It has become clear in both moral and economic terms that our nation can no longer afford or pretend to intervene in the political and military affairs of nations throughout the world, maintain a military and weapons establishment of unlimited size, explore the moon and, at the same time, rebuild our decaying cities, provide an adequate supply of housing, and finance domestic programs needed to solve pressing social problems.

THEREFORE,
BE IT RESOLVED BY
THE ARCHITECTS OF AMERICA
THAT:

One. We call upon the President and the Congress to assume responsibility for a comprehensive reexamination and reordering of our national priorities, recognizing that we have neither unlimited wealth nor wisdom, and that we cannot sensibly hope to instruct other nations in the paths they should follow when we are increasingly unable to demonstrate that we know how to maintain a viable society at home.

Two. We call upon our leaders, at all levels of government, to recognize that an efficient and humane environment is basic to the maintenance of a harmonious and prosperous society and that the skills to produce it are well within our grasp. At the same time, we wish to remind our representatives that neither hope, time, nor technology will solve the problems that presently make urban life a dirty, difficult and dangerous experience. Only a wholehearted commitment of will and money will enable us to apply the skills needed to erase the shame of urban America.


The American Institute of Architects
1735 New York Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006
Cover photo: Distant view of RUTH TAYLOR THEATER with other Trinity University buildings in background. Although design varied from surrounding buildings the theater construction and materials provide harmony.

Quantity, Quality, Design and land use all influence TECHNOLOGY in HOUSING AND THE RESULTANT HUMAN ENVIRONMENT. A.I.A. speaks to issues before Senate Subcommittee.
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Built to take advantage of its hillside site, the Ruth Taylor Theater contains 55,000 square feet of floor space in six levels and consists of three areas: the main theater wing, the theater shop wing, and the classroom and office area. The building is of reinforced concrete frame with concrete pan floors and a batten seam copper roof. The exterior walls are of the same red brick which has been used for the other buildings on the campus.

The problem was to design an educational theater building to accommodate any type of stage production, however small or however elaborate and also to be the center of Trinity Univer-
The heart of any theater is the stage area, and within the Ruth Taylor Theater there are three theaters. Theater One seating 400 to 500 people is used for major productions and is adaptable to all principal forms of theater. The second theater, Attic Two, seats 108 and is used for more intimate productions and experimentation. The third utilizes the coffee area, which opens onto the patio between the Theater and the Ruth Taylor Art Building.

From the beginning of discussions with the Director, the noted Paul Baker, the Architects quickly understood the special purpose, the personal desires, and the working and aesthetic nature of this theater project. The primary study effort was directed toward the stage, the actors, the appurtenances and spaces to support the performance. The audience was also of prime concern; its relation to the stage, and or stages, in regard to line of sight, acoustics, and lighting in the theater occupied a considerable amount of study. It is significant that any seat in the house, fixed or swivel chairs, is almost as good as any other. Anyone, anywhere, can see all activity on about 165° of playing area across and around the horseshoe stage or stages.

The Director made most emphatic demands for real flexibility and worked with the Architects for months to achieve this end. The relation of dock to shop, to wings, to stage, to audience, to lobby and street provide choices and opportunities of variation.
and creativity and just plain convenience.

The key aspects of the Theater are best described in the words of Director Paul Baker:

"First, the theater should be a masterpiece of space in its own right, a living masterpiece in space. Not an empty space, not neutral. It isn't like looking at a landscape: there may not be any "action" in it, but it is alive, organic.

The theater should also be a machine which can be implemented easily and quickly. Like the back walls at Trinity. They can be black, blue, cement-and in a few seconds; they have texture, and so on. Walls like that stimulate designers. Also the theater is designed so we can hang lights anywhere at any angle.

The use of the space develops during rehearsal, a group activity. Our theater—including the people who work it—is a very flexible organism. The space is
RUTH TAYLOR THEATER

the gigantic canvas we work on.

The wrap-around stage lets me have simultaneity and peripheral vision. I can put things on one stage, on two, or three; I can contradict or reinforce these actions with sound and light textures; I can move on the stages or between them; I can convert three into one or one into three.

No member of the audience really has a front seat. The chairs closest to all stages are those in the rear of the swivel chair section and the first and second rows of stationary seats.

All seats are excellent. The audience gains a remarkable change of perspective when turning from a closeup of one stage and then adjusting to a long view; then a different view of Stage 3.

This gives an added interest and a rest to the viewer, and flexibility in vision."
TECHNOLOGY, HOUSING AND THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

Statement of the American Institute of Architects Regarding S. Res. 78, 91st Congress, Before the Senate Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations

INTRODUCTION—Mr. Chairman, my name is Jeh V. Johnson. I am a practicing architect from Poughkeepsie, New York, and a member of The American Institute of Architects’ (AIA) Committee on Housing. Accompanying me is Rai Y. Okamoto, a practicing architect from San Francisco, California, and a member of AIA’s Committee on Urban Design. Today, we are appearing on behalf of the AIA, a professional society representing slightly over 22,000 licensed architects.

HOUSING TECHNOLOGY—In the letter inviting the AIA to appear before the Subcommittee, the Chairman suggested that we identify certain areas of environmental impact that should receive special attention by the Select Committee proposed by S.Res. 78. We believe housing technology ranks at the top of the list.

As a former member of the National Commission on Urban Problems, as an Architect in private practice and as a concerned citizen, I have seen and lived with the great deficiencies in the housing supply of this country; and I look with millions of others to a rapidly expanding technology in housing as a means of closing the serious housing gap.

For brevity, I will confine my remarks to Technology in Housing in a very limited sense, that is, to the shelter that houses the family. At the outset, it is clear to many architects that the technology of mass production, of space, and of computerization cannot be brought to bear on housing problems without an effective, powerful, and intelligent form of stewardship that can evaluate techniques and systems and match hardware capability to software needs. This stewardship could function to open the way for technologies that are now inhibited by a maze of political, economic, and social devices—some intended, some indirect or historic—by establishing priorities, goals, sources of funds, and legal mandates. It could function to match new and emerging technical and scientific capabilities to the housing needs of people in all places and at all of the necessary scales. It could function to assure the development of potentially unprofitable but socially desirable technologies and prevent costly and unnecessary overdevelopment of other technologies. Such a stewardship could come from a Committee on Technology and the Human Environment.

TECHNOLOGY AND HOUSING QUANTITY—The National Commission on Urban Problems in
its report released at the end of 1968 put the Housing needs of the country at 2.25 million units per year for the next ten years. This includes a minimum of 500,000 units a year for low income families. This compares with an average annual production of one and a half million units a year over the last six years. The all time record of housing unit starts was two million units in 1950. The need, then, is far greater than the present production, and it is clear that in the face of rapidly increasing materials costs, high money costs, labor problems and with a diminishing land supply in the demand areas, we will not come anywhere near our minimal goals without a dramatically accelerated infusion of new techniques in production and management into the large, slow moving thing that is our building industry.

The home building industry has always accepted and adopted such new technologies as it could, up to a point. The infusion of further advances has become now as much of a software problem as a hardware problem. These software problems are solved by purposeful and forceful public action and not by the demands of the market place or merely through profit incentives.

Few people who have studied the problems of Housing Technology carefully look to the development of a “miracle module” or any such similar “thing” as a single answer to the question of quantity production. They look instead to two concurrent thrusts, both innovative:

First within the existing context of building techniques, existing conditions, and existing people, we see evolutionary changes in product design and innovation, the utilization of labor, the organization of data and the production and movement of materials that continually becomes more efficient, more rational, and more flexible through more widespread adaptation of the best ideas and equipment now available and in use. Present experience indicates that many new techniques now available would have a significant impact on housing production if they were used in more places by more people.

Second, we look to revolutionary change in building, perhaps even a new kind of industry, that produces shelter that is fabricated systematically off-location, brought whole to a site and “plugged in.” Such a building would of necessity be conceived free of the historic patterns of construction, and free of the old conventions
and standards. For this reason, it may have to come from outside of the existing system. To promote such a structure, one needs a mandate that overrides the mass of inhibitions we mentioned before—the older local codes, the older local standards, many local work rules, much local zoning, and even many Federal and State standards. While much of this kind of housing is avowedly experimental, with no pre-tested market, it is clear that no individual, company, or group could accomplish this revolutionary change without the muscle of government behind it, the bigger and stronger, the better. This is another act of stewardship.

TECHNOLOGY AND HOUSING QUALITY—Production of so many millions of units of housing means nothing in itself. The real meaning lies in the contribution to a better life that new units of housing can make for our people. Quality is always difficult to define, and a “better” life is even more difficult to define, but I will say that our quantity production, our technology, must end in a product that our people will feel good about, and enjoy being in. The use of machines, devices, and techniques should be such that we can shape from them our aspirations, our hopes, our symbols, our excesses, and our emotional and spiritual needs. We believe it would be disastrous should our technology dominate the form of our new shelter, and in the process dominate us. The highest standards of design should prevail in whatever we do in housing. The Russians who have been extraordinarily successful in the production of large quantities of housing are lately coming to this realization. Their experience proves that shelter without a quality of human expressiveness, without a striving for beauty, is deadly and dehumanizing.

There are many examples of housing that are both deadly and dehumanizing right here in America, in fact. The Stewardship should dedicate itself to the proposition that technology should produce not merely an abundance of new things, but instead, an abundance of good things.

THE HARD JOBS—We have generally been successful, in this nation, in solving hardware problems, when they are purely and simply hardware problems. We have a considerable amount of rather well founded faith in our ability to make whatever we set out to make that works to essentially rational, scientific, or physical standards. We have not been as successful where the issues are human and, therefore, more complex. Housing is one of those areas in which physical capability meets with man and his feelings headlong.

Architects have traditionally had to bridge this gap, often precariously, sometimes unsuccessfully, sometimes heroically. They know what the hard jobs will be. They know that technology alone without a monumental human guidance effort will not meet the emotional needs of our people, rich or poor, black or white, those in the main stream and those on the banks. We know that technology cannot produce a mandate for its proper use—it cannot turn itself on. An expanding technology cannot be effectively superimposed on our existing land use pattern and controls, our existing land tenure patterns, our marketing, financing and decision making processes, and our existing communities with all of their present internal complexities without considerable adaptation of each to the other.

Scientific and industrial technology must learn more in its own methodical way about people and the social scientists must learn more in their soulful way about technology.

LOOKING AHEAD—In specific terms, we look to a number of innovations and developments of present techniques:

☐ Energy systems that will make buildings complete and self-contained ecological units that furnish their own energy, and dispose of their own wastes. Such structures will discharge no pollutants and will not be connected by wires, pipes, tubes, or ducts to any other outside system.

☐ Ever larger factory built building components designed for maximum flexibility that will reduce on-site labor and the related inefficiencies caused by weather and distance.

☐ Improved information gathering systems that will add to the scant store of knowledge now available on user needs and user response to new housing designs.

☐ Materials development, especially in the areas of maintenance reduction, sound transmission reduction, replacements for natural materials that will soon be depleted; fire protection and inexpensive substitutes for materials that are now
either hard to work or disproportionately expensive for what they do.

- A greater degree of daring and innovation shown on the part of the building component manufacturers, fostered in part by a higher volume of business and in part by prodding.

- Widespread use of devices that will give instantaneous, accurate, and complete information on the ownership, controls, taxes, and other data on land.

- Technologies that can help undo the misdoings of past technologies—the unglamorous job of clearing up the air, and the waters, reducing noise and radiations of various kinds, and burying the wires that cross the landscape and line the roads.

- Widespread use of what is called the "systems" approach to building that assembles structures from parts that are designed to be compatible from the beginning. A building vocabulary of parts that support, partition, illuminate, heat, cool or enclose, all recognizing one another, and the needs of the people they serve.

And all of this must be available whenever and wherever in the country it is needed, in quantities commensurate with local needs, if it is to mean very much to us. It will cost a lot of money, most of which will be recovered in improved efficiency and lower costs eventually. Most of all, we will have to generate a public will to accomplish these things. The stewardship I have suggested here can furnish this leadership.

DESIGN POLICY—Another area requiring study is the design process. The end product of the design process is our physical environment. Today, this end product is chaotic—a chaos developed during the 20th century, explosively expanded during its three middle decades, promising acceleration in the decades ahead.

The process which produces chaos is itself chaotic. Our failure to create an orderly physical environment is due, first, to the absence of a coordinated series of goals to be accomplished by the process. And, second, it is due to the absence of a mechanism for depicting such goals. The failure of the end product—the physical environ-
ment—is clearly recognized. The failure of the process that produced this environment is not yet recognized.

The task of securing environmental quality must become identified as a task of reform within the design process. Such reform means innovation in assessing user need, in building systems technology, in the allocation of resources, and in the maze of government procedures. Despite the overwhelming, complexity of our age, there is concrete evidence that a new design process can be articulated and that it can achieve significant results.

EXPERIMENTATION—Serious questions are being asked about how to change labor practices, building codes, government structure and delivery systems to create more of what we have now. In terms of the built physical environment, science has not been asked to appraise what we have, to probe the weaknesses, and to search for better solutions. Architects believe there is ample reason to question what we have built.

We experiment in medicine, even so far as transplanting vital organs. We experiment in space. We expect some failure. But we also expect to profit by these failures. Unfortunately, we do not experiment with the environment. Nor do we seem to benefit from obvious environmental failures.

Serious experimentation is imperative if we are to prepare for the social and physical change that will be upon us in the next fifty years. Perhaps environmental field stations at University or regional levels, patterned after the agricultural field stations, would be appropriate. In any event, there should be a testing ground for new design processes and building techniques that have a profound impact on the environment.

NATIONAL LAND USE POLICY—Another urgent subject requiring consideration by the Select Committee is the question of land use policy. We really cannot afford to build indiscriminately and with little consideration for the impact of building on the environment. But improper land use is commonplace.

Last week, for example, new building was halted in nine California counties because of water pollution. In Prince Georges County, Maryland, some projects are at a standstill because officials be-

latedly discovered soil conditions could not handle septic systems. Many of our seashores are clogged with buildings to the waters edge.

A national land use policy should be established. Americans tend to forget that this country was settled and built on the basis of a national land use policy, witness the Homestead Acts and land grants to railroads. Of course, individualism was also a prime factor. But the point is that there was a public/private partnership regarding land use that needs to be reestablished.

CONGRESSIONAL CONCERN FOR THE ENVIRONMENT—We believe that S.Res. 78 is a very worthwhile proposal since it directs the attention of the Senate to the importance of striving for a better balance between our growing technology and our living human environment. But we think consideration should be given to establishing a Joint Congressional Committee rather than a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment. Technology and its impact on the environment is of as much concern to the House of Representatives as the Senate.

Therefore, it seems to us that a Joint Committee, perhaps patterned after the Joint Economic Committee, might be more beneficial than a select Committee confined only to Senate participation.

CONCLUSION—Mr. Chairman, we believe that the problems of the environment are really relatively simple. It is just a question of where one places the values. For too long Americans have subordinated environmental considerations to progress, economics and technological growth. Americans have been careless with their environment assuming that if one chemical pollutes the river, another chemical can make it clean again. In our opinion questions of health, liveability and beauty must be placed high on the scale of values.

Much of the technology we hear about—so promising, and always dramatic in its potential—has passed over most of our people. When we see in our work the contrasts between the miseries of people in miserable conditions, wrecked cities and wrecked lives—and hear of the fantastic things that are happening in the laboratories, on the test benches, in space and in industry, we know that something is seriously wrong in the equation. We hope you will find the means to our new tools to fashion good things for all of our people.
With nostalgia as its theme, The Heritage Society of Austin, Inc. will stage its fifth annual Antique Show and Sale October 17-18-19 in Austin's Municipal Auditorium, lower level. This nationally publicized show is recognized as one of the largest in the Southwest and will feature the handsome exhibits of 45 major antique dealers from across the nation.

Founded in 1953, the Society has for its purposes: (1) To assist in the preservation of buildings, markers, historical sites, works of art, documents, papers, pictures, records and other writings of historical, traditional or cultural value... to discover and work toward the development of areas of natural beauty and charm, as well as those locations of especial historic interest within the city of Austin and its environs; (2) To disseminate knowledge, promote interest, encourage study and research and act in advisory capacity to interested groups regarding those matters enumerated above and (3) To cooperate with other persons, groups, organizations and agencies in effectuating these objectives.” The Heritage Society is an affiliate of the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Annually, the Society awards citations for preservation of old Austin homes and buildings; conducts a Pilgrimage of fine period homes and operates one of the Southwest's outstanding Antique Shows. The 1969 Show will be open Friday and Saturday, October 17 and 18, from 11 a.m. to 10 p.m., and Sunday, October 19, from noon until 7 p.m.

In 1968, The Austin Heritage Foundation was organized to receive gifts of money or property and administer a perpetual revolving fund for historic preservation. This plan offers genuinely concerned citizens the opportunity to join with others in retaining or restoring structures of historic or architectural importance. By providing necessary loans, the Foundation trustees can step into situations where important buildings are threatened with demolition and where all other efforts have failed. The Foundation could thus, in addition to present efforts of the Society, slow down the loss of some historic structures. It is expected that the Foundation can interest foundations and individuals in Texas and the nation in helping preserve the architectural heritage of the capitol city of Texas.

For the third consecutive year, Mrs. Paul Bolton is serving as the Antique Show's general chairman. Honorary chairman will be Texas' First Lady, Mrs. Preston Smith.

Again this year, the thousands of Show visitors will be invited to visit the Heritage Society's two properties: Heritage House, 3112 West Avenue, open to the public at no charge on Friday afternoons; and The Old Bakery, 1006 Congress Avenue, open Monday through Friday, 9:30 a.m. to 3 p.m., at no admission fee.

Recently Mrs. Bolton wrote the following descriptions of the two Heritage properties after she had completed a sizeable research job on the buildings and their history:

Heritage House had humble beginnings in 1846. In that year, a deed to the property was recorded in the name of a Texas pioneer, Mrs. Juliet James. It is presumed the first construction was the kitchen. By the 1880's, the original kitchen wing had been overshadowed by a two-story cut limestone structure with white painted trim. When acquired by the Judge Robert Lee Penns in 1903, the property had gone through several ownerships and possibly as many additions and alterations. They added a double gallery with fluted Doric columns.

The Penns were gregarious; their home became a mecca for children and young people who partied and danced on the broad gallery and beneath the ancient oaks, pecans and magnolias. When the Heritage Society acquired the home from the Penn heirs in 1958, the Society commissioned as a supervising architect for restoration, A. Watkins Harris, who as a young man had spent many
happy hours at the Penn home. He worked with affection on the project, so that today Heritage House has the charm of a graceful home while being used as a headquarters building and a museum of historic items from the early days of Austin and Texas. Through gifts and by purchase, it is gleaming with antique furniture, paintings, rugs and household accessories. This island of historic Austin in a great sea of modernism, stands as a symbol to the members whose dues and donations restored the Penn home. Francois H. Rubitschung, present curator and a friend of the Penn family, did the life-size sculpture of children playing in the fountain in the south side garden.

In 1964, when the restored Old Bakery opened as Tourist Information Center and Coffee Kitchen, it brought back to life one of the oldest original business buildings on Congress Avenue. Its two-story brick facade topped with a stone carved eagle with its wings outspread is typical of store fronts on the avenue seen by early Austinites.

Charles Lundberg emigrated from Sweden in 1863; he built his combined bakery and home in 1876. The Lundberg Bakery later was called the New Orleans Bakery. Lundberg prospered with the fast growing city. He added a popular confectionery. Trouble came when his delivery wagon overturned, dumping rolls, bread and cake and "even the cash box" into Waller Creek. In 1895, the Bakery was sold to a Swiss national, Henry Maerki. Congress Avenue Bakery was the name during 1922-23; its chief product was Sally Ann bread. In 1927, the business was called the American Bakery and Cafe, owned by O. P. Lockhart. The huge ovens went unused for the first time in 60 years during the 1930's. Grown shabby, the building housed various enterprises including a beer parlor called the Combo.

The restoration retained the original foot-thick limestone walls and the damask design tin ceiling. Countless persons contributed time, talent, volunteer hours and money in the project, again proving what historic-minded citizens can do. Staffed by members of the Heritage Guild, the Old Bakery makes a steady profit which is used for improvements.

The stone eagle still looks out over the granite Capitol which it saw constructed, and the wide Congress Avenue which it has known for nearly a hundred years.
DESIGN TEAMS

Men who study people are joining architects and engineers in a new wave of city building led by design teams. Design teams are at work in dozens of American cities coast to coast unsnaring civic controversy and plugging citizen needs into highways, schools, neighborhood revival and new communities. From highway corridors in Seattle, Los Angeles, Boston and other cities to entirely new towns for 125,000 persons, teams are matching building projects with needs of people.

Any project where you're dealing with an impact on the community is subject to the design team treatment. Design teams form when architects, engineers, landscape men and decorators—the traditional design profession—join sociologists, economists, psychologists and community workers. Goal: to work with residents, using a variety of skills and experience. Objective: a project that builds individuals and neighborhoods, fills public needs, and protects man and his limited supply of land, air, and water. Design teams can spur major improvement of a city, not just “dress up” projects or minimize damage.

In Chicago, a design team converted an eight-lane elevated “stiltway” into one-way depressed expressways with room in the middle for new homes, stores and light industry. Controversy over the $157 million first phase of the giant Crosstown Freeway evaporated as citizens helped the design team plan.

In Baltimore, the design team was brought in by the State Roads Commission of Maryland, and in two years won radical change in 18 miles of freeway which would have damaged historic Federal Hill and sliced two other neighborhoods. The team showed how two neighborhoods could be saved by alternate routes and a third revived by building on air rights over the freeway. A tunnel will be used through choicest parts of a park and a freeway diversion will carry around 45 percent of the traffic away from the area.

The $1.5 billion Cross Brooklyn Linear City spine of houses, schools, clinics proposed along the Interstate Highway line, Phoenix’s Papago Freeway joint development and Seattle’s 10-mile downtown highway corridor are getting intensive study by design teams. Smaller cities like Gainesville, Georgia (pop. around 40,000) are using design teams, too. A dozen Georgia Tech architectural majors are working with local residents and officials to redesign a 60-acre poverty pocket.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) has a $1.4 million study underway in Atlanta, Pittsburgh, Seattle, Dallas, and Denver “to get transportation improved downtown in a short time.” The DOT study now underway will determine the market for improved central district transit, then go to manufacturers to see if equipment can match demand. DOT is expected to be asking Congress for billions of dollars to help urban transportation in the next decade so those findings could be crucial.

New York City this spring unveiled a $1.1 billion Battery Park City with room for 55,000 inhabitants and 35,000 workers on Hudson River landfill. It was drawn by a design team and includes low-income housing.

A unique new school that will be scattered through Hartford, Connecticut’s South Arsenal neighborhood was invented by a team. Called the “everywhere school,” it will include a community center, clinic, library, adult education as well as instruction for children. The school will become the community.

Success for the design team depends on the political environment even more than money, time or available land. Is the city interested or not? Will it support and accept the team way?

Architects have always consulted the people who pay for buildings and often with those who will use them. And architects must collaborate with engineers, market analysts, investors, decorators, contractors, suppliers, and landscape men before a building can be finished. Design teams are an extension of this consultation plus three added dimensions:

—Architects are calling in social scientists to determine how the project will affect people and the environment. Economists, psychologists, opinion researchers, doctors and teachers have signed in.
Citizens are telling needs, offering ideas and reacting to plans before blueprints are drawn. They are in the process at the start. They become part of the client which formerly may have been solely a banker, public works director, industrialist or school board.

Joint uses for the new facility are sought. Object: increase economic return and cut waste, build a neighborhood, and save money and space.

What are the extra costs in time and money caused by the new approach? Construction cost may go up one half to one and one half percent. But added returns could more than offset this. Rescuing land can yield property taxes to a financially periled city. Social dividends—the preservation of a neighborhood or of institutions like churches and stores—are hard to figure but can be sizeable. Future use of air rights and surplus rights of way, if thorny legal and financing questions can be settled, might help pay for the project. Changes in highway and urban renewal plans could save low income housing and thus ease a city's housing shortage. Even in new growth cities like San Jose, Calif. (now the nation's 31st largest), highways have aggravated severe housing shortages by demolishing cheap rentals, social workers claim.

The design team process, particularly the public participation element, does take longer than the old, single planner method, some city officials feel. It also can offer an excuse for officials to avoid decisions. But if a costly and longwinded law suit is prevented, it could be viewed as a short cut. Bitter public hearings and referendum elections also could be averted. Such suits and elections have stopped needed highway solutions in numerous cities. San Francisco and Washington, D.C., for example, have not yet settled highway battles a design team might be able to resolve.

A design team uncovers information often overlooked in the past: What persons will use a project? What will it cost in disruption as well as concrete? What alternatives exist? How can it be combined with something else? A team may set up field offices, hold meetings (the Baltimore team held around 125), survey opinion, and its members can listen, talk, walk, see and feel the problem. Teams can introduce new technologies and methods in land use, traffic circulation, building materials and construction, or machinery. Unexpected fallout from the team's work can include: pressure on a city to adopt a good master plan and upgrade its planning staff or changed Federal, State and local regulations. From early opposition, Federal and many state highway departments have swung to firm support for the design team concept.

Even older neighborhoods can benefit from design teams. Pullman, model city built from 1880 to 1884 on the far south side of Chicago, is getting help from a current team. Here the goal is to safeguard schools, trees, landscaping—the qualities of a contained community—from new land uses that threaten them. Renovation of homes is stressed as well as as the value of a stable, well-established village amid a huge metropolis.

Entirely new cities are being designed by teams. Columbia, Maryland—a successful 18,000-acre New Town midway between Washington, D.C., and Baltimore—wasn't started until developer James Rouse had a 60-member team at work for eight months deciding "what is the ideal system for health, transportation, education . . ." The real shafts of light brought into this discussion came from rather ordinary people. A lady suggested a small bus system to safely take children to school and prospective buyers said schools should be small.

Design teams should be widely used in the future. Whatever Federal highway system will follow the $62 billion Interstate network is a logical arena for the teams. New airports are another logical use. The Air Transport Association says at least $2.5 billion will be spent on U.S. airports before 1976. Yet aviation writer Robert Lindsey points out: "There's not an airport in the country that's ready for the Jumbo Jets. And Architects should immediately realize they can't design the jetports without much more consultation with airline traffic controllers, users and others." Already 18 conservation organizations plus the United Auto Workers are battling a proposed $250 million jetport 50 miles west of Miami. They say it will destroy Everglades National Park. This latest controversy resembles in some aspects hundreds that have engulfed U.S. cities as money and technology confront people and a tolerable living space. The conflicts—plus some that may have not yet surfaced—look like tasks for a design team. Public opinion can no longer be ignored and antiquated practices must give way to common sense and changing needs. Participation is the order of the day and that's after all the essence of democracy.
NEW PERMADECK
ROOF DECK SYSTEM
FIRE-RATED ONE HOUR.

This roof deck system consists of an inch of Permadeck formboard on sub-purlins, Zonolite insulating concrete, and wire mesh. It's rated one hour.

But that's only part of the Permadeck story. There's strength, water resistance, and appearance. Permadeck is all of that ... and more.

All Permadeck roof decks are certified. They're applied only by Approved Applicators who have the experience and equipment to faithfully follow the specs.

At the plants, a rigid testing program is followed to assure that Permadeck equals or surpasses published standards. Accurate job records concerning applications are kept by Approved Applicators.

When the job is completed, we and the applicator jointly certify that the Permadeck was properly manufactured and installed according to architectural specifications.

All of which assures you of satisfactory long-term performance.

For complete information, call your Permadeck or Zonolite representative, or write us: Concrete Products Division, W. R. Grace & Co., P. O. Box 130, Brunswick, Georgia 31520.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

Architects were urged to greatly accelerate efforts to increase the number and advancement of black architects and to improve the environment in black communities. The plea was made by a special A.I.A. Task Force on Equal Opportunities.

The Task Force, reporting on a year's progress, stated that "a number of projects have been launched but the job we set out to do has not been done." Through the programs established by the Task Force, more members of minority groups are being brought into the architectural profession and into more active participation. Efforts are also underway to improve the quality of education and the professional opportunities for disadvantaged minorities. Guidelines are now available to help local AIA chapters establish inner-city design centers. An agreement reached with the Office of Economic Opportunity's VISTA will provide some 30 persons to help AIA chapters organize design centers around the nation. In most part, the VISTA personnel will serve as communications links between ghetto residents who need services and the center's volunteer professional architects and architectural students.

A scholarship fund was established in cooperation with the Urban League, and a grant made to the University of Kansas to conduct a pilot program involving a number of young people from the ghetto. The Office of Economic Opportunity has been requested to cooperate in a program for more on-the-job training to develop technicians technologists, and fully-trained professionals.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is being urged to cooperate in a program to get financial assistance for predominately black architectural schools. Architects have been stimulated to serve these schools as lecturers, visiting critics and counselors. In addition, faculty members from black architectural schools are being placed in jobs in architectural firms.
TECHNICIAN’S ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

A national program to increase the number of qualified technical personnel available to solve the architectural, urban, and environmental problems facing the country has been established by the National Urban League and The American Institute of Architects.

A major objective of the joint program is to provide greater opportunity for disadvantaged young people to become technically qualified. A 44-week technician’s on-the-job training program in architectural offices selected will be responsible for selecting and hiring the trainees, working with them in accordance with a training schedule, mutually set up with the trainee, the Urban League OJT office, evaluating the trainee’s progress to determine if he should continue, or has successfully completed, the program, increasing the trainee’s salary after 22 weeks, guaranteeing a full-time job to trainees who successfully complete the program, and carrying out ethically, and in good faith, the intent of the U.S. Department of Labor’s training contract with the National Urban League.

The National Urban League will recruit and screen potential trainees, assist in the preparation of the training schedule, aid and counsel the trainee, place the trainee in another job or program if he is unsuccessful in the first one, pay part of the costs of supervisory training for 44 weeks, and provide all of the administrative support and training guidance needed by the trainee.

The Urban Design and Development Corporation, in addition to locating 50 training places in ten or more cities, will assist in the preparation of training guidelines and obtain the endorsement and support of the profession to expand the program.

The program is one of several worked out by the Urban League and AIA in response to Urban League’s Executive Director Whitney M. Young’s challenge to the architectural profession in his keynote address at the 1968 AIA Convention in Portland. At that time, he urged the architects to commit themselves personally and professionally to an improvement of the urban environment in line with the “principles of democracy and the Judeo-Christian ethics.”
The Expanding Picture Of Mosher

HERE’S THE PLANT TO PROVE IT!

Mosher is on the grow again, expanding plate shop facilities to meet customer demand.

A new Pre-Heat and Heat-Treat Furnace with a new larger set of rolls provides a capability to form thick wall vessels.

A new Heavy Assembly Bay with crane capacity to lift million pound vessels.

Put us on the top of your thick wall inquiry list and find out what these new facilities can mean to your next job.

TEXAS SOCIETY of ARCHITECTS

THIRTIETH ANNUAL MEETING
SAN ANTONIO CONVENTION CENTER
PALACIO DEL RIO HOTEL
OCTOBER 29, 30 & 31, 1969

MOSHER STEEL COMPANY

PLATE FABRICATING DIVISION:
3910 Washington Ave., Houston.

OTHER PLANTS:
Dallas, Lubbock, San Antonio, Shreveport, Tyler.

fabricators of steel since 1885
"A small gem ... possessing a certain aura and attraction for the educated eye of the critic, or the sensitive eye of the worshiper." The First Christian Church of Menard gives observers these first impressions. Why? There are certain qualities about this small building which are invisible without further study which make it a small treasure of American architectural development—a significant statement of a period important in the evolution of the art.
A church history by one of the early members, Mrs. Cecil Walston, notes the recording of a deed on May 4, 1904, and a loan of $500.00 from David P. Hunter, trustee of the American Christian Missionary Society on March 26, 1905. Construction of the wood frame and clapboard building was completed later that same year. No record of a project architect has been found, but it is probable that the church plans were either taken from one of the plan books common at that time or that a denominational architect drew the plans at the direction of the central denomination offices. In either case, the designer was a most talented and sensitively creative individual, as can be seen.

The date of the design of the church, 1905, places it during that time of the return of American designers to eclectic inspirations of the past. The feeble glimmerings of a truly American architectural style had been snuffed out for the most part by the Columbian Exposition of 1893, and the classic inspirations of Rome and Greece were in vogue for most secular type construction. For religious structures, the dominant image was Gothic, a strikingly appropriate inspiration for the church form to take, especially if its worship format was basically liturgical. The basic characteristics of this small church are unquestionably Medieval in inspiration—pointed arch openings, apsidal east end, tall spire.

The total concepts of the Gothic church are based, surprisingly enough, on a very simplified system of abstract geometry—a system which becomes highly symbolic upon investigation. This theory has been convincingly stated and substantiated by one George Lesser, in a series of books titled *Gothic Cathedrals and Sacred Geometry*. Mr. Lesser states that nearly all architecture of significance down through the nineteenth century has been based on the principle of the absolute right angle, with proportions consisting of the judicious repetition of similar rectangles.

Consulting the analysis plates on this building, one will find that geometric symbolism is quite evident. For example, the floor plan is generated by three equal squares, each centered upon some important function of the building and symbolic of the Trinity. The same three centers are present in every European cathedral. Turning now to the front elevation, one finds the same principles repeated. Three centers of significance may also be identified.

The transition of the spire from square to octagonal is made in a very refined manner by means of a shingle course, whose corners are not defined by anything except the material itself. This results in a very smooth appearing movement. Other refinements can be found throughout the building design. The gem-like quality of its geometry forms the basis for its appeal.
From Board Room to Reception Room, Otto Coerver custom-built the new executive offices of the Dallas Morning News. Matched walnut paneling, carved solid walnut screens, shaped walnut cornice mouldings functionally enclose storage closets and filing cabinets, including an audio-visual projection area in the Board Room. The custom-built walnut directors' table and reception desk demonstrate the craftsmanship of Otto Coerver and the skillful execution and installation of these truly magnificent executive offices.

Jorge Gonzales-Reyna
Architect Jorge Gonzales-Reyna, a native of Mexico, was killed in an airplane crash near Monterrey, Mexico, in early June of 1969. He was born on the 14th of October, 1920, in Saltillo, Coahillo, but lived much of his early life in Torreon, México.

Jorge was a graduate of the University of Texas at Austin. He received his Bachelor of Architecture degree in June of 1943 and then attended Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, where he earned a Master's degree in Architecture. His preparatory education was accomplished in Colegio Frances Morelos, Mexico City, and St. Joseph's Academy, Brownsville, Texas.

In addition to his very active practice of Architecture in Mexico City, he had been the Dean of the School of Architecture at the University of Mexico. He was on his way to visit one of his projects in Monterrey when the crash occurred.

Jorge is survived by his widow, Senora Ana Maria Gonzales-Reyna, and children of Acazar de Toledo No. 157, Mexico City 10, D.F.

Stanley Gene Watson
Stanley Gene Watson, AIA, has been appointed an Associate of Harrell and Hamilton, Dallas-based Architects/Planners. Watson, a Bachelor of Architecture graduate of Texas University, headed his own architectural firm in Dallas before joining Harrell and Hamilton in 1968 as a Design Group Leader.

His experience lies chiefly in the area of commercial and public buildings. Watson is a member of the American Institute of Architects, and of the Texas Society of Architects.

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
Are you utilizing this man on your design team?

He is your trained All-weather Crete sales engineer. This specialist can assist you in planning the most economical roof drainage patterns utilizing All-weather Crete insulation. He can illustrate many successful types of plaza systems so that you may select the one design most appropriate for your building. He can provide your staff with scaled detail drawings illustrating the many roof deck and plaza system components adjacent to All-weather Crete such as drain types, membrane systems and wearing surfaces.

This man is also your trained All-weather Crete applicator who helps make your design come true. He is a highly specialized contractor licensed by Silbrico Corporation. This skill and selective licensing protects designers and owners alike with the assurance of expert All-weather Crete application and its exceptional performance for years to come.

Consider the importance of roof and plaza insulation ... hidden from sight, covered by membranes and wearing surfaces, applied over every conceivable sub-strate, this insulation is asked to perform many functions. Contact your local AWC specialist to assist you. Use his special knowledge on your next building project. (There's no obligation, of course.) If you don't know his name, write us — we'll have him contact you.

SILBRICO CORPORATION
P.O. BOX 19366, HOUSTON, TEXAS 77024
PHONE (713) 465-8897