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COVER:
Simple materials of brick and wood, elegantly detailed, present a restful and inviting atmosphere to the worshiper.
The 1964 Texas Architecture Award Winner is by O’Neil Ford and Howard Wong, Associated architects of San Antonio.
"Americans, in hundreds of communities throughout
the land, are becoming aware that they are living
amid unsavory, unpleasant, and largely unnecessary
ugliness. They are beginning to see again. In some
places, they are beginning to act. It is not a question
of decision as to whether or not we will continue to
build. We are building a whole new America, because
we will have to duplicate every single structure in the
nation by the end of this century in order to house
our expanding population and replace outworn
buildings and neighborhoods.

The question, then, is not whether we will build, but
how well. The answer to the question has to come, for
the first time in man's history, from the ordinary citizen
of the community. There are no kings, pharaohs, high
priests, nobles, and very few wealthy tycoons to decree
what shall be built and how. This was the practice in
past eras. As of now, the common man is on his own.

"No Time For Ugliness"
The box-like cupola, which perches on the apex of the roof, is the focal point of the exterior. Made of wood and glass, the cupola admits the only source of natural light into the sanctuary.
The massive, window-less structure of Saint Andrew Sanctuary looms like a fort on an 8½ acre rock knoll. Its warm colored, textured brick walk and rough wooden shingles blend easily with the surrounding live oaks and mesquites.
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The Communion table, which is directly under the cupola, with its symbolism of gathering together and centralness, is the focal point of the interior space. With the members of the congregation seated around the Communion table, the congregation members are made real participants in the service rather than spectators at it. At one end of an axis through the table, the pulpit is located; at the other the choir is placed.

The pulpit is slightly raised for sight lines and a brick screen forming an alcove has been built behind it for acoustical purposes. On either side of the pulpit are alcoves, one for the baptistry font and the other for floral arrangements. The choir stand is also slightly elevated, but remains part of the main body of the church so that singers and congregation are one. The sanctuary is lit by natural light from a lantern directly over the Communion table.

Artificial light is afforded from rheostat controlled plastic and wood cylinders designed by the architects, with exposed brick interior surfaces lit by fluorescent tubes in light trough along the walls.
As you no doubt have suspected and, I believe, expected, it has been suggested to me that I seek to emphasize the things common to all the people in our two great Continents. Every “hands across the border” speech I have ever heard has made much of this device and the more I see and the more I read, the more convinced—and delighted—I am that we are remarkably different and for quite understandable reasons.

Further, when I was asked to speak for just a few minutes on Recreation, I suspected that it was inferred that I discuss sports and formal games and wisely illustrate my knowledge of the subject by bringing you some examples of fine architectural accomplishments attendant to the spectacle and the great enterprise associated with physical contest. Though I do not dislike athletes any more than farmers or bookkeepers, I do not wish to be any of them. I am a walker and a looer, but I limit physical exercise to moderate attention to posture and the lifting of nothing heavier than a 4B pencil or a small cocktail glass. So, I will speak about recreation, but only as I dream of it, and wish for more of it. I have designed gymnasiums, tennis courts, play parks, swimming pools and one arena for a mild form of bull fighting and Charro activities. I hope I may do more interesting works of this kind and do find great pleasure in the fact that so many people use and enjoy the buildings, and there is often exciting challenge of span and height and powerful form inherent in the problem.

It now seems certain that the great “astrodome” in Houston may soon be eclipsed by one or more of the five or six similar structures proposed in as many cities. I feel the stadium that seats 500,000 persons may be as inevitable as the landing on the moon. I know that the impact
of growing interests in the so-called organized and competitive sports, and the fact that prestige and money are strong con-commitants to this activity, will produce magnificent and imaginatively conceived structures all over the world and especially in our countries of North and South America. The very exuberance of the Americans in the new era of big planning will provide a section of every metropolitan layout labeled “Recreation”—precisely as all plans have chunks labeled “commercial,” “residential,” and “industrial.” The filigree of expressways and interchanges will bend themselves to the proximity of the sports and recreation areas precisely as they search out the shopping centers and manufacturing centers. And these big plans with the big roads will clearly indicate that the people who use the Recreation areas are expected to race out and over and under and finally to park and then to walk to watch great contests or stare at monkeys at play or spread their picnic baskets and their litter over this huge campo and enjoy the sight of 50,000 other recreationists doing the same thing. It will be explained by the planners that this area of relaxation will be put where it is because the residential areas marked “Dense” and close in to the commercial center cannot economically support green play places nearby. The temptation to seize a commercial advantage will surely demand that there be places to sell—seats to purchase—and spectacles to watch—so the scale of the operation will demand a large area and the large open areas are necessarily rather remote.

Then, of course, there will be the places that are still farther away and beyond the traffic jams, where more artificial installations will methodically provide a few feet for a few hundred thousand persons per day to stand or sit or lie in prescribed rows. There will be the Jones Beaches, the Disneylands, the thrill ride and hot dog cities, and their size and placement will be as studied and computer proven as the sewage disposal plants and the fast transit systems that everyone talks about. They will not be like the string of parks in London that so beautifully complement the commercial and living areas near them and are accessible to the several hundred thousand who live near them and the several million who can come by the fast underground—nor will they be such jewels as Tivoli Gardens in Copenhagen, the Skanzen in Stockholm or Chapultepec Park in Mexico City. Neither will they be remotely like the little Parks in the middle of Savannah and Helsinki, San Luis Potosi, Quer.tar, and San Miguel de Allende in Mexico. These contrived and contained but vast places may have waterfronts or mirror lakes on the banks of a river but they will not be like the little river and its many bridges and little grassy shelves below the street level that winds through the middle of downtown San Antonio or like the Park and market that lies between shops and hotels and then looks out to the sea in the middle of Helsinki.

It is probable that the big playland will not be near the places where the people live who need them most. The wealthy families live close by Central Park—the poor families in Rio de Janeiro live on the rugged heights and the Copo Cobana is a glamorous setting for the rich. San Antonio’s 400 acre Brackenridge Park is on the north side and not on the west side where about 250,000 low income persons live. Even the big and very beautiful Parks of London are ringed by the fashionable neighborhoods and the very poor live far away from Chapultepec Park. I could name 50 situations very much like this.

This brings me again to one more thing our vigorous New World nations have in common—the poor and the slums. I believe every country in both continents has a plan and a feverish desire to wipe out the uncivilized areas of misery and filth and shame—but, the plans to wipe out poverty have a more fuzzy shape and the goal is a good dream that will be long in fulfillment. As long as there are millions of underpaid and undereducated human beings, there will, of course, be slums. Mexico City has a program of slum clearance and project housing that is staggering in its scope and its cost—and yet, I am told, the growth of the population will outdistance the capacity for rehousing unless this already heroic effort is vastly increased. The effort is noble but the solution is not in sight. The same condition exists in our country and many South American countries and will be more acute as industrialization and longer life expectancy bring astronomical growth of the cities and corresponding need for open areas where the low income people may have the air and sun and green that they cannot have in dense housing areas or on private plots.

So, I may now mention a significant difference in our U.S.A. and Canada and all the nations to the South in North and Central and South America. (A few slides of Little Plazas). The Canadians and the people who settled the United States first came for very simple reasons. A hundred and fifty years before the first English and Dutch set themselves on the Eastern coast of North America, the Conquistadores had plunged into the vastness of the South countries and had built towns and established boundaries. The prim colonists of New England sought a personal freedom and a place to farm and establish an order quite different from their homelands. The Spanish Conquerors, and to a somewhat lesser extent the other invaders, almost invariably sought riches
and their avowed purpose included the quick and almost complete decimation of all the indigenous culture—all the cities—and the people who stood in their way. It was the westward moving second and third and fourth generation descendents of the New England settlers who thoroughly, if less systematically, devoured the lands and subjugated and murdered the Native population. So only the process was different and the casualty statistics were different. It should be remembered that in all of the area now covered by the U.S., there were less than 1,000,000 indigenous inhabitants and in the Inca Empire alone, it is estimated there were over 20,000,000 living in a vastly more advanced and organized system of cities and agricultural areas.

The conquerors in our North countries moved broadside as they moved westward and the moving took a long time. The Spanish conquerors moved rapidly to remote places so that in Mexico, for an example, the land is covered with closely set towns in the high mountains, on the great plateau, in the raw Northern deserts. These were solidly established well before the 17th century, and many in the 16th century.

(We know, of course, that not all of the vast land was conquered and we know that much is still undeveloped, but what was most easily accessible and less strongly defended, and particularly that which was most desirable, was set in the pattern of a European plan of expansion.)

Our own bitter contest with the wide land and the native Indian was still in progress in the middle of the 19th century.

So there was a very strong difference in the kinds of towns that grew in the Northern countries in an age of Religious upheaval and new political philosophy, whereas in the Southern countries an almost Medieval civilization persisted. The “Age of Reason” and the Greek and Roman codes and ideology had found fertile ground in Northern Europe whence and when our forebears came to America, but the ancient feudal aristocracy of Spain was the single shape when Mexico and Central America and much of the Carribean and most of South America were settled so long before.

This little historical prelude which says so little about so much very clearly indicates another difference—and a difference which puts the Northern Anglo Saxon tourist cities in a second place position. The towns in our plains and
generally less rugged country grew as the roads grew or as primitive and temporary fortresses demanded. The buildings from the first to this very day were strung along the roads from the Stage Coach stop both directions, then as needed in multiple streets parallel to this strip with necessary access crossing roads. There were Commons in the East and Squares in the West but these were not like the significant plazas for people that existed in the Latin countries.

(How I dislike being called an Anglo-Saxon and I know how you feel about being called Latins—but it is a convenience and not an insult for us who cannot very well be called United Statesians—and you who come from the many South American countries must certainly disdain being called South Americans or Central Americans. The Mexicans have the right position.) The Southern or Latin countries did have the stamp, and the many mountainous places, the curse of the “Laws of the Indies” set up by Charles V, which almost invariably applied the same size of blocks, the same widths of streets, primary and secondary, up hill or down hill, in a rigid manner. In ten countries of South America, most cities were carefully laid out in blocks 112 metres square. The great Incas who built Macchu Picchu and Cuzco knew nothing of Europeans and the Roman and Greek standards of planning cities of squares. (They are probably better plans because they fit the land.) The great blessings of the city patterns of the Spaniards and Portuguese settlers was the very element that makes their cities so superior to ours. They provided for open areas, for parks, for gathering places that were just for recreation and variety (in the deadly gridiron) that had nothing to do with arteries of commercial centers and little to do with location of government centers or churches. This is the element of change and delight that we missed. This is the principle difference in the look and the nature of social communication between the towns in your Southern countries and our towns in the United States.

So I have spoken about our different beginnings, about our common burden of millions of second class citizens, the poor; about the difference in the pattern of our city development and, I believe I must speak of recreation—the kind of recreation that is had without cost for seeing or cost for participation. The recreation that seems to have less and less consideration in our big and comprehensive schemes for new towns or the replanning of our old towns is my interest and should be our greatest concern. So we have a common negative condition: the disregard for the necessity for little places near the places where our people live, where they just sit or stand or walk or talk or gently push the chessmen and checkers while the parade of worshippers or shoppers or celebrators move quietly or joyously around the place of rest and recreation. Of course, there are still the little towns of New England and Mexico and Colombia and Chile and Argentina and all the other countries in our Hemisphere where these civilizing bits of simple green and easy communication do exist. But, and in direct proportion to the anachronism, the great growing cities of all our countries are almost wholly delinquent in the proportion to the anachronism, the great growing cities high density and high enterprise areas. Sao Paulo and Houston and Los Angeles and Caracas and Bogota and Mexico City and Monterrey and Dallas and Chicago and New York and Toronto and Phoex and Albuquerque reckon their present growth as vastly more per year than in any several previous years and some expect to double in 20 years—but the order of growth is not the order of human values but purely economic. It is not a system of aesthetic advancement but economic.

Recreation has become a luxury and in one aspect a business. The city dweller must seek a respite from his tight world in the far away countryside and the countryside provides almost no place for him, even if he can afford to get there. The governments and planners and reformers speak for the better use of land, the better life for the millions moving to the cities—BUT, the asphalt and concrete areas grow bigger and the square feet or square metres of green per human being grow smaller. Our own country has few frontiers and the wilderness lands are remote and scattered and almost entirely unattainable by 90 per cent of our population. There will be more lands that go back to forest or desert as science lessens the needed acreage for agriculture, but the low income city dweller may never see this great expanse of earth and sky. It is by belief that cities could provide generously and without crowding for 500,000,000 people in the United States, but the sad fact is that before cities are set across the land where they should be and designed as the decent places they could be, the present cities will continue to spread and thicken and increase in layers and area and there is little sign that these unmanageable agglomerations will provide the little green places of quiet or noisy recreation where men can look at girls and girls can look at each and grandfathers can remember.

May we not change the pattern in our own country? Will the countries to the South remember their old patterns? Must Mexico City continue to look more and more like Kansas City?
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BUILDINGS AND THEIR SURROUNDINGS

PATRICK HORSBROUGH, School of Architecture, The University of Texas

The more remote we are from the natural environment, the more will the spirit pine for that which is of nature. Now, do not interpret my observations as being hostile to those engaged in the myriad and wonderous engineering adventuring now in progress ranging from micro-climat-ed to interplanetary travel, from the development of new materials to techniques of new economic and design sig-nificance, for this is not so.

My concern is, rather, that we have been somewhat less than adventurous, and have failed to sense the tempo of the time and take a lead in the promotion of that which is being provided for us by others.

My awareness of these passing opportunities is acute, for I have long been advised by a small band of practicing engineers whose proficiencies range from likely lunar probabilities to undersea habitation and storage, from domestic thermo-nuclear potentialities to air-cush-ion vehicles and vertical flight. These talented technicians keep me informed of events and achievements which they believe should be of value to an architect interested in every aspect of social, economic and physical development. Their graceful and much appreciated condescensions are seasoned with little asides and comments which sting me, since they serve to emphasize the increasing distance between imaginative possibilities, and our current contentment as designers.

My slight awareness of these thrusting circumstances gives me both an appetite for professional participation in these explorations and a petulant impatience in seeing the initiative for re-creating the human enviroment shifting, and slipping from our grasp.

In opening this Session, my assignment is that of BUILDINGS AND THEIR SURROUNDINGS, and I believe that the other Panelists have been invited to speak on Building Complexes, Federal, Public and Private; the Architect's Responsibilities in the Replanning of Cities; the Architect's contribution to Regional Planning, and it behooves me to establish, if I can, a reference to which other opinions can either relate or contrast.

The Environment is clearly the common factor between these topics of urban form and function, and of regional dispositions. The embracing subject which has been assigned to me, provides a chance to plead, once again, a series of interrelated issues which are deeply relevant to architectural concepts, design and to our professional association with other constructional procedures, whether these be ship-building or highway alignment.

I wish therefore to declare three dicta, to follow these up with the identification of three fields of urgent design comprhension, which I believe to be essential to future architectural endeavors, and then to summarize these issues by pleading for action respecting three particularities.

First, a point of SCALE. Architecture, however magnifi-cent, cannot be other than a detail of the landscape.

Similarly, a City can scarcely be greater than the landscape that sustains it; and Regional Planning cannot be successful unless the physical features of a region are read against the qualities of the regions around. At every stage of planning and building, the study must be measured along with the landscape.

Second, the quality of CONTRAST. It is clear that we are losing a "sense of place" as a result of the use of the all-pervading and novel uniformity of materials and methods which are inevitable with mass-production. This is no fault in itself, but in time such artifice will send the soul screaming in search of the values of contrast, and of variations of landscape in particular.

In other circumstances, I have been pleading for the in-
clusion of ‘contrast’ for particular study, as a distinct and basic factor in urban design. It is in the assessment of contrast, I believe, that the appreciation of the primary and of the lesser ingredients of the landscape lies, and it is this value of contrast which is of such compelling importance in the relationship of buildings to surroundings, harmoniously outrageous.

Third, a matter of MOMENT. As the significance of contrast between place and place rises, so too, will the comprehension of time become more urgent in all matters of urban design. This is especially acute when the dimension of distance, previously measured by time is now overcome by almost instantaneous communication and by increasingly speedy movement, so soon to be supplemented by yet swifter motion still.

I insist upon the inclusion of TIME and of timing as an essential part of any design equation, for no formula of human procedures is capable of resolution without this simple system.

There are also psychological factors to be considered. Imagine an envirium of increasing novelty and artificiality, and at once, you will appreciate the yearning to establish position, both geographical, (in relative place) and historical, (in relative time). Humanity, like any other species ‘belongs,’ and the increasing population densities which must inevitably destroy that original sense of position in a tidal mass of anonymity develops, it would seem, a compensatory interest in the past. The extraordinary and fast-growing pre-occupation with times past which is now current, is to me, a clear indication of the subconscious need for social reference that requires place and seeks position in time.

This desire to belong in place and time is sure to intensify as the penetration of interplanetary voids continues, for the dizzying reaching out naturally necessitates anchorage in the reverse direction, back along the passages of previous progress. The sensitivity of the architect towards time, and towards the rhythmic swing between extreme and extreme of fashion and design idiom has never been more urgent than at this period of social bewilderment.

Meanwhile, we flatter ourselves with the presumption of aesthetic leadership, and a former President of the A.I.A. with every justification, has declared the need for Professional Statesmanship in the assumption of command and of responsibility for the envirional seamliness of the nation.

The response to this timely gesture was disappointing both in the matter of support from the profession itself, and in the objections raised by kindred disciplines. I waved this challenge before the Landscape Architects at their Colorado Convention in 1961, since I was anxious to test their reaction to such a sweeping claim as that implied in Phil Will’s plea for “architectural statesmanship” in rallying the associated professions to action to arrest of our declining envirion.

Since my topic is “Buildings and their Surroundings” I return to the same issue, again, since the need for social lead is now so serious that statesmanship is indeed necessary if the public, the politicians and the professions are to be stirred to co-operative action. Politicians are very deliberately included in this trinity since the magnitude of most planning operations is inevitably so great that decisions cannot be made other than by those at the highest levels of government; and especially at this moment, when our representatives are beginning to take bold initiative somewhat in advance of the public perception and pressure.

I do not propose to argue, here, whether or not there is a decline in the quality of the inhabited environment, ranging from atmospheric cleanliness to water pollution, from the consequences of the natural aging of structures to the accumulation of trivial trash in the name of commercial competition. I take it for granted that we agree upon the general dislevelment of all that we behold about us, and that we agree that such a condition does not become a sophisticated society, let alone a Great Society.

In retrospect, it is sad to reflect how professionally introspective we have been throughout this whole period of intense industrialization, when our predecessors concentrated upon structures within the site limits of their commissions and were content to witness increasing in-between wastage that eventually begot wastage all about us. But their pressures were less and their priorities were different, and the social consciousness towards the surroundings was scarcely awakened let alone alarmed to its present one-hundredth-part awareness.

It is the redemption of this situation, the surroundings, the whole envirion in fact, that seems to me now to be so much more important than a contented concern with just architecture.

In urban planning, it is to be expected that the buildings take precedence, and therefore the envirional design should be subservient to their purposes. But since the urban form is steadily shifting to combine the benefits of static accommodation with the facilities for ready movement, the significance of the landscape, land form and ecology, is re-emerging.

As a result of watching this shift of emphasis from statics to dynamics in the process of change in the standard of urban excellence, I am increasingly opposed to the continuing separation of the three complimentary disciplines of architecture, planning and of landscape design.

The situation has now become so serious, in my estimation, that every intending professional having dealings with the surface of the earth, and of its prevailing condition, requires rudimentary training in what I term, ‘landscape comprehension,’ being a course in the language of landscape and the lessons therein. Without the
basis of some such unifying course, common to all those organizations which have joined in the recently formed Interprofessional Commission on Environmental Design, there can be little expectation of creditable progress in envirional improvement.

Now, in support of my three dicta upon the importance of our concepts of SCALE, of CONTRAST and of MOMENT, I want to emphasize three fields of vital comprehension that are common to all the inter-professional membership, and which have recently become inescapable extensions of conventional design routine.

The first of these is undoubtedly WATER, that essential element, so much abused, yet without which not one of our problems, of cultivation, land-use planning, industrial thrust or building enterprises could exist.

Our social and economic pressures are now so great that I assess the problem of water as prime in the continuance of those standards currently maintained, and progress becomes impossible without a much improved technology in the husbandry of water, its collection, use, treatment and continued re-use.

What surroundings can be expected without the continued assurance of healthy water? Ultimately, it is the surroundings that matter more than any structure, for it is the nature of the surroundings that first determines the need for and the form of the structure. Again, it is the condition of the surroundings which ensures the continued use of the structure.

Presently, we shall be as much concerned with submarine habitation, the planning of sub-surface storage, manufacturing and with marine cultivation, where the discipline of the surroundings is absolute, and where defiance brings disaster. Because of the supposed extraordinariness of the location and the type of accommodation required, are we, as architects, to be expected to leave their designing to the engineers because the materials used must be other than those to which we are accustomed?

I fear that there is the danger that we may be content to relinquish the pioneering of any such adventure to the engineers in the behalf that an architect's business is confined to the land alone. But I do not believe that we would be right in any such conclusion any more than it would be right to permit the naval architect to design also the public spaces of a ship, and from there to graduate to the land, urban design and architecture, yet this transposition may yet take place, and I for one would rejoice, for this very simple reason that naval architects seem to be able to handle the mechanical superstructures of ships with consummate aesthetic skill, which I have seen no evidence that any architect, alive, can be trusted to bring a stack-pipe or vent through a roof.

Design is our business, wherever it may be, whatever its purpose, and we are primarily concerned where design touches closely the whole range of human condition, for it is the vexing attribute of artistry by which we are bound in our service to the public. I can warn you further, that the more remote are the new design tasks from the current normal, the more exacting the envirional disciplines become, and the greater will grow the need for the effects of that artistry which still symbolizes the human inspiration now in competition with the near-perfection of mechanical computation.

I plead, therefore, that if it is recognized that an architect is indeed concerned with the surroundings, then attention to water as the element making surroundings meaningful, is fundamental. I shall try to persuade you also, that the rewards of studying architecture, past and to come in association with water will have all the fascination of pioneering, and yet more.

For the planner, the prospect of water is no less engaging for it will include the whole range of human motion from therapeutic values to recreational facilities for the multitude, from the regulation of resources to the discipline of gravity and of uses. Water is more vulnerable to misuse than the land, by reason of its constant movement. It demands greater respect and must therefore be handled with greater authority if revenge is to be avoided.

Indeed, it is humbling to observe that it is usually water that aggravates the lesser damage to the earth, often turning the initial human inadvertence to major devastation. Direct damage to water brings swift retaliation in the forms of polution, flood, ecological malbalance and maybe eventually drought.

Never forget that the absence of exposed water from most urban scenes also conceals the absolute dependence upon water that prevails, and I would add, that the emotional temperature of a population is higher in areas without visible water than in places where the abundance of water is obvious.

It is extraordinary to me that so basic a material is so consistently ignored when its presence, in whatever quantity, so affects every material with which we are concerned.

The second field requiring equal attention from both architects and planners follows hard upon the first, and is ECOLOGY.

I need not labor the same urgencies again, but the increasing rate of envirional decline in and about cities is in striking proportion to their increasing magnitude. The city is somehow the exception to the axiom 'the bigger the better' which is best emphasized, perhaps, by the one factor that is now common to all growing cities, the sourness or the absence of vegetation. Even when the original cities had been well planted with trees as

*consisting of Architects, Landscape Architects, Planners and Civil Engineers

AUGUST, 1965
an essential humanizing element in an arid and hostile landscape, as at Houston, or Dallas where the forest grew along with the city, those who have succeeded the planters care little for this heritage and the central areas are becoming almost barren.

The psychological need for foliage increases, it seems to me, with the mounting concentration of population, but this necessity can be relatively easily relieved by the wholehearted acknowledgment of ecology as an essential material for the architect to include in all that he undertakes to design.

Our population amassment has now become so immense that we can no longer afford to plan for human convenience alone, but must accept also the responsibility for the ecological balance of the area for the whole range of wild-life, resident and migratory.

For instance, I have in mind the millions of seasonal fowl that land along the shores of Chicago as their predecessors have done for milenia, and whose descendants will continue to do after that mighty city is recorded only by oddly regular grassy undulations.

Urban time has turned full cycle. The need for refuge, and security, from nature and against the natural forces has turned, with the massing of multitudes, towards the struggle for things natural and for vegetation even as a stifling man reaches for the air. It is not extraordinary that the importance of ecology in urban planning needs to be re-emphasized at all when so much attention is given to the advantages of suburban life and supposed seclusion, yet this is surely so.

Even as buildings are constructed, spaces between are created, and in total, the spaces between invariably outvolume the structures, yet the quality of cities is generally recognized in the nature of the structures. For me, however, it is the trash-cast vacuum of the 'in-betweens' that sets the standard of urban distinction, that conditions the character and ensures the continued decline of the social and the economic health of the city.

The third field, of prime professional concern, so independently forceful yet so intimately related to water and to ecology is that of TRANSPORTATION which so imposes upon envirial form and design. Movement in each element, land, water and air, on an ever increasing measure in number, in load and in distance, can no longer be ignored by the architect in the belief that because the mechanical contrivance is the product of the engineers that they are therefore exclusively concerned with and responsible for the demands that their contrivances may make upon the scene.

I have said already that the standard of urban excellence has now shifted from that of architectural nobility, as in Rome, Paris, or St. Petersburg, to convenience of movement, and still the cities are writhing in agony in the attempt to adjust to the demands for more services, for more rapid and more simplified movement and interchange.

Facility is being added to facility, without the proper clearance of previous systems, or any effective co-ordination between the areas of old usage and the requirements of the new because each change of system is bred by, and conceived in, commercial competition.

Ever since the passing of the horse, which provided the common dimension that ruled the rate, the volume and maintained a common measure of movement, for both rich and poor, confusion has kept more than even pace with invention.

Within the last 125 years the major industrial cities of the world have been developed and sustained by the introduction of canals, of railroads, of streetcars, of independent free roving vehicles (private and public), of super-highways (as distinct from roads or streets) of airfields, and now airfields extended for jet, super-jet and supersonic flight.

This catalogue of successive investment represents seven principal changes involving each element, land, water and air, in response to demand for both quantity and rapidity of service.

In rough figures this represents the introduction of an additional transportation system at the rate of one every 18 years. It is already 10 years since regular international jet air services were begun by Great Britain to South Africa, to Australia and elsewhere, and already the supersonic Concord is emerging (and it takes some 10 years gestation to turn an aeronautical concept into an operational aircraft.)

Meanwhile, new systems no more come one by one. We are now confronted with the immediate prospects of three dynamic influences simultaneously. Vertical flight in quantity, both passenger and freight is at hand (and I am not referring to the temporary and clumsy helicopter devices, but to Rolls-Royce achievements in adapting conventional thrust engines); Air-cushion Vehicles are now in service, blithly ignoring differences between ground and water and changes of season in their defiance of surfaces, snow, sand, swamps, rapids, ice or any combination of these; Drona's providing opportunities of combining storage and marine transportation and which also bid fair to revolutionize port facilities by relieving expensive land areas from being wasted with surface storage structures.

All these inventions, pioneered in Britain I need hardly add, are waiting imaginative application in these United States not only by your own distinguished engineers, but by architects and planners as well, who shall determine that such advantages are not paid for at a heavy price in further envirial desecration and decline.

Beyond these again, I warn you of the likelihood of sudden achievements following intensive studies of the force
of gravity for the complementary condition of antigravity, and also of the exploration of the whole range of magnetics, which, when better understood, will make the straining, roaring, burly-burly of present mechanical movement seem quite ludicrous.

I wish to impress upon you the possibility that we are about to emerge from this tyranny of noisy mechanisms and that our era of infinite inefficiency is about to outgrow. It is this possibility in particular, that should provide us, as envirionalists, with the chance to re-assert our imagination and our design influence upon the ever-changing demands of transportation, for it is this especial urgency that seems to provide us with the most ready opportunity of urban improvement.

TRANSPORTATION is deliberately included as a field of architectural operation as the legitimate concern of the architect, not only because of its obvious influences upon design, but especially because of the detrimental envirional effects that inevitably accompany the facilities and the services, however convenient at first they may be (Railroads and yards, elevated tracks, highways above, canals below, airports and harbors).

There is a further reason for emphasizing the importance of TRANSPORTATION to architects since, as prime envirionalist’s, you have an immediate responsibility for watchfulness to prevent thoughtless damage to the urban and social fabric from the slashing surgery of highway engineering.

I have seen so much damage in other cities wrought by these means. There is a common belief that the importance of the wheel transcends all other physical, economic and community factors, and this simply is not so.

Everytime I visit a strange city I ask about the needless losses, the needless waste caused by highway alignment, all well argued in the name of cost and convenience, yet soon imposing costly blight, wastage and inconvenience upon the immediate neighborhood.

It is also inevitable, it seems, that evidence of architectural quality, historic interest and scenic values are destroyed in the general rout that heralds the approach of The High-Way. Now it is, of course, a tedious and well known ploy to compose these routings in secret for obvious reasons of avoiding scandal and commercial transactions, but there are degrees of scandal other than that of horse-trading. One of the most serious of these is the matter of Heritage, of co-ordinated urban and social planning and of sheer seamliness, visual and ethical.

The continued repetition of this blatant procedure is really a betrayal of the environment in the interests of limited demand, whose future requirements, let me emphasize, may be very soon outmoded.

Walter Gropius once warned a startled London audience that the Automobile is here to stay. I tell you now, firmly, the automobile is a passing phase. And I therefore resent, strongly, the continued sacrifice of things of lasting quality for momentary gain, when I know that proper forethought and balanced assessments are not being made.

I am becoming aware that your Capital City of Austin and even the environment of the University itself is being subjected to this same routine treatment and I plead, once more, for “planning in balance” so that Austin may avoid the repetition of the disasters of Bridgeport, or Pittsburgh, of New Haven, or Chattanooga, of San Francisco and so many, many other now needlessly denuded American cities.

In summary, I want to turn, now, to practical action which we can take, immediately, to cope with a situation already long overdue for attention.

I am not of a revolutionary disposition, but as a result of what I have seen on all sides I do sincerely advocate the advantages of radical rthinking for, “As our case is new so we must think anew and act anew.”

The urban scene is disgraceful, full of dis-grace, and in our anxiety to applaud a novelty here and there we have come to ignore the endless senseless wastefulness of the inhabited envirium. “We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save (the condition) of our country.”

Since “the dogmas of the quiet past” are so very clearly “inadequate for the stormy present,” I can think of no better way of disenthralling ourselves than in asking the basic question, how much of this continuing inadequacy of thought and planning is the result of our educational experiences?

For my part, I am not content with any program of which I have knowledge, either in Britain or in these United States. I am increasingly aware of the gathering of forces which will overpower our professional endeavors and show to the public that we have not fulfilled an effective part in preventing the continuing deterioration of the city, and moreover, that we are unlikely, on the evidence available, to redirect affairs for we are too remote from those economic forces which continue to set the pace. In fact, I fear that as a profession we may be shown to be spiritually impoverished, imaginatively moribund and politically powerless, in brief—“we’re through”—the professional death barrier, unless we can readjust to the rising requirements of WATER, ECOLOGY and TRANSPORTATION.

Our defense may be that we have not yet been asked properly to perform, nor given the resources with which to compete and to vanquish, and that the general social inertia has thwarted most endeavors. While this may be true, it will be of no avail against the rising tide of urban despair.

I do not suggest that there should be any sacrifice of our principal activity as architects, in the service of these
other vitalities, nor that we should become less active as imaginative artists, for architecture is an art no matter how our circumstances may change. Let there be no doubt about that. Even as architecture, however repulsed, remains an art, so too must urban planning become an art once more, for the buildings—surroundings relationship may be likened to an array of pictures displayed in conditions that deny the value of their artistry. The gallery, too, must be worthy of the canvases, the nobility of the rooms must enhance the pictures, if their association is to have any mutual relevance and collective effect. (Would you care to see the Mellon masterpieces hung on the walls of a subway?)

Unfortunately, for those of us 'harrassed' with innate artistic sensibilities, the art of architecture is so infinitely more complicated than that of painting. Planning, in turn, is more complicated still, while architectural practice has inevitably become even more entwined in the problems of planning, legal and physical.

Beyond this again lies the basis of all form, material and associations in architecture and in planning, the landscape of which we have so little comprehension.

It is as pointless to review urban problems without reference to landscape conditions as it is to plan without an economic and social reckoning or by taking the law for granted.

Moreover, I have continued to note that officials at every level have become sadly disenchanted with plans and planning—the issues are too complex and the persuasiveness of both architects and planners remain largely ineffective at the very moment when increased budgets are demanded, and sometimes even yielded to.

Where are the spectacular urban improvements which the inhabitants are ever led to expect after so much promise? Notwithstanding the great works done since the war, the total advance has been less, much less than the total recession, as any city, old or new, American or European, will bear witness.

It is small wonder that the engineer gains in relative respect for, like the majesty of justice that must be seen to be done, he is seen to measure up, to plan and then to get busy, and presently, power pulsates, traffic flows, water, petroleum and gas are at taps turn.

In respect to envirial conditions, on the other hand, the mightiness of the planning labors and the meagerness of the results achieved, become a constant source of political exasperation. And now, the War on Poverty is about to accentuate again those same planning issues and procedures which were raised a decade earlier by the concept of urban renewal, with the added attraction of rural renewal.

The code-names may change but the problems remain remarkably unchanged—I do not intend to belittle, in any way, the achievements of the many of these mammoth programs, but in comparison with the Gargantuan cities yet growing, the results have been relatively small and far from keeping pace with the accelerating rate of decline that has smitten every American city large and small. Even Austin's mighty main street, Congress Avenue, is again the subject of an Editorial of withering criticism, as an example of careless blight in a place of importance, at a moment of prosperity—(Austin Statesman, April 17th, 1965).

This is clearly a moment for the closing of ranks and for the remarching of our struggling technical forces for we are at the Dunkirk of our endeavor against the forces of destruction, before we strike out once more, in the name of the total environment. No lesser dimension or division of the task will do. Further, in recognition of Goliath situation, we must not only be against a fearful foe, we must be positive and be for some honorable objective.

As with the co-ordination between separate and sometimes wayward services of army, navy and air forces, so too with the wanting design professions, architects, planners and landscape architects and their unification as envirialists, and I plead that our cause might be known as the realization of ENVIRICULTURE, nothing less than the coordinated redemption of the whole inhabited scene.
The Texas Architectural Foundation offers scholarships in architectural education and sponsors research in the profession. Contributions may be made as memorials: a remembrance with purpose and dignity.
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ANNOUNCING THE NEW ABSORBOTRON® SHOCK ABSORBER

Now, Josam can state without reservation that it has developed the one and effective means of controlling hydrostatic shock pressures and water hammer — with the new ABSORBOTRON Shock Absorber.

Years of testing gives positive assurance that when installed on any plumbing system and sized properly the ABSORBOTRON will effectively and permanently reduce shock pressures to within safe limits that do not exceed 150 P.S.I. (the normal working pressure at which all ordinary plumbing systems are designed to greater safety). The secret is in the new elastomer type bellows. Write for Manual SA-4.

District Representatives
JOE P. DILLARD & ASSOC.
1531 Edison  Dallas 7, Texas Phone: 512-7720
R. B. ARNOLD COMPANY
P. O. Box 10093
Houston 18, Texas Phone: OY 6-2591

Josam Manufacturing Co.
Michigan City, Indiana

Architectural freedom?
Versatility?
Grace and lasting good looks?
Get them all with the Armco Building System

Design possibilities offered by the Armco Building System are practically endless. Components — including five framing systems, a variety of roof slopes, three wall finishes, and a choice of colors — blend well with any other building materials, too.

Armco Sculptured STEELOX® Panels — heart of the Armco Building System — provide both attractiveness and durability. You can select from a wide variety of colors, lines and surfaces.

See your Armco Sales Representative soon. Or write Metal Products Division, Armco Steel Corporation, P. O. Box 1939, Houston, Texas 77001. Armco Building Dealers in 11 Texas cities.

ARMCO Metal Products Division
STARK STRUCTURAL GLAZED TILE

LOWEST MAINTENANCE • SCRATCH RESISTANCE • FIRE-PROOF SAFETY • UNEQUALLED DURABILITY • INITIAL ECONOMY • PERMANENT COLOR

Only Structural Glazed Tile offers all of these performance, esthetic and economical advantages for wall construction. Only Stark offers Structural Glazed Tile in such a wide variety of types to satisfy requirements of fire safety, sanitation, economy and design versatility.

NEW FEATHEREDGE COVE BASE...
Eliminates need for recessed floor construction. Stark Featheredge base may be installed after floor construction to accommodate resilient type floor coverings.

FULL SERVICE... We will be most happy to be of service at any time during your planning, specifying, bidding or building. Full information including sizes, colors, samples and prices are available... You'll find us convenient to write or call.

ACME BRICK COMPANY
General Offices, P. O. Box 425, Fort Worth 1, Texas
Since 1891 • Sales offices in principal cities
does this give you an idea?

This Texas Gulf Coast home was designed as the world’s first “total energy” house. Natural gas is its one source of energy for heating, cooling, cooking, water heating and electric power. The natural gas “total energy package” has already proved itself in commercial, industrial and school construction. Its adaptability to home and apartment use is only a matter of time. The simplicity and low cost of this single on-site source for all energy needs is particularly appropriate in Texas where gas is the natural fuel. If this gives you ideas, call the builder department of your local gas utility for details.

GAS...TOTAL ENERGY FOR MODERN CONSTRUCTION
Once noted mainly for its utility, concrete masonry has become a new and exciting material. The design versatility made possible by an almost unlimited array of shapes, sizes, colors and textures is winning new appreciation from architects, builders and homeowners. Of all masonry used for walls, 70% now is concrete masonry. 3,700 concrete masonry plants are turning to increased use of automation. Today, a single automatic block machine can produce more than 5,000 units in a normal working day. Contributing importantly to such advances are the research findings and technical data made available to the entire building industry through the 38 field offices of the Portland Cement Association.

PORTLAND CEMENT ASSOCIATION 110 East Eighth St., Austin, Texas 78701

An organization to improve and extend the uses of concrete.