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POVERTY AND THE OBSTINATE URGE TO BEAUTY

DR. WILLIAM H. CROOK

Director, Southwest Regional Office of Economic Opportunity

“Crisis” is defined by Webster as “the decisive moment” and “the turning point for better or worse.” It is a perpetually “in” word—one of the few remaining aristocratic words in a tired and strained vocabulary that was invented to serve man in a set of circumstances now gone forever. Though most words have been pulled and stretched beyond original shape and meaning, leaving us with a communications system less precise than that of some animals, the little word “crisis” has managed to survive with some of its integrity intact. It has survived commentators, preachers, politicians, wars and stock market crashes; and yet it still expresses the same concepts of decision and action that Tom Paine had in mind when he used it to help salvage the American Revolution with his Crisis Papers. This radical, resilient little word is now, to my surprise, found in the usually tranquil company of architects.

You, gentlemen, have let it in and your profession may never be the same again! For the disturbing thing about this word is that it does not just speak of the need for action, but often triggers the action itself. And you have employed it. Not in panic nor with shrillness, but in tones scholarly and with studied intention. You have referred to an “environmental crisis” that appears to be of singular concern to your profession. As a layman, I am not sure what an architect means when he speaks of an environmental crisis. I therefore feel free to grasp the initiative of ignorance and presume to tell you what a layman thinks a crisis of environment should mean to an architect and how he thinks architects can address themselves to that crisis.

Critical aspects of contemporary environment are many and pronounced, but the two most obvious aspects are: (1) America is running out of nature; and (2) the forces of urbanized society are in conspiracy against the sensitivities of us all.

To support the statement that “America is running out of nature is not difficult. The crisis faced in environment today is not the same as it was in the formative years of our nation. A sparsely populated and open frontier confronted man with different problems than those that now arise in the densely populated centers of the land. This is particularly so as these problems affect the poor. The affluent man may buy his piece of shoreline, his mountain view or his river frontage, and by so doing assure himself and his children those sublimities of nature which inspired the frontiersman and sharpened his aesthetic sensivities. But too many of our citizens, and particularly the poor, are being fenced out.
and pushed back from the surf, the sunset and the autumn leaves. As the population of our country increases and land becomes proportionately more precious, the common man's access to nature will continue to diminish. He will be increasingly walled in and bricked up. The historians may some day write that the most successful experiment in dehumanization was carried out not in the pavlovian jails of Russia or the death camps of the Third Reich, but in a designed and engineered something called "the city"—particularly in those parts of the city gone sour where the senses of man have gagged and rebelled at the touch and smell and sight and sound and taste of poverty. Here is environmental crisis at its worst. Here is an environment when the nostrils are desensitized by the acrid, pernicious smell of perspiration and stale urine; where everything that is touched is soiled, mildewed or broken; where, in fact, millions of Americans live and die in varying degrees of desperation.

A manipulated and desecrated environment has increased the burden on the human will. The poverty of the twentieth century slums is a conclusive poverty. There is, I believe, an obstinate urge to beauty in the human race. So urgent and obstinate that no force or combination of circumstances has ever been able to squelch it in the species. But there is evidence that the overwhelming oppressiveness of a spoiled environment can destroy that urge to beauty in the individual. I do not know, gentlemen, what an environmental crisis is, if it is not the decisive moment when all the forces of a total environment work negatively upon the spirit of a man.

An environment gone rancid dulls the senses. The human spirit denied beauty and exposed only to the loathsome and the ugly, has but two alternatives: rebel or die. The morning inventory at the morgue and the night report at the precinct station tell of Americans who have tried one or the other of these exits. When their hostility is expressed lathegically, they become resigned parasites on the anatomy of society. Perhaps even this is a way of taking vengeance—a subconscious attempt to sap the life out of a society that has discarded them. On the other hand, when their antagonisms are overtly expressed, they become violent and destructive of life and property—and we have a Watts on our hands. It was this knowledge that led President Johnson to say, "Beauty is more than a source of pleasure and recreation. It shapes our values, it feeds our spirit. It helps make us the kind of men and women that we finally become, and the kind of men that we finally become makes this great nation." In the United States today, thirty-five million people live in a no-man's land. Nearly half of these are children. Government economists have classified these people as "poor." Guidelines used to measure whether or not one is poor are cold, economic, statistical. For instance, an urban family of four with a total family income of $3,000 or less statistically satisfies the economic requirements for classification as poverty-stricken. Yet the poorness of this family cannot be summed up by statistics.

Reinhold Niebuhr contends that "poverty is not purely economic, but cultural," and Chancellor Murphy of UCLA defines poverty as a lack of "the intangibles—opportunity and the experience of beauty." If we deal as a people or a government only with the intangible of economic opportunity and neglect the other intangibles—the experience of beauty—there will be no decisive conclusion to the war on poverty. The White House conference on natural beauty was called by the President to emphasize the blight and waste within the nation. The Economic Opportunity Act was signed by the President to counteract the blight and waste of human lives. Both emphasis stress the necessity of involving the people themselves in any solution to be worked out. Federal and state programs may provide the tools, but community action at the local level will determine the success or failure of this bold and precedent-making program.

The most vital similarity between the two efforts is their common purpose—the objective of the beautification program is the enrichment of people's lives. The goal of the war on poverty is also one of life enrichment. Both programs are necessary if the young are to be provided with the opportunity to learn; the able-bodied with the opportunity to work; and every man with the opportunity to live in dignity. We are dealing with a problem more complex than billboards and automobile junk yards, utility poles and telephone wires. We are dealing with the future fulfillment or failure of thirty-five million people subject to filth, hunger, ignorance, premature aging, and early death. The crisis is one of human worth. Planting hedges around junk yards, banning billboards from road sides and going underground with telephone lines will have cosmetic effects, but the nation is not just diseased, it is sick, and it needs medicine as well as cosmetics. We must resist the temptation to act superficially out of quick guilt. Unless the attempts to beautify our physical environment are coordinated with even more serious efforts to meet the gut needs of society, they will prove more detrimental than helpful. They will prevent diagnosis and treatment.

One can hope that the recent resurgence of interest in culture, in the arts and natural beauty, came from a renaissance desire within contemporary citizens. A desire not limited by social class, income level or educational background. I believe that this desire is pronounced among the poor; that they exhibit a deep passion for beauty. A desire that can be seen in the child who collects pieces of colored glass from the muck of the street. It can be seen in the mother who nails a cheap print on a greasy wall or guards and waters a bright geranium in the windowless kitchen. There is an obstinate urge to beauty in man—in the bone and marrow of the species. It can be banded and destroyed by environment. It is an important part of the soul of the nation. It is the area of most concern to you.

Mr. Paul Friedburg, a landscape architect known to all of you, suggests: "The low level of residential planning in the country is an indictment of our entire culture. The home is our most personal possession and should, therefore, represent our aesthetic and social aspirations."

The obvious need for more attractive and adequate housing has often been the subject for discussion and action. This country is embarked on the biggest building campaign ever experienced by a nation. Estimates reveal that in the next forty years, a new America will be built—every structure in the country will be duplicated. But what kind
of an America will it be? This staggering building boom will but contribute to tomorrow’s problems if you do not take bold and decisive steps now. The Great Society envisioned by our President, “the place where the city of man serves not only the needs of the body and the demands of commerce, but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community,” cannot be had by merely duplicating what now exists.

If a crisis is “the turning point for better or worse,” and if a crisis does in fact now exist in our national environment, what, if anything, can be done? Before attempting to give an answer, let us ponder this “turning point” that seems to cause you consternation. Have we just reached the point of turning for “better or worse”? How do we know that we have not already passed it and that our course is not now inexorably set? Can we be sure that man has not already gone too far in destroying the delicate balance of his total environment?

On the other hand, perhaps you are alarmists and there is no crisis, just a lack of confidence in earth’s ability to cope with the multiplication of humans—this burgeoning population of vandals and wastemakers. Or the lack of confidence may be in the stoutness and flexibility of Homo Sapiens himself. It may be that his lungs will adjust to contaminated air, his genes will establish immunity to nuclear fallout; his intestinal tract will come to cope with insecticides and chemicals and that he will actually learn to enjoy a glass of detergent and sewage drawn fresh from the tap.

If, on the other hand, your concern is well-grounded and the moment of tide change is at hand, what effective action can be taken to influence the present remedially and the future preventively? Again let me delay the reply in lieu of a final question: are there positive forces inherent in our society which can be mobilized as allies for this crisis? I think there are. Not the least significant among these is the urge to beauty already discussed; the thus-far irressiprable desire to create and to invent that has made this country great. These creative and artistic accomplishments of our people may appear from our vantage point to have been brought about by a few exceptional individuals. Because they are great and successful in our eyes, we forget the backgrounds from which most of them have come. Before they were considered exceptional, they were just unknowns in the farms and towns and cities of the nation.

My job as Director of the poverty program in this region of the United States gives great satisfaction—the kind of satisfaction that makes a man sleep well when he knows that his efforts are directed toward assisting people less fortunate than himself. But there is more than satisfaction in this work—there is excitement. And it is important that the country share in this excitement. The stirring cry, “Gold in California!” galvanized a people into action in 1849 and set this nation in movement and challenged the spirit of adventure in hundreds of thousands. But the promises of wealth and adventure contained in that cry are nothing compared to the potential wealth of human genius, creativity and talent that will be turned up and made available to the nation and to all civilization as a result of the efforts now under way to eradicate poverty in America. It is impossible to estimate the wealth of dynamic energy, talent, wit and wisdom now latent in these thirty-five million people who have been designated as “poor.” The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 has set in motion the greatest gold rush in the history of man. At last this country has discerned where her true riches lie!

There is a different kind of “new awareness” in the country. It will also be an ally in the attempt to solve our environmental crisis. It is the awareness that too much has been destroyed, too much has been wasted, too much has been allowed to deteriorate and fall into ruin, too much was badly planned to begin with. This public awareness is, I believe, now being changed into affirmative action.

A third and vital factor that will figure in a solution to the crisis is the leadership that the present administration is giving. The Congress demonstrated courage and boldness in writing, “It is, therefore, the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this nation.”

Now, having pointed out some positive assets available to men who want to be a part of affirmative action, let me ask the question, “What can be done about the environmental crisis?” I believe that your role can be major and determinative. I believe that you can do these things:

1. You can begin now to detect tenements and slums before they are ever built—while they are still in the blueprint stage, and you can build in architectural and engineering safeguards against them.

2. You can resist with greater obstinacy the fickleness of a faddist public by refusing to build early obsolescence into your structures.

3. You can launch a national education program to help inform the public both of the growing scarcity of space and of the reckless waste of inferior construction.

4. You can enlarge the circle around your drafting table to include those areas of the city that are slums, those areas that are becoming slums, and those areas that will be slums in twenty years.

The architect’s best must be enlarged and extended and the architect’s involvement in community action intensified. What group of men is better qualified to serve the country as an early warning system against ugliness, deterioration and blight?

5. And finally, gentlemen, the considerable prestige of your profession can be brought to bear upon all areas of government and at all levels for strong legislation that will demand the highest standards for construction, restoration, and preservation of buildings and homes.

The war on poverty (which is part of the answer to your environmental crisis) is a different kind of war than any ever fought before—and it calls for a different kind of mobilization. It requires full mobilization of the best brains, the most artistic talents, the greatest engineering know-how that this generation can produce. There is definitely a role for the architect, if he will assume it.

This presentation by Dr. Crook, delivered to the "Texas Conference on our Environmental Crisis", is part of the complete proceedings available from the school of Architecture, University of Texas.
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PROGRAM

To design on a 6-acre site, 60 three bedroom, 2-1/2 bath town­house apartment units that offered all the amenities of a detached single family residence with the advantages of common green space, swimming pool and no maintenance for tenants.

If possible, most townhouse units were to be located on common green space designed for family enjoyment. These units needed a view of green space yet privacy from people in green space. Other townhouse units would have private atrium spaces.
SOLUTION

Four basic townhouse unit plans were developed; two unit plans to face green spaces and two unit plans with private atriums. By arranging units in different size groups and varying orientation of these groups, a series of contiguous green spaces was created. Townhouses facing the green spaces were raised 2½ feet so patio areas with 3½ foot fences would have have view of green space yet have privacy. All units have a two car enclosed garage and guest parking spaces are distributed around site.

All townhouse units required individual mechanical systems so they could be sold as condominium townhouses if the Owner desires, and construction cost had to be in line with competitive residential and apartment construction costs.

Three basic exterior materials were used; brick, stucco and stained redwood. Roofs are cedar shingles. Construction is wood frame and concrete slab foundation on piers. Roof framing is wood trusses with exposed wood soffits at overhangs. Interior finishes for walls and ceilings are generally textured and painted gypsum board with carpeted floors. Floors in entries are quarry tile and wood parquet in family rooms. Family rooms also have wood paneled walls.
The Comptroller General of the United States made a report last April recommending a fundamental change in the manner Federal agencies select architects and engineers for Federal construction work. Prior to World War II, most government facilities were designed by in-house staffs or, in unique circumstances, by independent architects and engineers selected under special design competitions. The rapid increase in Federal construction during the military buildup for World War II, however, soon made this system unworkable. Government agencies began to turn to outside architects and engineers for the basic designs and specifications required for the construction of Federal facilities.

The general trend or most accepted approach in the Government, and as I believe is sanctioned in Federal procurement statutes, has been to select A-E firms under a two-step system of competition.

The first step has been to rank A-E firms according to their capability to perform a particular project at a particular time. In a second independent step, negotiations are then entered into with the firm at the head of the list and, if a satisfactory price arrangement cannot be reached with them, with the second firm, and so on until the contract is made.

In the simplest terms, the Comptroller General recommends consolidation of these two steps so the cost of such services—in other words, the size of your fee including your costs—is considered concurrently with the selection of the most qualified A-E to do the job.

Under this approach, the size of the fee would become a factor in selecting the most qualified firm. And, in the ultimate sense, the amount an individual A-E firm would charge would be a determinative factor in the selection process.

The Comptroller General's report of last April was submitted to both the House and the Senate. Thereupon, the report was referred to the Government Operations Committees of the two houses. In the House Committee, the report was then re-referred to the Government Activities Subcommittee, which I serve as Chairman. Following receipt of this report, an exhaustive analysis was made of its contents. Several months later, in November of last year, when our studies were completed, I addressed a seven-page letter to the Comptroller General disagreeing with certain of the conclusions and recommendations his report contained. I pointed out that we are in accord as to the need for Government A-E service procurements extending to all firms or individuals coming within the competitive range as this term is used in the procurement Act of 1947 and the Property Act of 1949. In my letter, I emphasized that, to the extent agencies were not doing so, they should broaden the scope of their procurements of such services to include consideration of all firms that might be qualified and who were interested in working with the Federal Government.

In the November letter to the Comptroller General, however, I expressed disagreement with the fundamental conclusions on which his report was based. In a fundamental sense, we could not accept the proposition that the size of the A-E’s fee should become a determinative factor in the selection of the most qualified firm or individual to perform a particular contract.

We concluded that there were two basic considerations ruling against acceptance of the Comptroller General’s position.

First, there is what you might call the amplification effect. Although we are going to pay a given amount to design a Federal facility, we are then going to spend 20 to 30 times that sum to build whatever is designed. The quality and utility of the design services must be measured in terms of the facility as completed. At much greater cost, that design will
be constructed with all its virtues or deficiencies. After all, the Government must use and maintain the facility for decades. Logic, therefore, requires that we do whatever we can to optimize the efficiency of the basic design.

The second factor is that at the time of the A-E selection there is no available standard of performance to use as a measure of what the Government is to receive for its money. As I indicated in my letter to the Comptroller General, any reduction in the amount of the fee resulting from the type of competition advocated in his April report, could as easily come out of the quality of a successful bidder's subsequent performance as out of his margin of profit.

This approach could discourage the more painstaking, careful and thorough professional. His offer of higher quality services would be at the mercy of less responsible members of your profession who shaved the size of their fee through compromising the quality of the design they offer. Under this approach, we could gradually breed out of the Government's mammoth construction program the incentive for better, more usable building designs with lower contraction and maintenance costs.

Over the past several months, the Comptroller General has recommended several different legislative proposals as a means of carrying out his recommendations. Although these proposals differ in form and substance, none of them constitutes an acceptable substitute for the system the Federal Government has used for more than twenty years and which I firmly believe is fully in accord with the directives Congress had provided in our various procurement statutes.

Resolution of this problem, however, will not be easy. The Comptroller General, by express intent of the Congress, occupies a highly independent position. While he works for the Congress, no individual Member or Committee thereof has complete jurisdiction over him. And this is the way it should be.

Furthermore, Elmer Staats, the present Comptroller General, is a dedicated man with a distinguished record of government service. He is an old personal friend of mine, and we work together day after day on a routine basis toward improving the efficiency and effectiveness of government operations. The Government Activities Subcommittee, which I serve as Chairman, is one of the strongest supporters of the General Accounting Office of any committee or subcommittee in the Congress. The level of cooperation we have achieved with the GAO is unsurpassed, and the result in improvement of government operations—in savings to the taxpayers—has been significant.

At present, the Comptroller General and I, in keeping with our usual close working relationship, are seeking a settlement of our differences over these issues. I strongly believe that we can come to a satisfactory conclusion, maintaining the traditional approach to design services which emphasizes relative qualifications, talent and experience.

Meanwhile, there is the other side of the coin. As I am sure you understand, the traditional procedure Government agencies have used and which the Government Activities Subcommittee endorses is unique. Under provisions of the 1947 Procurement Act and the 1949 Property Act, Congress allowed agencies flexibility so that procurement procedures could be custom-tailored to meet unique requirements.

Therefore, continuation of this type of competitive negotiations relating to architectural and engineering services must logically depend upon the success we achieve through its use in bringing to the government the highest quality services at reasonable prices. If this approach does not produce the desired result, there is no longer any logical justification for treating the procurement of such services in any unique fashion.

Accordingly, continuation of the present approach in the Government's procurement of your services ultimately becomes the responsibility of your profession—at least those of you who participate in the Federal construction program.

I believe that the federal construction program in its entirety will receive ever-increasing attention in Washington. The General Accounting Office, under the Comptroller General, over the past several years has gradually moved into construction. There are now General Accounting Office auditors with extensive expertise in construction. The Government Activities Subcommittee has also made limited investigations into certain aspects of the federal construction program. As we achieve more precise evaluation of federal expenditures, through the use of modern data processing systems and systems design techniques, the Comptroller General and the House and Senate Government Operations and Appropriations Committees will almost certainly delve more deeply into federal construction activities. The present system of employing architects and engineers will therefore receive ever-increasing study and attention.

As you participate in the federal construction program, give the government your very best efforts. This, I believe, will lead to continued recognition of your professional status and to the continuation of a contractual relationship which favors, on a project-by-project basis, the selection of those most qualified to do the job.

Thank you.
About 1890, E. M. House decided to establish his permanent residence in Austin, and in building his home, he intended to have the best of everything. There was nothing new-rich or pretentious in his wish, it was simply the accustomed manner of conducting what must have been, by all accounts, an extraordinarily charmed life. Born in Houston on July 26, 1858, Edward Mandell House was the son of an enterprising baker, merchant, blockade runner, and finally property owner. The small fortune accumulated by his father allowed him to obtain the standard education available to young Victorians of the upper class. He was reared mainly in the East and in Europe, and later studied at Yale and Cornell.

The death of his father in 1880 necessitated his withdrawal from college and returned his attention to the state capital, the center of the older House's property holdings in Travis County. In the following year he married Loulie Hunter, and after wide travel in America and abroad—a pastime that was to continue throughout their lives—the Houses, now with two daughters, Janet and Mona, decided to settle in Austin and build a beautiful and hospitable
mansion (1,2). The cornerstone was laid on April 21, 1891.

For the next two decades, the residence at 1704 West Avenue was the center of House’s varied activities. In addition to managing and augmenting his holdings in cotton and ranch land, he pursued his interest in liberal politics and was largely responsible for the “making” of at least three Texas governors. He was evidently thoroughly unselfish and humanitarian in his political dealings, seeking neither public office nor favors for himself.

The mansion was constantly filled with relatives and friends, and gracious entertaining was perpetual. Many state and national notables, among them William Jennings Bryan, Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, were honored guests. Colonel House—an honorary title given him by Governor Culberson, which he personally detested—spared no trouble or expense in accommodating his friends. In 1898, Bryan and his family were visiting when one of their daughters became seriously ill. House promptly rented the mansion next door—where the Miss Texas Apartments now stand—and installed the Bryans there for the remainder of the winter. Judge James W. McClendon, Chief Justice of the Civil Court of Appeals, was a University freshman in 1892, and became friends with Mona House, “quite a leader and one of the most delightful women it has been my privilege to know.”

While the Houses traveled widely, particularly in the unbearably summer months, they continued to return to Austin until 1912. At that time, in New York City, Colonel House met Woodrow Wilson, and the two liberals were so perfectly attuned politically that the Texan agreed to manage Wilson’s campaign for President, a decision that brought him to national prominence and foreshadowed his later, major role as an intimate friend and advisor to one of our intellectually finest chiefs of state. The decision also entailed permanently leaving Austin, and though he continued to list the city as his official address, and maintained an office in the Littlefield Building, the family moved to New York in 1913.

In his frequent travels to New York, Colonel House, a man whose tastes were evidently as advanced in aesthetics as in social thought, was constantly aware of the architectural refinements then being developed in the city. A moderately important architect then working in Brooklyn was Frank Freeman, whose designs were ultimately realized on both coasts—and, of course, in Texas. On seeing one of Freeman’s New York buildings, House was much impressed by the rubble massiveness of the Romanesque style.

In the forefront of minor architects of his period, Frank Freeman naturally was awed by the achievements of Henry Hobson Richardson, and like everyone else strove to adapt them to his own uses. While some of his work was quite literally copying from Richardson, he was capable of doing pleasing original plans, as in the House residence and others similar to it. For those who wished mansions in the Romanesque manner, but whose means were not of Vanderbilt or Astor proportions, a variation soon evolved. Generally known as “the shingle style”, this mode of building was, as Alan Burnham states, an attempt to “express the lines of the Romanesque Revival via the medium of shingles and rubble.” It originated in some of Richardson’s late domestic designs and was adopted by Shepley, Rutan, and Coolidge (Richardson’s successor firm), W. A. Potter, McKim, Mead, and White, and countless others. A dark, roomy, comfortable style, it predicts modern informality and open-space planning, with a novel emphasis on function, rather than merely appearance.

Such a philosophy of building would naturally have been attractive to the easy-going, hospitable Colonel House, and Freeman may only have adapted plans already drawn by the prospective owner. In any case, the architect, two of whose houses his friendliest critic, Montgomery Schuyler,
called "... not only by far the most artistic examples of Richardsonian Romanesque in our domestic architecture but ... among the most artistic of our dwellings in any style," was commissioned to design the mansion in 1890. A Canadian by birth, he practiced mainly in New York City, working from his office at 132 Naussau Street. The House residence is presumably his only Texas plan, and one of the few examples of the style in the Southwest—which makes its impending destruction even more regrettable.

In 1890, Austin was a town of 20,000 persons, and the University registered 300 students. West Avenue was the newest and most fashionable neighborhood, and the lot, or rather entire block, which Colonel House purchased from A. C. Hunter on September 17, 1886, for $6000 was at the summit of one of the city's highest hills. From his choice position, House would be able to look south to his garden and past it across 17th Street to his stables, southeast to town, north to the University, west to the mesquite-covered plains where he customarily rode his thoroughbred horses. He would have wanted a spacious home with many porches and windows to take advantage of the hilltop breeze and provide shade for the hot fall afternoons—the family was usually gone in the summer.

Driving up the hill and onto the grounds by the main approach, the first thing that strikes one about the building, apart from its sheer hugeness, is the overpowering contrast of roof and stone, broken only by a broad white trim. The trim would not have been white originally, but rather some tone compatible with the colors of the stone and shingles.

Entering on foot by the front steps, or in a vehicle under the huge porte-cochere with its adjacent semi-circular planter, the visitor stepped onto the wide veranda that surrounds the first floor on the north, east, and south side. At the northeast corner is a circular turret which at first seems extended in the one on the second floor, but the two are actually entirely different structural units. From the turret, the veranda stretches to the formal entrance and is terminated by the east wall of the principal dining
room. The original driveway continued through the porte-cochere, southwest around the cornerstone to a basement entry, to the entry of the private dining room, then on past the garden to the stables across the street.

The magnificent south porch possibly the scene of some of the more important decisions in the history of American politics, overlooked the garden and was used for warm-weather entertaining. The way in which literally no expense was spared is illustrated in the ceiling of the vast semi-circular veranda. 8" x 10" girders finished with recessed panelling, radiate from the center, and the intervening space is vaulted in wood. The veranda extends to form a continuous connection fronting the east facade between this part and the main entrance.

Panelled girders supported by rectangular stone pillars 2' x 4' form the frame on which the masses of roof are set. The exterior wall and columns appear to be solid sandstone blocks, but this is only an effect given by a four to six inch veneer covering structural brick walls, the total width of which is two feet. The large sash-type windows, one opening from the library to the south porch, another leading from the parlor to the east, serve as doors and further increase the feeling of openness prevalent throughout the house.

Returning to the main entry, we can only attempt to imagine the massive front door, rather recently stolen by vandals. It was of solid, panelled mahogany, 8' high, 4½' wide, 2" thick. Entrance was into a spacious hall, with access to the formal dining room on the right, the music room to the left, and further down, the stair hall and the parlor, all a continuous, flowing, open space, unimpeded by doors and using the minimal wall area necessary for separation—an architectural refinement of unparalleled sophistication for Austin at the time.

Matching chandeliers imported from Paris hung in the formal rooms and mahogany was used liberally throughout, for the beams of the entry hall and the Colonel's library, and for the handrail and tread of the main stair. The rest of the wood used for doors, trim, and paneling was polished oak, long since painted over. If by a supreme act of the imagination one can recreate the original contrast of light and dark woods, the effect is magnificent. The floors throughout are of inlaid oak, possibly from the black forests of Germany, and by some reports laid by convict labor—though Mona House emphatically denies this.

The east half of the first floor comprises a grand hundred foot vista stretching from a large mirrored niche in the north wall of the music room, through the parlor, through a panelled sliding door into the library and out the sash-type window-door onto the south veranda overlooking the garden. A circular alcove with curved glass windows is formed by the
rurrent in the northeast corner of the music room. An
open portal leads to the parlor with its simple corner
fireplace and window-door like that of the library.
The walls in the music room, parlor, private and
formal dining rooms are of painted plaster with
wainscoting implied by a simple wood trim 3½'
above the baseboard.
Adjoining the library through a small passage is
the charming private dining room probably used as
a morning room by the family as well as for the
Colonel’s private conferences. On these latter serious
occasions, guests could be delivered by carriage to
steps at the southwest corner leading directly into
the room, without disturbance to activities in the
formal areas. The space under the landing of the
main staircase is utilized to provide a brilliantly
functional serving area connecting the informal and
formal dining rooms. A stair leads directly into the
kitchen below, and a dumbwaiter completes the con-
venient arrangement.
The basement of course was devoted to service
areas: a large kitchen with its own entry from out-
side, a dining room for the servants, a boiler room,
pantries, storage chambers, and even a wine cellar in
the Italian manner under the east veranda, accessible
only by walking under the south porch. This interest-
ning semi-circular space was ingeniously used by later
Greek occupants to provide a game room, complete
with bathroom, bar, and what we might now call
“conversation pit”—the former wine cellar. The area
under the parlor and music room is partially sealed
off, perhaps giving rise to the story of a chamber
“rumored to have been the storehouse for Colonel
House’s silverware and other valuables”—doubtless
another of those baseless prefabrications which inev-
itably accumulate about grand old mansions. There
are likewise said to have been the usual secret pas-
sages and chambers, but an examination of the plans
would seem to make them impossible to account for
spatially, not to mention the fact that the owner's
tastes hardly seem to have run in such melodramatic
channels.
A second stairway leads back up to the small pas-
sage connecting the library and morning room and
opening directly onto the main hall. The most im-
pressive interior feature of the building, the principal
stairway is notable not only for its now indiscernable
use of woods, but also for its sweeping slightest breeze. The fireplaces, all now demolished, were dec-
ored with hand-made tiles from Germany and
France, some of which illustrated stories from the
Bible and Shakespeare, episodes in Ivanhoe, and even
the changing of the seasons. Full-length plate glass
mirrors set at angles into the mantels provided dress-
ing areas, and each room would have been flooded
with light—if the occupant wished—at any hour of
the day.
The third floor, entered by a single narrow stair,
was reserved for the servants, the children, and the
wardrobes of the owners. Three Swedish maids were
employed by the House family and were provided
with quarters only slightly less finished than those
of their masters. A small room to the west, with
what could only have been a humidor above the
fireplace, may have been furnished for them to
receive callers, or perhaps it was a study for the
Colonel, where he would not be as likely to be
interrupted as in the library on the first floor. Di-
rectly opposite, facing east, is a tiny but delightful
porch, with what must be one of the best views of
Austin now no less than it was 75 years ago.
The other rooms, built under the eaves of the
wildly irregular roof, reflect this oddness. The most
pleasant is under the huge cone that forms the
south roof; three small windows look out over east,
south, and west Austin, and what is still the edge
town. Adjoining was a small porch since enclosed
and converted into a bathroom. At the northern end
are two rooms resembling nothing so much as box-
cars with slanted sides and windows at the end. Rather surrealistic in their hexagonal elongation and
darenesc they might nevertheless have been quite
pleasant when furnished.
We have no way of knowing exactly what the
Colonel paid for his home, but whatever the price,
it was probably a bargain. He evidently contracted
the construction himself, and if there were any rec-
ords of the transaction, they no longer exist, at least
in public hands. One estimate of $50,000 seems
credibly low, even for Austin in the 1890’s, where
costs of labor and materials may have been minimal.
Still, heavy mahogany, oak from Germany, Parisian
chandeliers and tile, cut and stained glass an inch
thick, curved turrets, wooden shingles, and countless
other refinements have never been cheap items on
the builder’s market, and with or without the fur-
nishings from Marshall Field’s in Chicago, twice the
$50,000 amount would not have been unreasonable.
Certainly not if we take into account the innovations
in style and convenience, fully decades ahead of con-
temporary Austin, where the other fashionable homes
were those of the Littlefields, Bishop Kinsolving,
Ira H. Evans among many others—all fairly inter-
esting examples of steamboat Gothic, but archi-
tecturally quite conventional for the time. The House
mansion, however, was stylistically as advanced as
work being done anywhere in the country. Evi-
dently its owner appreciated this fully, for as his
daughter Mona recalls, “Papa thought it was the
prettiest house he had ever seen.”
Whatever the original cost, Colonel House sold
his home on March 16, 1914 to a close friend and
candidate for governor in 1912, W. F. Ramsey. In
addition to a relatively small cash amount, possibly
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$12,500, there was an unspecified exchange of property—land and livestock—in Cleburne, Texas. Presumably, Ramsey did little to alter the building, apparently, he and his family lived much as the Houses had.

In 1918, Ramsey sold the house and since then it has changed owners several times. The building's latest owner, Zidell Realty Company, has not rented it and vandalism has been extreme. As if to settle the matter conclusively, the final blow came on March 22, 1966. Early in the morning, just after midnight, fire broke out on the third floor. The blaze was quickly controlled, but not until flames had eaten into all six of the structure's attics, laying open the roof. What the fire did not destroy, the water did, and even the argument that the house was still repairable—apart from finding anyone willing to undertake the task—was no longer possible. So now it stands, evidently totally ruined and fit only for destruction. Estimates of what might now be required to save it seem pointless, for if funds were unavailable before, when there was still hope, they are now further away than ever, and that the lovely mansion will fall seems a sad but inevitable fact.

Not that the place is without friends, even in the last stages, The Heritage Society of Austin has long expressed a wish that means of preservation could be found, but has been able to do little more than simply express wishes. Mr. Zidell has offered to give the building to anyone willing to relocate it elsewhere, but still no takers. Granted, $75,000 is not easy to come by, but there were former days when the price was much lower, and in any case, the amount is not terribly large when one considers the wealth that is everywhere evident across our most prosperous state. Whatever the extenuations, the good wishes of historically-minded citizens have been regrettably ineffectual, and the result is all the same as far as the landmark is concerned—it will be destroyed, perhaps within the year.

EDITOR'S NOTE: The E. M. house is now all but totally destroyed—all that remains is the basement and portions of the first floor and masonry walls.

Article layout by Donald W. Roberts
Buildings with real sales appeal

A blue flame sign set in front of a new dwelling symbolizes the important savings an architect or builder can offer customers. The combination of modern GAS heating, air conditioning, cooking, water heating and yard lighting saves a buyer thousands of dollars over the duration of his mortgage. Hotels, motels, schools and office buildings also benefit greatly when gas is included in the plans. Yes, GAS economy offers the built-in sales appeal that can be a real boost to your business.
Perennial best seller on the publications list of The American Institute of Architects is a document known as B131. It is AIA's Standard Form of Agreement Between Owner and Architect, and it is a masterpiece of compression.

In B131 can be found a comprehensive statement of the architect's basic services, a summary of additional services he is prepared to offer, and a brief list of the owner's responsibilities, plus provisions relating to every eventuality from arbitration to termination and, of course, space to enter the agreed-upon fee. Behind each numbered paragraph, moreover, are decades of custom, tradition and experience (including a good number of lawsuits). B131 can tell the prospective client a great deal about the time-honored way of getting a building built.

But B131 and its companion documents can't tell him everything. Before the client signs on the dotted line, he needs more than a brief and legalistic summary. He needs an understanding—the deeper the better—of what the complex and changing profession of architecture is all about.

The mysterious architect and his many hats

There have been few polls about the image of the architect, but those few have produced some interesting results. On the one hand, they show that the prestige of the architectural profession is high; one survey placed it second only to medicine in public esteem. On the other hand, the same polls show that hardly anyone knows exactly what the architect does.

B131 clears up some of the mystery, but its brevity makes the architect's function sound deceptively simple. It breaks his services down into five phases:

1. In the first, schematic design, he "consults with the owner to ascertain the requirements of the project," prepares schematic design studies and presents a Statement of Probable Construction Cost.

2. In the design development phase, he prepares design development documents "consisting of drawings and other documents to fix and describe the size and character of the entire project" and submits a further Statement of Probable Construction Cost.

3. In the Construction Documents phase, the architect prepares the detailed working drawings and specifications upon which the contractor's bids and the actual construction will be based.

4. During the bidding or negotiation phase, the architect assists the owner in obtaining bids, negotiating proposals, and awarding and preparing construction contracts.

5. Finally, in the construction phase, administration of the construction contract, he watches the work itself and issues certificates of payment to the contractors as it progresses.

There are several ways to amplify this spare description. One, of which the architect himself is particularly fond, is to point out the varied functions...
which each phase of his services entails. Thus, at the outset he is an investigator, ferreting out the client's needs, tastes and requirements; then a diagnostician, isolating and defining the building problem. Next he becomes the planner, organizing space, circulation and facilities to meet the owner's requirements, and the creator, seeking to produce an original, evocative and satisfying work of art. From this point on he is also a coordinator, directing the work of multitudes of others from engineers to craftsmen, and an agent, representing the client's interests in the purchase and use of goods and services. During construction he is, to some degree, a policeman, but he is also an arbitrator of disputes between the client and the contractors.

Perhaps the most meaningful way to weigh the architect's services is by their relative complexity and the kind of demands they make on him. In the schematic design phase, much depends on the building type. If it is a hospital, for instance, the architect must sort and interpret a mass of complicated data before pencil touches paper. If it is a church, on the other hand, he will probably begin the process of design much sooner, seeking a form that will express the liturgical principles that are the core of the program.

In the design development phase, the architect must give more detailed attention to matters which are, in themselves, becoming increasingly complex: the structure of the building and the mechanical, electrical and acoustical systems which will have much to do with the pleasantness of the interior spaces. (They will also have much to do with the building's cost; in some cases, these systems account for over half the total.) The store of specialized knowledge in each of these branches of building engineering seems to grow geometrically as the technical papers and reports pile ever higher. The architect can't possibly master it all, but he must be aware of technical advances and understand their potential application to design.

After this, the construction documents phase might seem a simple, if tedious, exercise. Yet the drawings and specifications must convey a precise verbal and graphic statement of the architect's intentions, and their preparation demands a certain creative flair for communications. In choosing materials and equipment, moreover, the architect constantly faces a bewildering array of new alternatives. If the client doubts this, let him take a look at his architect's file cabinet of product literature—and the amount added by any given day's mail.
Before actual construction begins, a contractor must be selected, which is done during the bidding or negotiation phase. The client may extend an invitation to several qualified contractors to bid, or he may negotiate with one contractor, picked with the help of the architect. In any event, the architect assists the client in selecting the contractor and also in preparing construction documents in conjunction with the client’s attorney.

Finally there is the construction phase. Its demands on the architect depend largely on the contractors: if they are skilled and receptive, construction can be the exciting climax to all that has gone before, if they are not, it can be hell. In either case, the architect must know nearly as much about day-to-day procedures as the contractors and care more about craftsmanship than do most workmen in this mass-production age.

Portrait of a profession in transition
The intriguing thing about the architect’s services is that they involve so many qualities normally considered to be opposites: creativeness and practicality, imagination and prudence, individuality and group leadership, sensitivity and business acumen. To put it another way, the architect has to be part administrator, part constructor, part engineer, part artist. The administrator is generally pictured as cool-eyed and competent; the constructor as venturesome and extraverted; the engineer as abstracted and introverted; the artist as detached and flamboyant. The pictures don’t fit together very easily.

It is at once fascinating and revealing that the architect, with all this to think about, is seriously considering taking on still more. Two forms of expansion of the architect’s services are now being discussed: responsibility for the design of larger chunks of the physical environment and/or concern with the extra-design problems of the commercial and industrial client.

Those who wish to take on more of the environment carry the banner of urban design. They feel the architect has been concerned too long with the creation of occasional gems in the slag heap which the uncoordinated, undesigned American urban environment is becoming. It is up to him, they believe, to broaden the application of the architectural process to entire neighborhoods, cities and even regions. What this means to the individual client is that today’s architect is likely to show an unexpected interest in the impact which the building will have on its surroundings.

Behind the second kind of expansion is the architect’s uncomfortable awareness that a good many of the most powerful influences on building have simply gotten out of his control. Real estate economics, taxation, automation of the industrial process, even public relations, to give but a few examples, often act as significant determinants of design; yet the architect is seldom called in when the key decisions about them are made. The answer that is being offered is the broadening of the architect’s competence to provide a whole range of new services—feasibility studies, operational programming, assembly of land and money, and a good many others—all under the aegis of professional coordination and counsel.

Perhaps the best rule of thumb for the individual client is that the architect should have some voice in all decisions which will importantly influence the eventual shape and function of the building, so that he does not enter the design process with a hand tied behind his back. The question of just how far the architect should go beyond his basic services depends on the nature of the project, how much the architect feels he must do to insure its success and how much the client confidently feels the architect can do well.

The essential thing is that the extent of the architect’s services be thoroughly talked about in the first architect-client conferences and spelled out in the contract between the two. Equally frank treatment should be given the subject of how much the architect is to be paid; the beginning of a building project is no time to be bashful about discussing money.

The delicate matter of the architect’s fee
The traditional way to pay an architect for his services is by a set percentage of the project construction cost. The percentage fee has earned its wide acceptance by inherent fairness: what the client pays and what the architect receives are automatically in some kind of proportion to the project’s size and complexity. Sadly, however, the percentage fee can sometimes raise as many problems as it solves.

“Everybody considers payments to contractors and suppliers part of the building’s cost,” said an architect recently with resignation. “The percentage fee sticks the architect’s part out in the open, like some kind of optional extra. It’s too easy to shoot at.” A more dangerous flaw in the system was underlined at a meeting of architects and school administrators.
a few years ago. In the midst of a perfectly friendly exchange, a high-school superintendent said in his best just-between-us-boys tone, “Of course we all know that architects have to keep costs up to a certain level to come out on their fees.” Every architect in the room turned apoplectic, and with good reason. “Hell,” said one later, “I did a school for that character once, and I spent half my time knocking down his wild ideas. If he’d had his way, the school would have cost just about twice the budget.”

The amount of the percentage depends on a number of variables, notably the project’s location, size and complexity. It can range from 3 or 4 percent for a big but simple warehouse to 12 or 15 percent for a small but complicated research laboratory. The across-the-board average (not to be used as a guide) has been estimated at between 6 and 8 percent—a good deal less than most contractors allow in their bids for profit and overhead, and about a third of what the auto and aircraft industries invest in product design. Most local AIA chapters have drawn up recommended minimum fee schedules which provide useful guidance. The AIA suggests that architects who do not use these schedules print their own to discourage unprofessional haggling.

The percentage fee is the method of payment covered by AIA Document B131. There are two others used widely enough to have standard forms of their own: the Multiple of Direct Personnel Expense, B231; and the Professional Fee Plus Expenses, B331.

Under the provisions of B231, the architect adds up the salaries of his personnel for the time spent on the project, plus the cost of all consulting services, and multiplies the totals by a mutually agreeable factor to arrive at the fee (AIA suggests the multipliers be not less than 2.5 for personnel, 1.25 for consultants). This method can be especially useful if the scope of the project and the extent of the architect’s services are hard to predict, but it requires careful bookkeeping by the architect and constant auditing by the client.

Under the professional fee-plus-expenses-system, the architect himself is paid a separate fee for his personal services, and also paid a multiple of direct personnel expenses and consultants’ costs. (The multiple of personnel expenses is generally lower, because the principal’s role is taken care of in his personal fee.) The personal fee may be a lump sum, or a lump sum covering some of the architect’s own contributions and an hourly rate covering others.

The value of this method is that it gives the client freer access to the advice and consultation of the architect than do the others; its disadvantage is that it is the least clear-cut method of paying architects.

There are a few extras. The client is expected to reimburse the architect for such incidental expenses as travel and to pay the bills for site surveys, soil borings and other such reports and tests. B131 also contains a 18-subparagraph list of “additional,” though nonexpanded, services—special surveys or analyses of program requirements, alteration of already-approved documents to accommodate last-minute changes—and suggests they be paid for at a multiple of the architect’s costs.

B131 also stipulates that payment to the architect begin at the first consultation, with a minimum of 5 percent of the total fee, and continue monthly according to a cumulative schedule: 15 percent to be paid by the end of the schematic design phase, 35 percent to be paid by the end of design development, 75 percent by completion of construction documents, 90 percent by bidding or negotiation phase and the balance by the end of construction. Initial payments are based on an educated guess of what the building will eventually cost.

Such an educated guess, or even a firm estimate, is invariably one of the first things the client seeks from the architect: how much money for the building or, if the budget has its absolute limits, how much building for the money? About all the architect can tell him is what buildings of a similar size and nature have cost lately in the project’s locality. In the design process, the size and nature of the building may change beyond either the architect’s or client’s wildest imaginings. And by the time drawings and specifications are completed, the “bidding climate”—the relative hunger or satiety of contractors at a given moment—may change drastically. It can, in fact, change overnight, a fact which many architects and clients have discovered to their joint fiscal distress.

Protecting the interests of both parties
There is, of course nothing sacred about the standard architect-client agreement forms. AIA itself revises them periodically; they are often modified in one way or another for individual projects; and sometimes they are not used at all. But the basic ground rules established in the standard forms should not be discarded lightly. They have been carefully drawn with the interests of both architect and client in mind, and their wide acceptance speaks well for
Some of their provisions may seem at first to be stacked in favor of the architect, but in the end turn out to be justified. For example, the contract states that drawings and specifications remain the property of the architect and cannot be used again without his written permission. It is a minor matter, but the client may feel he has bought and paid for these. The architect's position is that he is rendering a service, not selling drawings, and that the documents are instruments of service, not merchandise. His main purpose is to protect the uniqueness of the building against piracy by a third party.

A more serious source of concern is that the standard form of agreement makes only one reference to time, and that is the provision that the client shall render his decisions "promptly, to avoid unreasonable delay in the progress of the architect's work." There is nothing to guard against unreasonable delay on the part of the architect himself.

This does seem rather one-sided, and yet the architect, at the beginning of a project, has a much difficulty guessing how long it will take as he does estimating its final cost. He doesn't really know whether the client knows his own requirements and whether he will be reticent or garrulous in discussing them; whether the job will really turn out to be as fearfully complicated as it first looks; whether the contractor chosen will be fast or slow, etc. There are some parts of the architectural process that can be kept to a fairly tight schedule, such as production of contract documents, but there are others which it is folly to rush, such as design.

The information in this series of articles is from The American Institute of Architects new 18-page publication, "Your Building & Your Architect." The booklet is for distribution by AIA members to prospective building owners and can be purchased from the Institute's Document Division at The Octagon for $25 for 100 copies and 50c each for less than 100.
"THE BLACK CITY" — GULF STATES REGIONAL CONVENTION

The National Committee on Urban Design of The American Institute of Architects commends the Gulf States Regional Convention for its courage in addressing the annual meeting to the topic of "The Black City." We welcomed this invitation to bring our committee to Memphis for what we expected to be, and was, an important learning experience.

During our stay we had the opportunity to visit with a few of the citizens of the black ghetto here in Memphis. The shocking conditions that we observed painfully reminded us that while we live in comfort and plenty, many of our brothers—fellow citizens—across the country live in squalor and deprivation, with spirit, but with little hope or opportunity.

We are not concerned with placing blame or with preaching. We are concerned because many of these inhumane and degrading conditions are unnecessary. We saw streets and vacant lots laden with debris, incredibly decrepit structures housing families who must pay rent and utility bills that represent two-thirds of their average annual family income, unpaved streets, and homes heated only by gas stoves and without bathtubs.

We cannot help but consider what must be done to overcome this deplorable condition. Immediate relief is needed, as well as a continuing program for providing practical alternatives and free choice.

It is a fact that no panacea will be found. A complete range of efforts is required for local, immediate, short-range, and long-range impact.

The poverty-stricken ghetto area which we visited does not receive equivalent city services expected by whites. It is obvious that here, as in other similar ghetto areas poaching our nation, truly effectual publicly and privately spon-

sored programs are urgently needed to create job skills and opportunities, provide decent and above-minimal housing, and provide the public facilities and services necessary to support an enriching community life and encourage individual self-fulfillment. The physical and social decay resulting from years of neglect and public apathy must be replaced with neighborhood environments created with a deep understanding of the social needs and aspirations which must be accommodated.

All citizens are entitled to routine city services such as street cleaning, litter control, and regular trash collection.

All citizens are entitled to routine city code enforcement processes to assure tenants of safe and sanitary housing, through ongoing maintenance and replacement of substandard dwellings.

As architects concerned with the living environment, we are acutely aware of the needs of these neighborhoods, but as individuals we are unable to come to grips with the solution for such problems when poverty prevents a workable economic and social system.

The underlying cause of what we have seen is the lack of adequate education and employment opportunities—denied to an entire group of people—and a lack of even an alternative choice. These root causes are a direct result of lack of awareness and apathy in the white community.

We, as architects, are ready to help—in our way—to understand the problem and to take steps toward improvement. In a letter from the President of our Institute to chapters all over the nation we have offered to assist our 167 local chapters in engaging in programs which we believe will be helpful.

At the Callender Pie Shop... there is no compromise with quality

THE SPECIFICATIONS CALLED FOR GENUINE CLAY SHINGLE TILE

The superb design that makes every Marie Callender Pie Shop as distinctive in Southern California as the pastries they offer, is enhanced by the generous use of the most appropriate roof covering—clay shingles. Neither beauty nor quality was sacrificed, and durability was added, when architects Colwell & Ray, A.I.A., specified only genuine clay shingle tile—from the kilns of San Valle. After all, if it isn’t clay...it isn’t tile.

San Valleé Tile Kilns

Representative for Ludowici-Celadon Roofing Tile, Quarry Tile and Nafton Brick in California and Arizona

1258 NORTH HIGHLAND AVENUE, LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90038 • TELEPHONE (213) 464-7289

TExAS — NEW MEXICO DISTRIBUTOR: LUDOWICI-CELADON COMPANY, DALLAS
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Front desk, wall coverings and elevator cabs by Otto Coerver...

The soft gold wall covering, the unusual elevator cabs, the rear-lighted mail boxes and panelled front desk; all add warmth to the welcome at the new Hilton Inn in Dallas. Custom built by Otto Coerver Company, they work to create the atmosphere that lets Hilton say, "the insiders have all the fun."

Otto Coerver Company, Inc.
3311 Elm / Dallas, Texas 75226 / (214) 748-8345

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.

Texas Architectural Foundation
327 Perry-Brooks Building
Austin

Texas Society of Architects

Twenty Ninth Annual Meeting
Corpus Christi
Driscoll Hotel
November 6-9, 1968

Billboards Limited!
The American Institute of Architects has announced three winners in its nationwide chapter slide show competition. Participants were required to interpret concerns and activities of architects in American cities.

Chosen from 25 chapter entries by a jury of three were: "California—Three Images", "Whither Tacoma?", and Houston's "Billboards, Limited!".

Billboards Limited! This short film is much more than a series of telephoto views of a community with too many billboards. It not only cites the problem, but documents it with photography and script which could not help but alert the citizens to this widespread, but unfortunately seldom recognized, form of urban ugliness. The pictures, while made in Houston, are applicable almost everywhere.
Fourteen awards were presented to Rice University School of Architecture students this week in recognition of exceptional achievement.

Warren Rome of New Hyde Park, New York, was winner of the $500 M.N. Davidson Foundation Traveling Fellowship, with Roy Lowey-Ball of Bombay, India, named alternate. The Davidson Fellowship is awarded the best proposal submitted for the use of funds to further research, for study and travel, or as an aid toward expenses of graduate study.

Douglas P. Harvey, Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Calvin Powitzky, Jr., Pasadena, Texas, and Robert Heineman, Lubbock, Texas, divided the $500 award. A Houston builder, Mr. Neal sponsored the competition on the best feasibility studies for the construction of a tower of eight to 12 stories, integral with an existing two-story structure.

Recipients of the Walsh Prize in architecture were Robert Heineman of Lubbock, Texas, $200, and Guy Rollins, 909 West Main, Houston, $200. Available to members of the fourth year class, the Walsh Prize serves to assist with expenses of the fifth or final year in school. The award is based on a brochure of work selected over a four-year period with emphasis placed on technology.

Featherlite competition winners were Robert Heineman of Lubbock, Texas, $200; John Cain, Rumson, New Jersey, $125, and Rod Simmons, Denison, Texas, $75. Awards will be officially presented at the Texas Society of Architecture annual meeting in the fall.

Calvin Powitzky of Pasadena, Texas, was awarded the $100 Chillman Prize for the best pictorial rendering of a building during the year. This award is annually presented by Rice Architectural Alumni Association in honor of James Chillman, Jr., Trustee Distinguished Professor of Fine Arts.

The American Institute of Architects Medal went to Philip David Belanger, Wood River, Illinois, with Jeffry Corbin, Midland, Michigan, runner-up. The AIA medal is awarded to a fifth year student on the basis of undergraduate scholastic achievement, character, and promise of professional ability.

Roy Lowey-Ball of Bombay, India, was winner of the Arrants Award, presented for outstanding promise to the profession. It is provided as a memorial by five alumni and classmates of Edward Bowers Arrants, School of Architecture graduate of 1925.

Richard Everett of Fort Worth, Texas, received the Alpho Rho Chi Medal, traditionally awarded to the runner-up for the AIA Medal. Alpho Rho Chi National Professional Fraternity of Architecture established and awarded the medal first in 1931.

The Architectural Lighting Award went to Robert Heineman of Lubbock, Texas. David Drake of Oswego, New York, was alternate. Provided by the Illuminating Engineering Society, San Jacinto Section, the award is given for outstanding lighting design. Mr. Heineman will be a guest at the Lighting Conference for Architects and Consulting Engineers in Cleveland, Ohio, September 18-20.

**Advertisement:**

THIS YEAR

ABSORBOTRON®

IS "IN" —

WATER HAMMER

IS "OUT"

Why continue to install "old fashioned" air chambers?

Air chambers absorb water and become ineffective unless recharged. Absorbotrons may or may not cost less in the beginning, but certainly far less if you add the cost of recharging air chambers one or two times. Moreover, look at the savings in space—an 8" high Absorbotron provides complete and permanent protection against water hammer, while a 50" air chamber will not.

For the complete story write for Manual SA-3.

District Sales Representative

R. B. ARNOLO COMPANY JOE P. DILLARD & ASSOCIATES
29 Wough Drive 110 Manufacturing Street
Houston, Texas 77009 Dallas, Texas 75207
Phone: 713-864-7733 Phone: 214-748-7708

JOSAM MANUFACTURING CO., MICHIGAN CITY, IND. 46360
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Pick one to die.
Pick one for jail.
Pick one to waste away.
Pick three for happiness.

Some children find happiness easily. Others need the help and guidance only a trained person can provide, medical attention they cannot afford, love they have been denied. When you decide to give to your United Fund or Community Chest, you may change a life.

Your fair share gift works many wonders/THE UNITED WAY

27 million families benefit by child care, family service, youth guidance, health programs, disaster relief and services for the Armed Forces from 31,000 United Way agencies.
HemisFair’s 21-story Hilton Palacio del Rio utilized revolutionary building techniques to complete the luxury hotel in just nine months.

Monolithic room modules were precast and completely furnished, down to the last ashtray, seven miles from the construction site. The individual 35-ton cubicles, 496 of them, were trucked to the site and then literally “flown” into place by use of a helicopter tail rotor.

Over 18,000 square feet of Monarch ceramic tile were used in this uniquely-erected luxury hotel. Monarch ceramic tile is used to best advantage in individual baths, public rooms and kitchens.

Monarch’s 20 years of experience offers you the most complete products line of glazed wall tile in the nation.

See Monarch ceramic tile in HemisFair’s beautiful Hilton Palacio del Rio — or write Monarch for additional information.
Strongwall's special design grabs hold of mortar four ways for the strongest bond available...with over 300% more gripping power than plain reinforcing. Quality mortar cannot be effective if your reinforcing material doesn't do its job. MidSTATES Strongwall Masonry Reinforcing is engineered to grip mortar better, four ways.

1. Strongwall side rods are knurled on four sides. The rough, indented surface gives better bonding power...better gripping. 2. Cross bars are welded over side rods as recommended by National Bureau of Standards and Corps of Engineers allowing mortar to flow around reinforcing. 3. Side rods are also deformed with a series of 10-degree bends which work together with knurling to give Strongwall its superior grip. 4. Cross bars extend 1/2 inch beyond the side rods giving more bonding surface and distributing stresses more evenly across the weld. For full details on MidSTATES STRONGWALL LADDER TYPE MASONRY WALL REINFORCING, send for our illustrated catalog. Truss type reinforcing is also available. Write for complete information.

STRONGWALL Reinforcing Grips Masonry Walls Four Ways!

MID-STATES STEEL and WIRE COMPANY / Southwest Branch: Sherman, Texas
Home Offices: Crawfordsville, Indiana / Branches in Jacksonville, Fla., Greenville, Miss.