government Action** means that governments must first of all care about civic improvement. No city has yet had any successful program without the commitment of its government, this specifically led by a persuasive mayor. Government action also means intergovernmental cooperation, for civic problems transgress political boundaries. And this means that governments have to become involved at all levels, from the borough to the Federal level—each component acting where its performance is needed.
Professional Competence means that architects, planners, engineers, transportation engineers, civil engineers, landscape architects, city managers, sociologists, educators—all those who speak and act from professional platforms and address themselves to the problems of the city—must be up to the job. They must be men whose thoughts are in the stars, whose eyes are in the horizon, and whose feet are on the ground. Professional competence implies interprofessional cooperation and sympathy—and an open mind.

Competent City Management means a good local building code which is well administered, competent civic housekeeping, and efficient administration of the city's building agencies. It means an up to date building code. It means a minimum of delay in obtaining approval for buildings and projects. It also means a maximum of coordination between the various agencies whose approval is needed for various projects. It means a sound zoning plan based on a sound over-all city plan.

Proper Financing means an obligation of the city as well as private enterprise to budget wisely. Urban renewal programs have done this quite well. But each city should budget its money for capital improvements strategically in order to assure the greatest private building response from each public expenditure. A city must also schedule its annual outlays to complement, if not stimulate, improvement projects of the private sector.

These five ingredients have all been present in varying degrees in every successful undertaking. They need to be stated here because they must lie at the heart of anything the AIA would attempt now. Basically the efforts of the AIA have two main thrusts:

First—we must arouse desire and enthusiasm for community design. We must arouse the general public to the possibilities and government to its obligations. Design must be the basis of all civic improvement undertakings. The interest of the public can be aroused by publications, films, books, meetings, the AIA Journal, press and TV stories, publicity, through chapter, regional, and national AIA effort. The public must be shown that one of the best investments it can make is in design—whose prime purpose is to improve the quality of life in the city.
Second—the AIA can improve professional competence—its own and that of other professionals—by disseminating ideas and information on the elements of community design, urban esthetics, conservation, preservation, etc. Professional competence can be improved by books, the AIA Journal, case studies, special articles, reference lists as to various sources of information, the AIA library, and special meetings and professional seminars.

The AIA has done much in all of these areas. The coordinated effort suggested by the "War on Community Ugliness" will make these efforts more effective. But how can the AIA organize itself to do the job?

The institute and its chapters are not going to "do urban design" or provide any professional services in community design. That is a job for practitioners. The AIA’s job is to arouse interest, to point out areas of concern, to point out areas requiring attention, and to point out efforts requiring coordination. Most of all, the AIA at all its levels can act to see that the job of designing the community is being done and done properly. This can operate at three levels—the Octagon in Washington, the seventeen AIA regions throughout the country, and the many local AIA chapters at either the state or city level. At National or Octagon Level the AIA can work with all the Federal agencies that are responsible for community design and programs. These are the HHFA and its several component branches, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Department of the Interior, and, most important, the office of the President. The AIA must identify itself with President Johnson’s War on Poverty and his Great Society. The AIA must ally its "War on Urban Ugliness" with the Federal programs. At national level the AIA must produce an abundance of technical information for the use of its membership. It must also produce an abundance of useful propaganda (that word intended in the best sense), in order to explain to the public why good community design is important.

In essence, the Octagon has a threefold job: Liaison with appropriate Federal governmental agencies; Providing the membership with adequate technical information; Producing good public information material.
At Regional Level the AIA must be in contact with its state government to assure that state development programs and policies are both adequate and sound. The national AIA can, of course, provide information as to what sound and adequate programs are, informing each region of the program of the other regions and states. The regional level of action is often a state level. Sometimes it is a matter of interstate cooperation, as where several states have mutual interests, or where a metropolitan area crosses state border lines. At regional level each AIA region should have the ear of the state governor and the state legislature. The basic area of attention should be the coordination of state policy and action, industrial development, county and city progress, coordinated programs for relating resources, transportation, provision for reserve land and redevelopment of urbanized areas—all into a sound and healthy statewide program.

It would also be the duty of the AIA regional organization to be ever insistent on good functional and esthetic design—in the preservation of a forest, the placement of a state highway network, the design of bridges and major public works, the provision of adequate recreational green spaces, as well as the design of the major entrance views of the city.

At Local Chapter Level operations would be a miniature version of efforts at regional. Of course, many cities do not have their own chapters, in which case the efforts toward city improvement and state improvement would be combined, to be handled by whatever AIA organization exists in a particular place. But the functions would be the same—watchdog, conservation of assets, pointing out things that need design study and attention, always pointing out possibilities for city betterment, and, most important of all, holding up a great vision of the best that each city can be.

The story of the renewal of Philadelphia is probably the best example of the power of design ideas. These ideas must be presented to the general public long before they become undertakings by either the public or by private developers. It is the responsibility of each AIA chapter to insist on visionary thinking for each city. When interest in redevelopment of a portion of the city begins, its
chances of taking the right direction are much greater if
the minds of the citizens have been exposed to great and
practical design concepts. Otherwise the public mind is
burdened by the image of the worst of the renewal area
it seeks to improve. These bad impressions prevent the
public's imagination from looking and seeing higher.
The investment in design concepts for a city is the best
investment a city can make.

THE PROGRAM IN OPERATION—AN EXAMPLE
How could the AIA “War on Community Ugliness”
operate in actuality? There is one action which we can
engage in nation-wide this spring. This would be in addi-
tion to the specific committee programs described below.
This action concerns highways and community amenity.
The 1962 Federal Highway Act specifies that “after
July 1, 1965, no Federal funds will be advanced for road
building in metropolitan areas unless those metropolitan
areas have planning processes in operation.” Planning
processes are not precisely described, but there are ten
points which roughly indicate what is called for.
Intended is that each city should have its own statement
of what it wants to be and what kind of highway system
it wants. No doubt these points have been made in re-
sponse to the growing criticism of expressway bulldozing
and clearance. Actually it is not the Federal highway
program which is at fault. It is its poor administration by
the state highway commissions. The July 1, 1965 provi-
sion puts the responsibility for articulating local interests
squarely in the hands of local communities and their
spokesmen. The big question is whether the local com-
munities have articulate spokesmen who can, in fact, rise
to this great opportunity, and, more, whether it has any
ideas of its own to start with.
The likelihood, as things presently stand, is that they will
not. Some years ago the Federal highway programs made
a similar bid to local communities to prepare land-use
and circulation plans which would be the basis of the lo-
cation of Federally financed roads. The local communities
with few exceptions failed to provide such plans. They
were not equipped to do this, equipped in the sense of
the five points discussed above. The likelihood is that
most of our cities and towns will be just as unprepared

on July 1, 1965 (or at a date decided upon by our in-
dividual chapters), a delegation of local AIA officers
throughout the entire country should appear before every
mayor and governor with these statements of program for
design. These delegations should make clear to the mayor
and governors that their purpose is to avoid the discon-
tinuation of Federal highway funds (which is a real pos-
sibility) and to assure that proper programs are in
operation which will result in good highway patterns
for the city. The local delegations can also inform the
officials as to the meaning of urban design and the serv-
ces of architecture which can be applied to complement
the municipal programs.
This July 1, 1965, Urban Design Action Day can be
widely publicized locally and nationally. The July 1,
1965 Action Day will be the kick-off to the “War on
Urban Ugliness” and its programs.

THE MAIN OBJECTIVE
Action in highway planning can open the door to many
other facets of community design. If the AIA is able to
make a contribution toward improving highway planning,
it can take the next step in open space planning and
acquisition programs. AIA chapters can support their
local planning agencies and supplement their efforts with
urban design.
The main objective will be to inject urban design think-
ing into every aspect of community building, starting
now with the most advanced programs, such as highway
building. But there is hardly a city that cannot enlarge
its park system, improve its street hardware and furni-
ture, initiate a municipal tree program, start a program
to bury its overhead wires, improve its signs.
Ideas such as these can be developed by all our chap-
ters and funneled through the Octagon for dissemina-
tion to all our chapters. Many chapters have already
made significant proposals which all our chapters can
benefit from. In this program we have the makings of a
powerful new effort that will be a proud heir to an earlier
effort of our professional forebears.
ROBERT L. DURHAM, FAIA
Chairman
Commission on Architectural Design

This story begins with an architect. It is the story of a city, Seattle, given a strong surge toward urban thoughtfulness and esthetic aspiration by citizen volunteers laboring with and through city government. The story hasn’t yet been finished, but the experiences during eight years seem to indicate that the civic leadership that architects are prepared to offer can be expanded manyfold by joining forces with kindred souls.

It is told here because The American Institute of Architects, through its Committees on Esthetics, Collaborating Arts, Urban Design and Historic Preservation, assisted by the Committees on Exhibitions and Public Affairs, has declared “War on Community Ugliness” in order to help achieve “a great environment for a great America.” This is not to be conceived merely as a negative “anti-ugliness” campaign but as a positive continuing crusade for better communities which are within the creative ability of the citizens and the design professions.

The splendid report produced by the combined efforts of the Georgia Chapters of the AIA, the American Society of Landscape Architects and the American Institute of Planners entitled “Improving the Mess We Live In,” as well as the many practical projects being produced by AIA chapters, demonstrate clearly that our country is ready for action now. Noteworthy new urban design projects can be seen in many American cities and can be compared with the significant contributions of our ancestors. One tool now available for chapter use is the establishment of “municipal committees on urban environment and culture.” In Seattle this action has become accomplishment.

The Seattle story began when John Stewart Detlie AIA, past president of the chapter, met with a few friends to discuss marshalling the esthetic forces of the city. The initial gathering also included a landscape architect, a drama professor, a painter, a newspaper critic and a few others. Out of this bull-session was born Seattle’s Allied Arts, a congress of all those associations in the city interested in culture and beautification, and including the local chapter of the AIA. The significance of this step was clearly felt a few months later when the officers of Allied Arts called on the City Council for the establishment of a Municipal Art Commission. By this time Allied Arts numbered in its membership some 20,000 potential voters. The reception given the calling committee was quite different from that which probably would have been given to a group of architects. After a brief study, the request was granted even though initially it was operated on a quasi-official basis.
The May 1955 ordinance establishing the Commission was a one-page affair creating a group of ten members as advisors to the City Council—no salary, no power, no office. The membership was made up of a painter, a sculptor, a musician, a writer, two architects, one landscape architect and three laymen. In 1964, eight years later, it is generally recognized that the entire cultural climate of Seattle has been affected by this humble beginning. After one year, a more comprehensive ordinance was passed by the City Council (printed verbatim on p. 43).

In 1959 the then mayor of Seattle, Gordon S. Clinton, stated, “The increasing influence of the Art Commission in the official family of our city government is a mark of the growing maturity of our city and a tribute to the caliber of leadership exhibited by Commission members. It was your group that suggested in 1957 that trees and shrubs be taken from the freeway right-of-way for landscaping the World’s Fair site. By following this suggestion, the Exposition has gained mature trees and made a substantial saving. The Commission’s suggestion that Mark Tobey be honored by the city is another example of its alertness and imagination. We look forward to continued cooperative effort between the Art Commission and city departments so that, as our city grows, we can continue to apply the yardstick of beauty as well as utility to its development.”

The Municipal Art Commission is charged with advising the city government on projects which will or should beautify Seattle and add to its cultural vitality. The Commission does its work with the City Council, the Mayor and the city departments in reviewing plans for new improvements from the standpoint of assuring good taste and a regard for Seattle’s often threatened natural beauties. As the Planning Commission admonishes, “The right things in the right places,” the Art Commission forwards pleasantness and quality of design in all of these “right” things.

At the same time the Art Commission works with civic organizations, individuals and business concerns expressing official municipal support for the so-called “amenities” which enrich urban life for people: more and better music of various kinds, live theater, better art and literature, and the fostering of a physical and cultural environment which pleases the eye, uplifts the spirit and prods the flowering of all native talents.

As it happens, three out of four of the Commission’s chairmen have been architects, and much of the study committee work has been contributed by members of our profession. For assignment of work the Commission has generally been divided into small subcommittees somewhat as follows: landscape and architecture; under-ground wiring; billboards and signs; historic sites; performing arts; civic arts; painting, sculpture, literature and graphic arts; and public information.

Three general principles guide the Commission:

1) The principle that the development of the beauty of the city is the normal function of city government in providing for the general welfare. Constant attention to the processes that contribute to the beauty of a city is the soundest civic business for beautiful cities the world over have been permanent attractions for tourists through the ages.

2) The principle that public funds expended for civic projects should be spent to insure beauty as well as utility. Beauty is seldom a matter of price, and ugliness which robs the people of their dues is too expensive. To expend public funds to inspire is as necessary for human happiness as to expend public funds for amusement or recreation.

3) The principle that plans for civic beautification and cultural advance must be coupled with deliberate action to insure progress. Some recommendations are needed immediately; others require slower or phase action. Our city must proceed, for time is not on our side. Many American cities have been ruined through lack of a positive program or the lack of the means or organization to act.

Two types of action are recommended to the City Council: First, arrest the process that corrode the beauty of the city or impede the development of Seattle’s cultural resources; second, inaugurate definite and positive pro-
jests to enable the city to move forward in every cultural way.


Looking backward, the Commission has thus far failed to accomplish many of its goals. Nonetheless, it is significant how many battles have been won. Architects found that it is quite a different thing to call on the City Council in a committee augmented by bankers, writers, garden club officers and well-known patrons of the arts. At times, requests in line with Art Commission goals found their way to the Mayor’s doorstep by devious routes stemming back to Allied Arts and its 20,000 constituents. Probably the greatest break for the success of the Commission came through general press interest, and especially because of the interest of the city’s leading music and art critic, Louis R. Guzzo of the Seattle Times has covered almost every meeting for eight years. Hence, a day or two after each Commission meeting, thousands of citizens were reading about the latest arguments, victories and defeats in the field of esthetics.

“Commissioners Promote Interest in Good Design,” “Beautification Isn’t an Idle Word,” “Let’s Stop the Engineering Handouts,” “Beauty and Utility Should Wed, Have Children” were some of the titles of the generous space given to Art Commission issues.

“Agencies of government and private industry, too, must be encouraged to hire competent professionals to design anything from a letterhead insignia to a twenty-story building. Mediocre craftsmen may keep the cost down at the outset, but they prove to be more expensive in the long run because their products won’t stand the test of time,” wrote Guzzo. This is the architect’s basic story, spoken in public hearing, finding its way to the people through the daily paper. We architects can’t do any better.

Other significant factors have, no doubt, added to the success in Seattle. For one, the major effort put into the planning of the Seattle World’s Fair has hastened cultural maturity in this city, only a little over a hundred years old. The establishment of the Central Association, a pooling of the strength of downtown property owners, created another and significant voice for an improved urban environment. Here again architects were in the background but pushing hard in the right direction. When the goals of the Art Commission (obviously “doodlers” to a city councilman) begin to be echoed by hard-shelled, hard-headed businessmen, action eventually starts.

And it has started. At the end of four years the Commission set up a six-year target: 1) Establishment of scenic drives, 2) Inventory of scenic lookouts, 3) Central business district enhancement including downtown parks and rehabilitation of Pioneer Square, 4) Landscaping of the central freeway, 5) Utility pole reduction and undergrounding of new utility wire installation, 6) Billboard regulation, 7) Waterfront development, 8) Fountain construction.

With Seattle’s effort to perpetuate the World’s Fair site as “Seattle Center” by removal of temporary buildings, the installation of permanent landscaping, and the conversion of Paul Thiry’s Coliseum to a 15,000-seat arena, many of the eight points previously enumerated by the Art Commission were accomplished in one seventy-eight acre area. The view from Seattle’s revolving restaurant high atop the Space Needle now affords one a look at a completely landscaped complex as conceived by landscape architect Lawrence Halprin.
Progress is being made on billboard control, underground wiring and waterfront development. Few cities can boast so many new fountains as can Seattle. For the first time in recent years, a major street tree planting program took place between the retail shopping core of the city and the World’s Fair site. Perhaps one example will serve to show how the effort of only three architects can be multiplied to achieve success. When the new freeway was laid down over Seattle’s topography, thus wiping out 5,000 houses, the landscaping subcommittee of the Art Commission requested the State Highway Commission, through the Seattle City Council, to provide adequate landscaping. After months of patient work, the group finally began to convince the state engineers that the state’s preliminary proposals for landscaping were less than desirable. “Instead of small pretty shrub, we need a reforestation project,” stated the subcommittee. While this was going on and due to the same pressure, two outstanding architects were retained for design consultation on freeway structures. The final result is that Sasaki, Walker & Associates have been retained as consultants to the state for what may be two or three million dollars worth of landscaping that would never have been included without the dedicated work of the Art Commission.

Plans for all city structures with the exception of the public schools come before the Art Commission for review and recommendation to the City Council. The most significant part of this procedure is that plans for utilitarian structures must by city ordinance be brought by each city department for review. Details of railings down to the shape and spacing of basic supports are all part of the review procedure. This means, of course, that the products of our best-known architects must also be brought before the Commission for review. Such a procedure is not without its birthing pains, but, nevertheless, a new consciousness has been engendered in city departments on the necessity for the selection of the best qualified professionals available for the design of all public structures.

During the last two years the Institute has placed a major emphasis on the increasing demand for programs which will overcome urban ugliness. The AIA Committee on Esthetics was established and with Institute funds, a series of seminars on ethical responsibility have been held throughout the country. Significant contributions have been made by some chapters to this over-all program. A pilot study of “Design Concept Seminars” is still under study to determine procedures for undergirding our responsibility as architects to create better design on the projects we do.

The time has now come to take the fight to the cities and towns of America through chapter action. This is not to suggest that they have not been diligent in fighting urban blight, nor that architects have been ineffective in contributing to the appearance of our American cities. However, there is reason to believe that the tide is now turning and that there are more and more civic leaders who have become aware of the immense need for protection of our countrysides and, by adequate planning, creation of more attractive and livable urban areas.

The Institute, through its Board of Directors, Commissions and Committees, is continuing to establish procedures and tools for use on the national scene in this all-out war on ugliness. The real strength of the Institute, however, lies with each member and through teamwork by the AIA chapters. What has proved to be an effective technique in Seattle appears to be practical for any metropolitan area.

Even the city councilmen agree that the Art Commission is a useful tool for democratic leadership. One councilman, noted for his past support of Commission aims, recently returned from Europe saying, “You know, we ought to get busy and save some of our historic buildings.” The use of art commissions in American cities may prove to be a potent tool for chapter use.

The Seattle Ordinance which appears on the preceding page is but one example to be made available for local action.
THE ORDINANCE

An ordinance establishing the Municipal Art Commission of The City of Seattle and prescribing the duties and functions thereof,

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF SEATTLE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. There is hereby established a Municipal Art Commission to act in an advisory capacity to the city government of the City of Seattle in connection with the artistic and cultural development of the City. Such Commission shall consist of seventeen members to be appointed by the Mayor subject to confirmation by a majority of the City Council. At least three shall be lay members, and the others shall preferably include two members from each of the following arts and professions: painting, sculpture, music, literature, architecture and landscape architecture, and two members learned in the historic or architectural traditions of the City. The Mayor shall solicit suggested nominations for such appointments from architectural, art, musical, literary, educational, museum and other cultural organizations for the non-lay members.

Section 2. Previous appointments to such Commission for one-, two- and three-year terms with one-third of the terms expiring each year under Ordinance 84162, as amended, are hereby confirmed and hereafter all appointments shall be for three-year terms, provided that any vacancy shall be filled for the unexpired term.

Section 3. Members shall serve without compensation from the City, or from any trust, donation, or legacy to the City for their services as such members; but this limitation shall not preclude a member or his firm receiving compensation from the City under contract or otherwise for services rendered outside his duties as a commissioner.

Section 4. The Commission may organize and elect a chairman annually and adopt such administrative procedures as are necessary to accomplish the purposes mentioned in Section 1. City officers and the staff of city departments may consult and advise with the Commission from time to time on matters coming within the scope of this ordinance, and the Commission may likewise consult and advise with such officers.

Section 5. No work of art shall be contracted for or placed on property of the City or become the property of the City by purchase, gift, or otherwise, except for a museum or gallery, unless such work of art, or a design or model of the same as required by the Commission, together with the proposed location of such work of art shall first have been submitted to the Commission for its recommendation to the city government. The term "work of art" as used in this ordinance shall comprise paintings, mural decorations, stained glass, statues, bas-reliefs or other sculptures, monuments, fountains, arches or other structures of a permanent or temporary character intended for ornament or memorialization. No existing work of art in the possession of the City shall be removed, relocated or altered in any way without being submitted to the Commission for report and recommendation.

The Commission shall have similar authority and duties to those stated in the first paragraph of this section with respect to the design of buildings, bridges, viaducts, elevated ways, gates, fences, lamp standards or other structures erected on or to be erected upon land belonging to the City and concerning arches, bridges, structures, and approaches which are the property of any corporation or private individual and which shall extend over or upon any street, avenue, highway, park or public place of the City.

The Commission with the assistance of the City Building Department is authorized to prepare and maintain a roster of sites and structures in Seattle of historic significance and may recommend to the City Council measures for the preservation of any structure on said roster, including the withholding of a demolition permit for a reasonable time, with the consent of, and with due regard to the rights of the owner thereof.

Section 6. The Commission shall decide any matter submitted to it involving an expenditure of less than one thousand dollars within fifteen days after submission, and upon any other such matter within thirty days after submission. If it fails to do so, its recommendation shall be considered unnecessary.

Section 7. The Commission may advise with owners of private property in relation to the beautification of such property; and anyone contemplating the erection of any building or the making of any improvement thereon may submit the plans and designs or sketches thereof to the Municipal Art Commission for advice and suggestions for which no charge shall be made by the Commission.
The University of Tennessee will open a School of Architecture next September, with Bill N. Lacy, now associate chairman of Rice University’s Department of Architecture, as its dean, U-T President A. D. Holt announced today.

This will be the first architectural school in the state, created to meet the needs of Tennessee youth who are finding it increasingly difficult to gain admittance for architectural studies because heavy enrollments are gradually closing the doors to Tennesseans at schools in other states, said Dr. Holt.

The U-T president said the new school has been in planning stages for more than a decade. Assistance in planning has been given by the Tennessee Society of Architects and by a special advisory committee of the American Institute of Architects.

The dean of the new school, who will begin his duties at U-T on Sept. 1, is a native of Madill, Okla., and earned both a bachelor’s and a master’s degree in architecture at Oklahoma State University. Although only 32 years old, he has established a nation-wide reputation in the architectural profession.

He has won four fellowships and awards, and has been the designer of a number of state, regional and national award-winning buildings. Among the design projects that he has assisted are master plans for Duke University and Southern Colorado State College, a science center at the University of Miami, and a Chilean Community Facilities Project. Currently he is working on a master plan for the Autonomous University of Guadalajara, Mexico.

In accepting the new U-T position, the dean-elect said he will organize a school to prepare architects for “new responsibilities which have developed during this generation.”

“The challenges of the environment we must create are staggering and call for a revision of the old methods of preparation for the profession. We are dealing with an architecture on a new scale—no longer the scale of a single house and car, but that of the super highway and mass housing. Our concern today should be to find ways to create settings for individual happiness within this new scale of environment,” he said.

Dean-Elect Lacy has been on the Rice staff since 1961, and he has served as acting associate chairman of the Department of Fine Arts as well as associate chairman of architecture. Previously, for three years, he taught at Oklahoma State University.

In addition to teaching, he has been a principal member of the Todd-Tackett-Lacy architectural firm at Houston, Texas, and a designer with Caudill, Rowlett & Scott, architects-engineers-planners.
stucco goes high, wide, and **handsome**

The plastering industry—and the makers of Trinity White Portland Cement—present this building to architects and builders with considerable pride. It's an example of the sort of result that portland cement plaster...stucco...can give when used with imagination. The seventeen floors of stucco curtain walls and balcony facings have a crisp, clean, monolithic look.

Conquistador Condominium Apartments, Houston • General Contractor: Spow-Glass, Inc., Houston • Plastering Contractors: Charles F. Schilling Co., Houston • Architect: Claude E. Heaton, A.I.A., Houston
newest way to sell homes!

EXTERIOR DECORATING WITH CONCRETE

A COLONIAL DRIVEWAY CREATES NEW CHARM FOR TRADITIONAL HOMES. Today, a new concept in decorative concrete paving is helping builders achieve exciting new buyer appeal. Exterior decorating with concrete can turn a driveway into a dramatic sales feature. The cobblestone effect shown here goes beautifully with "period" homes. An hour's work with a grooving tool adds this authentic touch. Your own crews can do the whole job. Shown, too, are just a few of the other textures and patterns being achieved with versatile concrete. For more ideas or technical information, get in touch with your ready-mixed concrete producer or PCA.

PORTLAND CEMENT ASSOCIATION, 110 East Eighth St., Austin, Texas 78701
An organization to improve and extend the uses of concrete, made possible by the financial support of most competing cement manufacturers in the United States and Canada.
And Mosher Did!

To the mile long Devils River Bridge on Hwy. 90, West of Del Rio, Texas . . . 3000 tons of Steel Super Structure with its welded Plate Girders rising 220 feet above the river bed.

In This Case . . . The Devil Got Its Dues . . . and so will the travelers of Hwy. 90 when they cross Mosher's "Mile of Steel" . . . the Devils River Bridge.

GIVE THE DEVIL ITS DUES . . .

MOSHER STEEL COMPANY

HOME OFFICE AND PLANT: 3910 Washington Ave., Houston.
OTHER PLANTS: Harlingen, Corpus Christi, Lubbock, San Antonio, Shreveport, Tyler.
fabricators of steel since 1885