

THE
OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects



NOVEMBER
1930

Volume 2

Number 11

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

THE OCTAGON, WASHINGTON, D. C.

OFFICERS

President.....	ROBERT D. KOHN, 56 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.
First Vice-President.....	ERNEST J. RUSSELL, Chemical Building, St. Louis, Mo.
Second Vice-President.....	HORACE W. PEASLEE, 1228 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
Secretary.....	FRANK C. BALDWIN, The Octagon, Washington, D. C.
Treasurer.....	EDWIN BERGSTROM, Citizens National Bank Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

For One Year (1930-31)	For Two Years (1930-32)
CHARLES D. MAGINNIS..... Statler Bldg., Boston, Mass. (New England Div.)	FREDERICK W. GARNER.....616 Walnut St., Cincinnati, Ohio (Great Lakes Div.)
CHARLES BUTLER.....86 W. 45th St., New York, N. Y. (New York Div.)	CHARLES T. INGRAM.....1211 Empire Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa. (Middle Atl. Div.)
LOUIS LADEAUME.....730 Compton Bldg., St. Louis, Mo. (Central States Div.)	FRED F. WILLSON.....P. O. Box 497, Bozeman, Mont. (West. Mount. Div.)
For Three Years (1930-33)	
FRANKLIN O. ADAMS.....509 Twigg Street, Tampa, Fla. (South Atlantic Div.)	
M. H. FURBRINGER.....110 Porter Bldg., Memphis, Tenn. (Gulf States Div.)	
FRED. H. MEYER.....625 Market St., San Francisco, Calif. (Sierra Nevada Div.)	

LIST OF CHAPTERS, 1930

ALABAMA—*Harry B. Wheelock, Steiner Bank Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.; †Jesse W. Green, 713 Education Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.	NEBRASKA—*W. L. Younkin, Capitol Commission, Lincoln, Nebr.; †Noel S. Wallace, 2561 Whitmore Ave., Omaha, Nebr.
ALBANY—*Norman R. Sturgis, 91 State St., Albany, N. Y.; †Harvey W. Jackson, 32 Clermont St., Albany, N. Y.	NEW JERSEY—*Cornelius V. R. Bogert, 210 Main St., Hackensack, N. J.; †Clement W. Fairweather, Metuchen, N. J.
ARKANSAS—*George H. Wittenberg, Home Insurance Bldg., Little Rock, Ark.; †Lawson L. Delony, 2407 Louisiana St., Little Rock, Ark.	NEW YORK—*Stephen F. Voorhees, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; †Theodore I. Coe, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
BALTIMORE—*G. Corner Fenhagen, 325 N. Charles St. Baltimore, Md.; †Charles D. Loomis, 12 East Pleasant Street, Baltimore, Md.	NORTH CAROLINA—*James B. Lynch, Southern Bldg., Wilmington, N. C.; †W. W. Dodge, Jr., 20 Woodlark Rd., Asheville, N. C.
BOSTON—*Wm. Stanley Parker, 120 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.; †Edward H. Priehard, One Beacon St., Boston, Mass.	NORTH TEXAS—*Lester N. Flint, 608 Melba Bldg., Dallas, Texas; †Arthur F. Thomas, 712 Construction Bldg., Dallas, Texas.
BROOKLYN—*Chas. C. Wagner, 32 Court St., Brooklyn, N. Y.; †George Francis Kless, 130 E. 15th St., New York, N. Y.	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Henry H. Guttererson, 526 Powell St., San Francisco, Cal.; †James H. Mitchell, 369 Pine St., San Francisco, Cal.
BUFFALO—*Karl G. Schmill, 1342 Prudential Bldg., Buffalo, N. Y.; †Benjamin C. Buell, 547 Franklin St., Buffalo, N. Y.	NORTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA—*C. Paxton Cody, 116 Times Square, Erie, Pa.; †J. Howard Hicks, Erie, Pa.
CENTRAL ILLINOIS—*Joseph W. Royer, Flat Iron Bldg., Urbana, Ill.; †Philip R. Hooton, Peoples Bank Bldg., Bloomington, Ill.	OKLAHOMA—*Leonard H. Bailey, 1217 Colcord Bldg., Oklahoma City, Okla.; †A. Thomson Thorne, 332 Exchange Bank Bldg., Tulsa, Okla.
CENTRAL NEW YORK—*Melvin L. King, 300 Denison Bldg., Syracuse, N. Y.; †Merton E. Granger, 474 So. Salina St., Syracuse, N. Y.	OREGON—*Frederick Johnson, 422 U. S. Bank Bldg., Portland, Ore.; †Fred Aandahl, Lewis Bldg., Portland, Ore.
CHICAGO—*Howard I. Cheney, 80 East Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Ill.; †Carl E. Heimbrodt, 20 No. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.	PHILADELPHIA—*John S. Schwanks, Architects' Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; †Horace W. Castor, Architects' Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
CINCINNATI—*Ernest Pickering, 1 Interwood Place, Cincinnati, Ohio; †Russell Potter, 1305 The American Bldg., Cincinnati, Ohio.	PITTSBURGH—*Frederick Rigger, Westinghouse Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.; †Robert C. Bowers, 407 N. Craig St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
CLEVELAND—*Philip L. Small, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio; †James H. Duthie, Union Trust Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio.	RHODE ISLAND—*Russell H. Shaw, 2600 Industrial Tr. Bldg., Providence, R. I.; †Albert Harkness, 1428 Industrial Trust Bldg., Providence, R. I.
COLORADO—*G. Meredith Musick, Republic Building, Denver, Colo.; †W. Gordon Jamieson, 518 12th Street, Denver, Colo.	SAN DIEGO—*John S. Siebert, 632 Granger Bldg., San Diego, Cal.; †Louis J. Gill, 32 Sefton Bldg., San Diego, Cal.
COLUMBUS—*Daniel A. Carmichael, 5 E. Long St., Columbus, Ohio; †W. A. Gordon, 584 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.	SANTA BARBARA—*Russell Ray, San Marcos Building, Santa Barbara, Cal.; †E. Keith Lockard, 114 East de la Guerra Street, Santa Barbara, Cal.
CONNECTICUT—*George Herbert Gray, 42 Church St., New Haven, Conn.; †Alfred W. Boylen, 19 Whitney Avenue, New Haven, Conn.	SCRANTON-WILKES BARRE—*Thos. A. Foster, 909 Brooks Bldg., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; †Lewis Hancock, 1010 Mears Bldg., Scranton, Pa.
DAYTON—*Edwin F. Simpson, 860 Reibold Bldg., Dayton, Ohio; †Elliason R. Smith, 1005 Commercial Bldg., Dayton, Ohio.	SHREVEPORT—*Clarence W. King, Shreveport, La.; †Edward F. Neid, Shreveport, La.
DETROIT—*Bronson V. Gamber, 3500 Union Trust Bldg., Detroit, Mich.; †Arthur K. Hyde, 904 Marquette Bldg., Detroit, Mich.	SOUTH CAROLINA—*Albert Simons, 43 Broad St., Charleston, S. C.; †Lea LeGrand, Greenville, S. C.
EASTERN OHIO—*Barton E. Brooks, 321 Dollar Bank Bldg., Youngstown, Ohio.; †Walter J. Canfield, 1301 City Bank Bldg., Youngstown, Ohio.	SOUTH GEORGIA—*Walter P. Marshall, 1001 Savannah Bank & Trust Bldg., Savannah, Ga.; †Percy Bugden, 125 East 49th Street, Savannah, Ga.
FLORIDA CENTRAL—*John W. Vickery, 3119 Jerome St., N. St. Petersburg, Fla.; †C. Sedgwick Moss, 500 J. Bruce Smith Bldg., St. Petersburg, Fla.	SOUTH TEXAS—*John W. Dehnert, Esperson Bldg., Houston, Texas; †Addison S. Nunn, 212 Scanlan Bldg., Houston, Texas.
FLORIDA NORTH—*Rudolph Weaver, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.; †W. Kenyon Drake, 21 Ocean Street, Jacksonville, Fla.	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Harold C. Chambers, 1107 Hibernian Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.; †H. Roy Kelley, 1102 Architects' Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.
FLORIDA SOUTH—*Richard Kiehnell, 930 Seybold Bldg., Miami, Fla.; †E. L. Robertson, Calumet Bldg., Miami, Fla.	SOUTHERN PENNSYLVANIA—*Henry Y. Shaub, 20 1/2 North Queen St., Lancaster, Pa.; †Harry E. Yessier, 38 Schmidt Bldg., York, Pa.
GEORGIA—*Francis P. Smith, Norris Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.; †Preston S. Stevens, 101 Marietta Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.	ST. LOUIS—*Wilbur T. Trueblood, Chemical Bldg., St. Louis, Mo.; †P. John Hoener, 3605 Laeale Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.
GRAND RAPIDS—*Harry L. Mead, 602 Michigan Trust Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.; †Roger Allen, 463 Houseman Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.	ST. PAUL—*Beaver Wade Day, 1212 Builders Exchange, St. Paul, Minn.; †Thomas F. Elberle, 692 Euclid Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.
HAWAII—*Marshall H. Webb, Box 537, Honolulu, T.H.; †Herbert Cayton, 324 S. M. Damon Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.	TENNESSEE—*A. B. Baumann, Jr., 813 1/2 Market Street, Knoxville, Tenn.; †W. A. Rutherford, Jr., Sequoyah Hills, Knoxville, Tenn.
INDIANA—*Arthur H. Bohn, 218 East 32nd St., Indianapolis, Ind.; †Warren D. Miller, 610 Ohio Street, Terre Haute, Ind.	TOLEDO—*Wm. W. Waechter, 1220 Madison Ave., Toledo, Ohio; †Louis U. Bruyer, Department of Architecture, Board of Education, Toledo, Ohio.
IOWA—*Anna B. Emery, Observatory Tower, Des Moines, Iowa; †Vernon F. Tinsley, Hubbell Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa.	UTAH—*Raymond J. Ashton, Vermont Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah; †Lorenzo Young, 1458 Princeton Ave., Salt Lake City, Utah.
KANSAS CITY—*Edward W. Tanner, 6400 Ward Parkway, Kansas City, Mo.; †H. B. Dunham, 300 West 47th Street, Kansas City, Mo.	VIRGINIA—*Marcellus E. Wright, American National Bank Bldg., Richmond, Va.; †S. J. Collins, 230 Institute St., Staunton, Va.
KANSAS—*Charles W. Shaver, 147 1/2 South Santa Fe Street, Salina, Kansas; †George M. Beal, 305 Marvin Hall, Lawrence, Kans.	WASHINGTON, D. C.—*Gilbert L. Rodier, 726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.; †Fred E. Robbins, 726 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.
KENTUCKY—*Wm. G. O'Toole, 714 Louisville Trust Bldg., Louisville, Ky.; †G. M. Grimes, 1706 Heyburn Building, Louisville, Ky.	WASHINGTON STATE—*Roland E. Borhek, 918 Washington Bldg., Tacoma; †Lance E. Gowen, 307 Lumber Exchange Bldg., Seattle, Wash.
LOUISIANA—*Richard Koch, 604 Audubon Bldg., New Orleans, La.; †Morimer Favrot, 1205 Hibernia Bank Bldg., New Orleans, La.	WEST TEXAS—*Emmett T. Jackson, Builders' Exchange Bldg., San Antonio, Texas; †Robert M. Ayres, Smith-Young Tower, San Antonio, Texas.
MADISON—*Frank Riley, 24 E. Mifflin Street, Madison, Wis.; †James R. Law, First Central Building, Madison, Wis.	WEST VIRGINIA—*Carl Reger, Morgantown, W. Va.; †Carleton C. Wood, 366 Washington Ave., Clarksburg, W. Va.
MINNESOTA—*Wilbur H. Tusler, 104 S. 9th St., Minneapolis, Minn.; †Guy N. Crawford, 317 Essex Bldg., Minneapolis, Minn.	WISCONSIN—*Henry C. Hengels, 445 Milwaukee St., Milwaukee, Wis.; †Alexander C. Guth, 653 Franklin Place, Milwaukee, Wis.
MISSISSIPPI—*N. W. Overstreet, 1221-25 Standard Life Bldg., Jackson, Miss.; †Vinson B. Smith, Jr., Gulfport, Miss.	
MONTANA—*Chandler C. Cobagan, Box 1305, Billings, Mont.; †W. R. Plew; Boseman, Mont.	

* Presidents

† Secretaries

THE OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects

Published Monthly by

The American Institute of Architects

Executive and Publication Offices, The Octagon, 1741 New York Avenue N. W., Washington, D. C.

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS THE COPY. \$1 PER YEAR. (FOREIGN \$2)

Checks or Money Orders should be made payable to The American Institute of Architects. All communications for publication should be sent to The Secretary, The A. I. A.

Copyright, 1929, by The American Institute of Architects

Entered as second-class matter, February 9, 1929, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C.

Advising the Client to Build Now

November 18, 1930.

The Board of Directors of The American Institute of Architects, at its meeting in Detroit on November 14, 1930, approved the following statement on the building situation in the United States, as presented by the President of the Institute, Robert D. Kohn. The statement is now placed in the hands of the members of the Institute for submission to those who are interested, including state and municipal bodies, and the public press of all communities. It is as follows:

THE unemployment problem is a serious one in all parts of the country. An excellent committee, meeting in Washington under the chairmanship of Colonel Arthur Woods, is trying to find ways to meet the emergency. One of its recommendations is that we must speed up the public works programs of cities, states, and the Federal Government. We can help in that direction, and in other ways as well.

Building costs are low, lower than they have been for years. Labor is anxious to work, and efficient. This is surely an excellent time to go ahead with building wherever there is an immediate need for space or one that will exist within the next few years. Why not take advantage of the low prices? There are many hospitals, schools, and other institutions which need new buildings, or rebuilding, or alteration. Private residential work and housing of other kinds are much needed in certain parts of the country. For all such work the present time is most propitious. It is variously estimated that building costs are down from 12 per cent to 18 per cent on ordinary construction from the high of 1929, and in certain parts of the country on some types of work the cost is down 20 per cent.

We have heard of a number of corporations that have acted promptly on this situation. An important educational institution in the middle west is starting its building program, paying interest on borrowed money (in advance by two years on the proceeds of a bond issue) because the interest charges of this borrowed money will be more than met by the saving in building costs. And this institution

will have the use of its new buildings two years sooner, because it had the wisdom to go ahead.

One difficulty in the present situation is that arising from the absence of plans for many of the projects for which appropriations have been made. Many millions of dollars are available for Federal, state, county and municipal building projects, but for many of such projects there are no plans and specifications. They should be promptly taken in hand, and the architects of the country can surely be of assistance in getting them started.

A prominent construction company official reports: "Not since 1922 have we constructed buildings at such low prices as during this year, and in my judgment, the moment it becomes clear that business is improving, depression prices for materials will be withdrawn and the cost of buildings will increase. There can be no better time than the present to consider the advantages of a new building—how much will it cost, when should it be started, and how long will it take to build. These facts are essential for a sound decision."

We hope our suggestions in this direction will prove to be practical and hence of value. The Federal Government realizes that the situation needs prompt action for many reasons. But in the field of institutional and private building, too, the public has not realized its opportunities and its obligation to advance promptly all construction work so as to increase general employment. We urge upon established and growing institutions and businesses that they start their building projects now—not only because of the unemployment crisis but because building costs are generally so favorable.

Some Notes on the XII International Congress of Architects, Budapest, September 5-14, 1930

By GEORGE OAKLEY TOTTEN, JR., *Secretary, American Section of the Permanent Committee*

THE XII International Congress of Architects, which convened in Budapest in September, was a delightful affair. It was one of the most successful gatherings of architects ever held. The Executive Committee is to be congratulated, the arrangements were perfect and everything proceeded in an orderly, dignified manner and with dispatch but never with undue haste. The delegates were warmly welcomed, delightfully entertained and departed from their Hungarian hosts and Budapest with regrets but with many happy memories.

There were some four hundred architects present representing twenty-six countries. It is a pity that American architects have not grasped the importance, the pleasure and the profit to be derived from these great international gatherings. Although there were many present, it was a small delegation for so large a country. Those who did attend will tell you they never had a better time.

Budapest, too, is a city well worth seeing. Its location on the Danube with its graceful and truly architectural suspension bridges, its picturesque hills crowned with towers and spires is not only unique but so beautiful and attractive as to call forth the instant admiration of the beholder. The best approach to the city is by boat from Vienna. It is a delightful day's sail in a small river steamer and full of interest.

One passes many quaint and curious boat mills, anchored in the stream. The water wheels which grind the grain are turned by the river current. There are quaint villages and, as one approaches Budapest, high hills with formidable medieval castles. It is a day long to be remembered.

But to return to the Congress. There is a Permanent Committee made up of sections with from one to fifteen members from each country belonging to the Congress, depending on population. England, France and America each has fifteen members. This Permanent Committee has charge of the Congress between sessions, it selects the countries in which the Congress is held, determines the subjects to be discussed and makes all arrangements for the meetings. It always holds a meeting the day before the opening of a Congress and the day following its close.

At the meeting the day before the opening of the Budapest Congress, Mr. Totten, on behalf of the American Section, repeated the Committee's invitation to hold the next session in America. Mr. Frank C. Baldwin, the Institute delegate, extended

a similar invitation from The American Institute of Architects.

The following day, September 6, the formal inaugural opening of the Congress was held with great pomp and splendor in the beautiful Renaissance Hall of the Academy of Sciences. The session was opened by Jos. Th. I. Cuypers, President of the Permanent Committee, who announced the President of the Congress, Robert K. Kertész and Secretary General Béla Rerrich.

The President made a short address and introduced Count Kuno Klebelsberg, Minister of Culture and Education, who opened the Congress and greeted the delegates. He was followed by the Minister of Commerce and Dr. Ferenc Ripka, the Mayor of the City.

While it is customary for an official delegate from each country to respond to the salutation of the President, as there were so many countries represented it was decided to have only one speak in behalf of all. Probably because America had extended an invitation, an American was accorded this honor.

Among the many distinguished foreign architects present might be mentioned Prof. W. Kreis of Dresden; Von Stubbens of Berlin; Calza Bini of Milan; Dr. D. F. Slothouwer of Amsterdam; G. A. Sutherland of Manchester; E. Pontremolli, Member of the Institute, France.

In the afternoon, the members of the Congress attended the formal opening of the "Hungarian Style Tendencies" Section of the International Exhibition of Architectural Designs in the National Salon. This was an exhibition of Hungarian architecture in the Hungarian style. The Americans were astonished at the great number of buildings in purely Hungarian style to be found in the smaller cities of Hungary.

The Congress had arranged an International Exhibition of Architectural Designs held in the Picture Gallery. This was formally opened Sunday morning and was an exhibition of considerable extent and interest. Some countries were represented by their historic buildings, as for instance France and Italy. While Germany, Austria, Sweden and Finland exhibited only their latest creations. Some of the latter were beautiful, some were marvelous and some were queer. America exhibited the admirable Institute collection of drawings and photographs assembled by Mr. J. Clarence Levi and many examples of America's tallest buildings. The exhibit was in charge of Mr.

Branson Gamber, delegate of the Detroit Chapter, A. I. A.

Later in the day, the members visited the Architectural School and viewed the work of the students of the R. H. Joseph Technical University.

Sunday afternoon, excursions were made by motor to the hills about Budapest, including St. Gellért Mountain, Szechenyi Mountain, Sanatorium on the Suabian Mountain where tea was served. The views were superb.

In the evening the members of the Congress were entertained at dinner by the Executive Committee.

On Monday morning, September 8, the discussion of the five subjects, which was of course the real business of the Congress, began. Each subject was assigned to a special room and was presided over by a president and several secretaries from different countries. Hungarian, French, English, German and Italian were the official languages.

For months before the opening of the Congress papers on the subjects to be discussed had poured in to the Permanent Committee. These were digested by the committees and abstracts or entire papers were printed so that at the discussions only abstracts were read and conclusions or resolutions formulated. These were the gist of the subjects and are given in full at the end of this review.

The discussions went on every morning. In the afternoons interesting illustrated lectures were given. Some of the subjects were: "Details of the Construction of Greek Monuments," by N. M. Balanos, Director of the Greek Ministry of Education; "Latest German Buildings in the Modern Style," by Prof. Bestelmeyer (Munich); "Through the History of Art to the New Architecture," by Paul Ligeti of Budapest; "Future Development of Washington," by George Oakley Totten, Jr.

Especially arranged visits were made to some of the many museums of Budapest, including the National Museum and Museum of Fine Arts which are filled with masterpieces and copies of medieval, renaissance and modern European art; the Industrial Museum with examples of modern Hungarian industrial art; but the museum that fascinated the Americans was the Ethnological or Demographical Museum. This was a revelation as most of the Americans did not know of the wonders of the native Hungarian peasant art. Such farm house interiors! Such peasant costumes! Mr. Mason of Detroit remarked: "The Modernists should come here for inspiration of their ornament." The embroidery work of the Hungarian peasant is unrivalled.

On other days we went to see the national archives; the royal castle, one of the finest in the world, located on the hills overlooking the Danube but too well known to need description here; the Houses of Parliament, which were especially illuminated for us and where tea was served.

The American Minister and Mrs. J. Butler Wright entertained Mr. John M. Howells, Mr. Frank C. Baldwin and Major George Oakley Totten, Jr., the official delegates of our Government to the Congress, and their wives, at the Legation at luncheon. We do not own a legation building in Budapest but Mr. Wright is very anxious to have our Government purchase the house he is occupying.*

Count Kuno Klebelsberg entertained the members by a sail on the Danube to Esztergom where resides the Primate who conducted us through the Cathedral. We also saw Salomon's Tower at Visegrad. On this trip Prof. Lorch made good use of his knowledge of languages.

Beautiful St. Margaret's Island in the Danube has been laid out as an athletic and recreation park. Here all sorts of athletic sports are indulged in, including, of course, canoeing and rowing. There are several important mineral baths here. Budapest has been famous ever since Roman times for the curative qualities of its baths and mineral waters. One should at least mention in passing that the many hotels of Budapest are unsurpassed in their appointments and cuisine. One of the most notable, the St. Gellért, is owned and managed by the city. It is of great dimensions and includes mineral baths and an enormous swimming pool located in the beautiful terraced gardens of the hotel. The water of the pool is mineral and a unique feature of the pool is the artificial waves, as high as are usually found at our seaside resorts.

A special gala performance was given at the Opera House for the members of the Congress when one of the famous Hungarian operas, "A Carnival Wedding," by the Hungarian composer Poldini, was sung.

On another occasion, H. R. H. the Prince Regent graciously received the official delegates at the Palace. The once famous Admiral, now one of Europe's foremost statesmen, will undoubtedly greatly aid his country in regaining the prestige cruelly wrested from it by the Great War.

The municipality of Budapest entertained the members of the Congress at two elaborate and highly interesting banquets. In fact, there was an elaborate program arranged for nearly every evening during the Congress.

The event of greatest importance to American architects was the announcement made at the closing session of the Congress that America's invitation had been accepted. The announcement was greeted with great acclaim and enthusiasm. This is the first time the great International Congress

*The other Official Delegates appointed by President Hoover to represent the United States but who were unable to attend the Congress were as follows: Prof. William A. Boring, Mr. Cass Gilbert, Dr. C. Howard Walker, Prof. Warren P. Laird.

has consented to convene in the New World.

The closing session was held in one of the beautiful halls of the Redoute Building followed by the closing banquet.

There are likely to be several unique features in connection with the coming Congress.

The question of distance from Europe and the expense involved in coming to America have been the chief factors against a Congress being held here. Then, too, the European architects until quite recently have felt that our architecture has not been worth the journey. This feeling has undergone a change and I believe that most of our foreign conferees have quite a curiosity to see and some admiration for what we have done.

The question of the time of the year has still to be settled. We, knowing the intense heat of our summers, prefer spring or autumn, while many European architects, and those most interested in Congresses, are patrons and cannot well leave except during July and August. This is a matter that will be difficult of adjustment.

A suggestion was made in Budapest that we charter a steamer and that all foreign delegates sail on the same ship. This was followed by another thought which was that the discussions be conducted on the boat, thus leaving the entire time in America for sight-seeing and entertainment. This is another question to be threshed out.

One of the great difficulties of international meetings has always been that of language. The writer while in Budapest had what he thought was a real idea. It was that by the aid of the radio, interpreters in adjacent rooms, and ear pieces, one would be able to listen to the debates in his own language. What was his astonishment the week after he arrived in Washington to find that the International Road Congress had solved the problem in exactly that way and with complete success!

The Congress of 1933 will be a tale not of two but of three cities—New York, Washington and Chicago. It promises to be the most interesting one ever held, and if we work hard in preparation, perhaps the most worth while.

SUBJECTS DISCUSSED

COMMISSION OF THE DEBATES

President—George Oakley Totten, Jr., Washington, D. C.
Vice-President—Ivar Tengbom, Stockholm.

THEME I

President—Prof. Ing. W. Kreis, B.D.A., Dresden.
Vice-President—Prof. Waelder Gy., Budapest.
Recorder—Prof. Dr. Ing. Kotsis I., Budapest.
Secretaries—Kiss T. Antal, D. Arve K., Budapest.

"The Reform of Professional Architectural Instruction to Conform to the Exigencies of Practical Life."

Resolutions

Considering the economic conditions of today, as well as the radical changes in production since the world war, the Congress deems it necessary that a more complete

instruction should be given in finance, economics and the workings of organizations than formerly.

It deems it necessary that the study of these subjects should not be put off until the student has finished his theoretical studies but should go hand in hand with them. In order to accomplish this end, the Congress offers the following resolutions:

First. Without detriment to the architect's artistic conceptions, the compositions should be studied with an idea of their actual execution, especially from an economic point of view.

Second. As economic architecture is based on a thorough knowledge of construction, it is necessary to lay stress on the study of construction and to begin the study of materials at the very beginning of a student's career.

Third. Parallel with the theoretical study of materials should be a practical study to familiarize the student with the actual materials. This applies especially to new materials which should be tried out in the student's laboratory.

Fourth. The Congress expresses the hope that before a student receives his diploma he shall be required to pass a certain amount of time on actual buildings and in an architect's office.

Fifth. The Congress deems it necessary that before an architect begins practice he shall have some knowledge of law, administration and political economy.

Note: It is hoped that our American schools will consider this resolution and will profit by the suggestions offered.

THEME II

President—Prof. Calza Bini, Milan.
Vice-President—Prof. Sandy Gy., Budapest.
Recorder—Laczay O., Budapest.
Secretaries—Padanyi-Gulyas J., Gotthard Za., Budapest.

"Chambers of Architects and Architectural Associations."

Resolutions

The Congress expresses the following conclusions:

First. That the title of "architect" shall be protected by law in every country in accordance with the resolutions of the XI Congress and that the same laws that will regulate the registration of architects will impose legal penalties for the illegal use of the title.

Second. The Congress considers it desirable that corporations (societies) of architects should be organized in every country from a legal standpoint and authorized to register architects who are qualified by education and experience and thus safeguard the interests of the profession (and public).

Chambers of architects, syndicates or commissions should be created with legal authority, according to the laws of the country, to handle the subject.

Third. That the delegates of each country should endeavor to have the architect who prepares the plans, supervises and controls the work, separated from the contractor who executes the work.

Fourth. The Congress decides that all the resolutions and wishes adopted shall be transmitted by the secretary general through the various sections to the governments of the different nations and to the League of Nations.

Note: Previous Congresses have advocated the registration of architects and many of our states now require this. The Institute has always endeavored to have architects employed as suggested in article three.

THEME III

President—Prof. E. Pontremolli, Paris.
 Vice-President—Hoepfner G., Budapest.
 Recorder—Szabolcs F., Budapest.
 Secretaries—Arkay B., Pechy L., Budapest.

"The International Protection of the Artistic Rights of an Architect."

Resolutions

The Congress expresses the following conclusions:

First. That the right of authorship of an architect shall be equally recognized in all countries that have joined the Bern Union. Alteration, additions and partial or complete demolition shall not be permitted by law if it results in irreparable artistic loss.

Second. That individuals must not appropriate the ideas or projects, but that the state, city or other authorized authorities shall have the right of expropriation in such cases where expropriation is deemed necessary from the point of social or national interest. In such cases, the indemnity paid the author shall be by mutual agreement or fixed by a court and that the design so taken can be used only for the purpose mentioned in the agreement.

Third. That the protection of the rights of the author as determined by the Bern Union shall be placed under the League of Nations.

Note: Previous Congresses have advocated copyright laws that would protect the artist (architects, painters and sculptors) with the same protection as that accorded authors. Some countries have such laws but this is not true in America. We do not even belong to the International Copyright Union but there is a bill before our National Congress advocating our joining this union.

In this connection we believe that the Institute would do well to create a commission to formulate a letter requesting owners of buildings to employ the original architects of the buildings for any alterations, changes or enlargements that they wish to make. This suggestion is made in justice to the original architects and usually is a point of economy and efficiency for the owner.

THEME IV

President—Prof. Dr. Ir. D. F. Slothouwer, Amsterdam.
 Vice-President—Orban F., Budapest.
 Recorder—Dr. Ing. V. Bierbauer, Budapest.
 Secretaries—Nagy M., le comte Csaky E., Budapest.

"The Role of the Architect in Industrial Constructions."

Resolutions

The Congress expresses the following conclusions:

First. In industrial construction it is desirable that the architect be consulted at the very inception of the work and shall at once begin the study of the plans and the character of the architecture he will adopt. It is also of prime importance that the architect's position shall be legally stipulated.

Second. In general it would seem best that the architect be called in as a consultant (not an employee), but he should have a special knowledge of the industry under consideration.

Third. It is considered especially desirable to have the faculties of different courses in a university in very close touch. Especially is this the case with faculties of architectural and engineering courses so as to insure a close and harmonious cooperation between the architect and the engineer.

Fourth. We believe that it is absolutely necessary for architectural societies to propagate these ideas among industrial organizations in order to convince them of the necessity of employing architects in industrial constructions from a point of view of national economy and hygiene. It is deemed necessary that architectural societies should begin this propaganda by pen and word of mouth at once.

Note: The Institute has always advocated every point mentioned in this resolution and it is hoped will continue to push the matter.

THEME V

President—G. A. Sutherland, Manchester.
 Vice-President—Prof. E. Medgyaszay, Budapest.
 Recorder—Dr. Ing. Moller K., Budapest.
 Secretaries—Gerloczy G., Gaul G., Balint A., Budapest.
 "Architectural Acoustics."

Resolutions

The Congress expresses the following conclusions:

First. As architectural acoustics is now a well established science, with recognized laws, it is hoped that its study will be included in all schools of higher architectural instruction.

Second. It is desirable that every country shall possess a scientific laboratory for acoustical research and for the study of acoustic materials.

Third. Halls that are known to be acoustical failures should receive profound study.

Fourth. It is hoped that phonetic isolation, necessary for efficient work and repose, will be required by the building departments of our cities. This may be accomplished by the use of proper acoustical materials.

Note: An old subject just coming into its own. We do have in the Bureau of Standards a government scientific laboratory that is doing splendid work.

Architects and Real Estate Men

By THOMAS S. HOLDEN, *Vice-President in Charge of Statistics and Research,*
F. W. Dodge Corporation

Foreword by Robert D. Kohn:

Some months ago Mr. Thomas S. Holden sent me a most interesting letter reviewing his impressions of the Toronto meeting of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. It seemed to me that these impressions would be of interest to architects generally as they were to me; for while Mr. Holden is at present engaged in collecting statistical information on building construction he was trained as an architect, and hence understands the architect's point of view. On my invitation he prepared this more extended statement of his views on this subject.

IN THAT important side of architectural practice which pays office rent, staff salaries, office expenses and the architect's living, the business side, commercial considerations are predominant and

real estate economics are playing a role of ever-increasing importance. In the year 1929 contracts awarded on architect-planned projects, as reported by F. W. Dodge Corporation for the 37 eastern

states, amounted to \$2,917,000,000, divided as follows: Commercial buildings, \$718,000,000; apartments and hotels, \$715,000,000; one- and two-family houses, \$432,000,000; educational buildings, \$364,000,000; industrial buildings, \$187,000,000; hospitals and institutions, \$137,000,000; social and recreational projects, \$115,000,000; public buildings, \$111,000,000; religious and memorial buildings, \$94,000,000; public works and utilities (including bridges, railroad stations, water-front projects, etc.), \$44,000,000.

The combined value of commercial buildings, industrial buildings, and apartments and hotels represents 55½ per cent of total architect-planned work; all these classes of buildings must be planned for an economic return on the investment represented by land plus building. Although much architect-planned work in the field of one- and two-family houses consists of work done for individual owners' occupancy, total investment in land and buildings and a high order of planning for best site-utilization are important considerations; add the amount of architects' work in this class and you have 70 per cent of all their work in projects where real estate considerations are of outstanding importance. With reference to the small house it will appear later in this article that a new line of activity and architectural opportunity is likely to open up in the next decade. The remaining 30 per cent, consisting of work that might be lumped together under the general heading of public and institutional building, constitutes that portion of the profession's annual program in which real estate considerations are rather secondary and in which the opportunities for the more academic types of buildings occur.

Architects who have been most successful in recent years in getting the business of designing city skyscrapers (office buildings, hotels, apartments) have been those who have a broad knowledge of real estate economics and have entered into consultation at the earliest stages of planning with those real estate men and building managers competent to advise on the features of the building required to make it an income-producing investment for the owner. These same city skyscraper buildings are the ones in which characteristic new designs, free from limitations of traditional styles, have been developed, and the ones for which general building contractors have carried furthest efficiency methods in the construction process. The set-back requirements of the zoning law of New York City, which has so profoundly affected skyscraper design of recent years and led to such interesting new developments of mass and form, are themselves prompted by real estate considerations, considerations of the utility and value of surrounding property. It is the belief of this writer that more and more in the future will real estate considerations affect the de-

sign of smaller structures and the business of erecting them; that architects whose practice is largely in the smaller commercial and residential classes of work will succeed in expanding their business by gaining a broader knowledge of real estate and land economics just as the firms who plan skyscrapers have done. The one field of building in which architects' participation is relatively smallest, the small house, is numerically the largest field of building today and therefore the one which invites wider architectural participation. One of the most important ways in which such participation may be increased is through grasp of the real estate economics of housing.

Real estate men, as brokers and rental agents, deal in the completely assembled product, the finished building on its site. They make the direct contact with the buying public and are in closer touch with the current active building demand than any other group. Many times they initiate projects by showing prospective investors the possibilities of certain sites for definite kinds of building development. At other times they actually promote and finance commercial, apartment and house development projects. In our economic system they are the ones who have always taken the initiative in the development and expansion of our cities, their business centers, their industrial sections, and their residential neighborhoods.

At this point, some one may raise the quite valid objection that the development of American cities up to date has been for the most part planless, wasteful and with many deplorable results, economical and social. One answer to that objection is that if our communities have in the past left the job of advance planning to the opportunist methods of speculators, the communities are probably as much to blame as the speculators. But the other and far more important answer is that no group of citizens and business men today is more keenly aware of the evils that have resulted in the past from unrestrained real estate and building speculation than are the real estate men of the country; no group is developing a more intelligent and progressive program for turning its activities from speculation into stable business; no group more anxious to expand its influence and its opportunities by learning how to serve the public and the respective communities in which it operates more intelligently and more efficiently. In their local and national real estate boards they have developed a strong organization with a well-articulated program of periodic surveys, economic research, education, and development of high standards of business practice in its membership. It was my privilege to attend as guest the annual convention of the National Association of Real Estate Boards in Toronto last July. In the program of the meeting high-pressure salesmanship methods had small place; the impor-

tant
as he
regu
renc
soun
coop
habit
estat
how
buil
press
by e
gates
of a
most
tions
sear
ter j
the
patr
N
the
Nati
iden
to r
the
goin
that
of s
thro
Both
to s
to st
have
ders
the
prac
need
the
wha
rem
Rec
arch
the
first
asce
wish
min
plan
Am
in v
requ
tact
In
for
deca
ing
on
tion

tant subjects under discussion were such matters as how to make better vacancy surveys in order to regulate demand and supply and avoid the recurrence of booms and depressions, how to secure sounder methods of real estate financing, how to cooperate with town-planning experts, how to rehabilitate blighted urban areas, how to relieve real estate of seemingly inordinate tax burdens—in short, how to serve their communities better and thus build up their business on a stable basis. My impression of this meeting, both from the papers read by experts and their reception by the visiting delegates, was, that here was a business that had come of age and here was an organization based on the most advanced principle of modern business associations, that of educating its membership, through research into its own economic problems, to do a better job for the American public and thus earn for the industry the right to larger consideration and patronage.

Now, it seems to me that the expressed aims of the leaders in the real estate business and of the National Association of Real Estate Boards are identical with the aims of American architects, that to realize the program of accomplishment set forth the real estate men and their organized boards are going to need the full cooperation of architects, and that architects are quite likely to find wider fields of service (and more opportunities for business) through fuller cooperation with real estate men. Both architects and real estate men have got to learn to serve their communities better. It is only fair to state that at the present time the real estate men have progressed further than the architects in understanding community needs and in anticipating the wants of the buying public. Architects have practically always served individual clients whose needs were rather definitely formulated by the time the architects were consulted. This is probably what Mr. Henry Wright had in mind when he remarked in a recent article in the *Architectural Record* that the slogan, "Make the Public more architect-minded," had just as well read, "Make the architect more public-minded." An architect's first step in planning for an individual client is to ascertain, by searching questions, all the client's wishes and requirements for the building he has in mind. I would suggest that as the first step in planning for the great American public and for American communities, the architect should learn in very considerable detail the public's wants and requirements from the man in constant direct contact with the buyers, the real estate man.

In the field of housing special new opportunities for architects are likely to arise in the coming decade. There are a number of reasons for believing that housing will be produced more and more on a quantity basis. Continued trend of population to the cities is one reason. Another important

reason is the growing tendency, as reported by real estate men, on the part of prospective home-owners of moderate means to go shopping for a completely assembled house and lot, so that they can see with their own eyes just what they are paying for, judge the neighborhood they may decide to live in, and make their investments all at one time with a simple plan of financing their payments. This cuts down the market for unimproved residential subdivisions, and tends to put the subdividers into the housing business. There is an opportunity in our larger communities for the growth of residential development companies, large and well-financed, which will utilize the best available planning talent (architects and engineers and town-planners) for research and advance planning, spreading the overhead cost of these services over large numbers of buildings. Here the problem has more to do with land-economics and plot-planning than with the design of individual houses. Even if the factory-built house should arrive, it will not be complete until it is properly located on its site. In any form of quantity-production of housing, land economics and plot-planning can not be ignored. As a matter of fact, a completely standardized factory-built house seems today to have rather limited possibilities. Standardization and simplification of structural units, with maximum assembly in the factory and minimum hand labor on the job seem to be on the way; such a development would permit flexibility in design and adaptation to varying requirements. Improved housing at low-cost for American families of average and below-average income is a quantity-production problem, and so recognized by the real estate men. Individuality of design, in low-cost houses, is far less important than substantial quality, efficiency and low cost. Architects like Andrew Thomas, Clarence S. Stein, Frederick L. Ackerman, Henry Wright, and the group which has worked in the Small House Service Bureau, have made notable contributions to better standards of low-cost house and apartment design, working from an understanding of real estate economics. If architects generally wish to annex the low-cost housing field, they will obviously want to work in closest relationship with real estate men.

Another factor favoring large-scale production of moderate cost housing is the present situation of lending institutions, with their large accumulations of money and limited outlets in available mortgage investments. With such successful examples before them as the apartment housing project of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company and the Radburn development of the City Housing Corporation they might be very logically led into the financing, possibly even into organizing, large housing companies.

The small house (under \$10,000, say) represents in a certain sense a common failure of architects

and real estate men; up to the present time both groups have largely left this field of opportunity to the ministrations of plan-factories, speculators and local builders with little skill in planning, with jerry building and real estate depressions as the principal results. Neither group has yet found a way to produce improved homes at lowered costs. During the last residential building boom, after the peak of small-house building in 1925, there was a distinct trend on the part of home-building companies toward better houses, better as to modern improvements and conveniences and better as to architectural design. But, these betterments were achieved only at greater and greater costs to the buyers, which simply meant that sales were being made in an ever-narrowing market which eventually very nearly disappeared.

A number of the larger and more responsible housing companies throughout the country have membership in local real estate boards and in the Home-Builders and Subdividers Section of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. Through such membership they work for more effective control of housing and subdivision production, and for higher building and business standards. If, as seems likely, responsible housing companies are to grow more numerous and more important in the residential section of the building field, they are apt to continue these close ties with the real estate field.

As the architect becomes more real-estate-minded he is inclined to visualize development possibilities for specific plots of ground, with reference to apartment projects, store groups with special parking facilities hitherto non-existent, parking garages, suburban branches of large city department stores, and similar projects. It should be possible to make some sort of working arrangement with a real estate man for joint presentation of such a project to a prospective investor.

Probably the best way for architects to start cooperating with real estate men would be to get ac-

quainted with the activities of local real estate boards, find out what town and community planning activities they are engaged in, what they have done in the way of vacancy surveys, studies of local conditions in real estate financing, organization of property owners' divisions, and so on. As individuals or as local chapters, the architects should be able to find ways of working with the local real estate boards in surveys of the communities' needs and constructive work for the communities' betterments. By so doing, architects are quite likely to have their own eyes opened to business opportunities they had not thought of before.

If I were a practicing architect and a member of The American Institute of Architects, I think I should want the officers of my association to confer with officers of the National Association of Real Estate Boards for the purpose of laying out some joint program of research on the economics of building, probably on the specific subject of the economics of housing, of sponsoring cooperation between architects and real estate men in local groups as well as in the national organizations and of arranging for interchange of information on all the newest developments in building technology and real estate economics. Such a suggestion, made by an unofficial observer outside the membership of either of the organizations referred to, may possibly be a little presumptuous, but it is made with the sincere conviction that, if acted upon, it would quite likely conduce to progress in the building industry and mutual benefits to both organizations, their respective members and the public they both serve. Numbers of individual architects have doubtless already done all of the things suggested in this article; but the public looks to The American Institute of Architects for leadership in understanding its needs, the Institute being the one national architectural organization that can develop a constructive program of cooperation with other forward-looking associations operating in the building industry.

Comment on Mr. Holden's article by Henry Wright, A.I.A.

Mr. Holden's article, "Architects and Real Estate Men," should prove a valuable stimulant to thought and discussion. Whether or not we may be able to credit the full change of attitude on the part of real estate men in general, there is no question that the depressed market in lot buying as well as building has had a sobering influence on all concerned, which may well be taken as an opportunity to coordinate the fields of promotion and planning in a manner which their mutual interests would warrant. I am not sure that mutual approach would not prove that the real estate men might contribute ideas about planning, while the archi-

tecs would suggest better ways of promoting and selling.

Mr. Holden's article may be only an introduction to the next step. These men fail to cooperate often because they do not understand each other. If their methods and ideals could be mutually interpreted it would go a long way to clearing up the situation. I am inclined to think that in addition to the opportune conditions there is also just now an unusually broad-minded group at the head of the Real Estate Boards. They would, I feel sure, welcome a suggestion for the appointment of

carefully selected committees from the Real Estate Board and the A. I. A., to canvass the subject more thoroughly. Even a change of heart still leaves the imprint of former methods, and I doubt if the most advanced group of the real estate men yet realize in

the least how far our land system has gone toward stultifying the development of a half-way creditable or efficient standard of planning for all intermediate types of dwellings, which form the bulk of housing in this country.

School Buildings and State Bureaus

A letter from H. W. Schmidt

IN the September number of *THE OCTAGON* there appeared a discussion on "School Buildings and State Bureaus," by William J. Seward, F.A.I.A. Comment on that article came from Mr. H. W. Schmidt, Supervisor of Buildings, Department of Public Instruction, of the State of Wisconsin. Mr. Schmidt's point of view should be of interest to the chapters of the Institute, to the membership at large, and to those states which have boards or commissions engaged in schoolhouse work. His letter follows:

"I recently had the opportunity of reading an article on School Buildings and State Bureaus contained in the September number of *THE OCTAGON* and feel that a reply and some comments on this article are not only timely as far as this department is concerned but will be of decided interest to your association.

"The matter of getting adequate school building service and giving technical information along all lines to rural school boards and communities intruded itself upon our consciousness some six years ago due to the fact that the most outrageous examples of rural school buildings both in planning and appearance came through constantly. In this state as in many others, buildings may be designed by others than architects, provided the term 'architect' is not used in connection with such design. Consequently we felt that something had to be done to give these districts the proper service.

"We also found as stated and implied in your article, that most architects could not afford to spend time and considerable effort on the designing of simple one- and two-room structures. I am afraid that much of this work in the past has simply been delegated to the chief or other draftsman in the office of the architect, consequently after questioning a number of leading and reputable architects we undertook to give all types of architectural and engineering service to any who desired to avail themselves of it. The specific architectural service, however, was confined to one- and two-room rural buildings for which we developed complete plans and specifications. The architects commended our attitude on this and with one exception—and the exception is not a member of the Institute—we have had no complaints. On the contrary.

"Engineering service is not specific to the extent

that we develop plans or give specifications for this type of work, but we act in an advisory capacity only. We also make suggestive layouts for buildings of any size but refuse to commit ourselves on definite planning beyond the limits previously stated.

"I am very much in agreement with much which the article contains, especially as it refers to stock plans and stereotyped buildings. The writer has felt the limitations imposed by these very definitely and we have consistently refused to design buildings, arrangements, and exteriors which to us did not seem proper and fitting. Only this spring a county superintendent came to us and said he had eight or nine buildings which were to be replaced in his county and he wished one plan which would serve for all. The department refused to do this and it did not leave a very pleasant feeling with the county superintendent. However, we stood pat and in consequence we designed only three buildings and the others went to some architect who did the job wholesale. The matter of plastering the state or a community with orthodox buildings is in my mind an aesthetic and architectural crime.

"During the last four years we have sent out one hundred and seventy-seven different plans for one- and two-rooms. In order that you may get some first-hand information as to the work which we are doing I am sending you one set of blueprints of one of our buildings, a set of standard specifications, and also a series of photographs of a few of our buildings. I believe you will appreciate that the orthodox is non-existent and that our buildings at least bear the stamp of originality. Whether they are of a design which would be universally commended is an entirely different matter and has no bearing on the subject. If we can design buildings, such as the Elm Grove, and others, I believe this state is in no danger of being made subject to an architectural program for rural schools which would be considered detrimental.

"I am not giving you the above information in any apologetic attitude nor as a defense of the article but am presenting it purely on the basis of what this department considered a good policy toward the rural communities and to the state building program in general. If you find the time and opportunity, I will be glad to get your comments."

The Problem of the Farm House

By WILLIAM DRAPER BRINCKLOE, A.I.A.

THE October issue of *Agricultural Engineering* (the Journal of the A. S. A. E.) lies on my desk. It's the special building number—and I turn to an article by J. L. Strahan, of the Loudon Machinery Company—"The Need for Research in Farm Structures."

Here's a sample paragraph: "Now what does the business farmer get when he goes to the architectural profession? He gets nothing unless the architect is in a starving condition, and then what he gets is just a shame. As a matter of fact the successful architectural practitioner has no time for him. And the unsuccessful one has no knowledge of the agricultural engineering principles involved in farm building design. This situation is exactly what is to be expected. The farmer himself is so ignorant of the economic status of his building program that he wouldn't hire the most competent agricultural architect in the world; if there was one, principally because he thinks he can't afford the fee."

Absurd? Not a bit of it! As a matter of fact, Mr. Strahan had referred this article, before publication, to the President of the Institute, who in turn requested me to read and report. Some things in Mr. Strahan's paper I criticized adversely; but the particular paragraph above quoted had my hearty approval. It is cuttingly blunt; but absolutely true!

"Yes, true for a dairy-barn, perhaps," snaps out one of my professional brethren, "but does this idiot mean to say that I or any other architect, can't design a farmhouse?"

"Precisely that," I respond, and I mean to say it, too!

Years ago I was asked by a farm magazine to contribute a farmhouse design every month. So I sorted out some of my most successful suburban cottages and published them; but somehow they didn't seem to go over. I said to myself, smugly, "Oh, those hick farmers are too dumb to know a good design when they see one, that's the trouble!"

Then, one day, came a letter, ill-spelled, poorly written, scribbled in pencil on a sheet of scratch-pad paper:

Dere Mr. Brinckloe,

That little scetch you printed was real prety; but it ain't no use to farm folks like us. You got the bath room up staires, witch ain't right when you ain't got runing watter like we ain't, and got to carry it from the kitchen range tank. And you got the staires at the front, and ain't got no wash room like, witch the men kin come into and leave thare coats and boots without messing up my kitchen. Why don't you show us, some real farmhouse plans?

Mrs. Tom Smith.

I laughed as I read it; then I re-read it, and didn't laugh. Was she right? Perhaps. Must a

farmhouse plan be entirely different from a suburban cottage plan? After all, what did a city-bred chap like myself know about farmhouse life?

I went to the editor of *The Farm Journal*. "Look here. We're both guessing as to what the readers want. Let's run a house-plan prize contest; then we'll know."

"Guess you're right; go to it," he said.

So I ran the contest; it produced thirty-five hundred sketch-plans and letters. Mighty crude they were, of course; yet tremendously illuminating! I realized fully that I hadn't known even the elements of farmhouse design.

Since then, I have run similar contests for the Country Gentleman, and various other farm periodicals. The results have merely confirmed the conclusions I drew from the first contest.

Now, what are the fundamentals of farmhouse design?

1. Let us remember that on the farm, the family enter and leave by the rear door (not necessarily the kitchen door, however). The fields, the stables, the poultry yard, all lie back of the house. Even if the wife wants to visit a neighbor, she must first go to the garage, and the back door is the nearest to that. Whereas, in all other homes, the route to shop, office, store, or neighbor, lies via sidewalk, bus-line, or station; and the front door is the most direct way. It's all right to put hall and stairway at the front of the town house; but on the farm, these must be at the rear.

2. The farmhouse cellar is used far more than the town house cellar; firewood, winter vegetables and fruits, and sometimes even incubators are kept down there. Hence a convenient "grade doorway" is needed, instead of an outside hatchway. The favorite scheme is to have the grade door open on a landing from which one goes down to the cellar or up to the stairhall. This gives the desired rear entrance to the house, without multiplying doors.

3. Three times a day the farmer, his sons, and his hired men, come tramping in to meals; boots and clothing messy with mud, dust, chaff and a hundred other defilements. The city man's work is usually far cleaner; even if it isn't, he has shaken off the worst of the dirt during his journey home. Therefore, the farm woman demands a small wash-room or lavatory, entered directly from outdoors, where the men can shed miry boots, mussy overalls, dripping raincoats, etc., and then wash up a bit.

4. The farmhouse kitchen is entirely unlike the ordinary kitchen—differently placed, differently equipped, and decidedly larger:

(a) A question of psychology governs its position. "I want a window directly over my sink,

with a view of the road," writes one farmer's wife. "It's a great comfort to a lonely woman, spending hours in her dish-washing and cooking, if she can occasionally see someone passing by." And many hundreds of other farm women have written me the same thing. It is significant that before the coming of the automobile, the majority of the inmates of state insane asylums were farmers' wives; the utter loneliness during a great part of the day, with no new subjects for thought, literally drove them insane! Hence the kitchen must be at the front, or the end, of the house; not the rear.

(b) Town or suburban menfolk eat only two meals at home; sometimes less. But the farm housewife must cook and serve breakfast, dinner and supper for several hard-working men who demand heavy food and plenty of it. Her work is twice as heavy, and lasts twice as long. But she can cut corners a bit if most of the meals are served in the kitchen. A breakfast-nook set (table and two benches) in an alcove, is the choice of most farm women. In any event, the regular kitchen work-table is needed for other purposes, and cannot be used for meals.

(c) Gas or electric ranges are impossible or impractical on the farm. In winter, a wood or coal range is used; in summer, a large oil-stove. Space for both must be provided, so that, in spring or fall, either may be used, according to the weather. The ordinary kitchen has space for only one stove.

5. Regardless of the mossy old jokes about Farmer Corntossel and his annual bath, I find that practically every farm family wants a bathroom. But this room *must be on the ground floor, very close to the kitchen.*

Why?

In town or suburb, it's only a question of connecting to the public water and sewer lines, at a nominal cost. But on the farm, a water-system and sewage disposal plant will cost from \$500 up. This expense, added to a complete bathroom installation is beyond the means of the average farmer. Therefore, I find, the usual custom is to install only a bath-tub; with a cheap hand-pump at one end, drawing cold water from well or cistern. Waste water runs out into a ditch. A suction pump is not practical much more than fifteen feet above water-level; hence a second-story bath is not feasible. Moreover, hot water must be carried from the open tank on the kitchen range, and it's out of the question to lug this water away upstairs! Hence, the very great majority of farmhouse plans

in my various contests showed a bathroom near the kitchen.

Very frequently a chemical toilet is put in. Obviously, that is far more practical in a downstairs bathroom. If the toilet is a big one, the tank must be buried underground or set in the cellar; and the big open soil pipe leading to it must be vertical. The longer this pipe, the more foul and offensive it gets. If a commode type of chemical toilet is used, the bucket must be frequently emptied, and that means a lot of extra labor, if upstairs.

6. At least one first-floor bedroom is a necessity in a farmhouse, for many good reasons.

Some of these given by farmers' wives were: An aged grandparent is too infirm to use the stairway; a young baby must take its nap within hearing of mother; the farm woman wants to hastily fix herself up a bit for meals, but hasn't time or strength to run upstairs; the farmer wants to be able to go out at a second's notice, if he hears something wrong at night about the stables; and so on.

7. A large kitchen porch, properly screened (and perhaps enclosed with glass for winter) is a necessity to most farm women. The reasons are too many and complex to give here, but most of them are perfectly obvious.

8. On many general-purpose farms, a large number of extra harvest hands must be fed occasionally. Therefore, the living room and dining room must be easily thrown together, so that the long table for the "threshing dinner" can be set out. On specialized farms (such as poultry ranches) this is not necessary.

9. More and more, the modern farmer is demanding a little office, where he can work at his accounts, study his bulletins and market reports, pay his men, bargain with crop-buyers and salesmen, etc. Farming has become a highly technical profession and a highly competitive business; the farmer needs his private office, just like any other professional or business man.

These paragraphs are a sketchy outline of the requirements of the modern farmhouse. Is it any wonder that most architects, as I did, make complete failures when they first try to plan farmhouses, without a special study of the requirements? Is it any wonder that farmers and agricultural engineers have small confidence in us?

Is there any reason why the architect should not take far greater interest in farmhouse architecture than he does?

The Building Congress Idea

By WILLIAM ORR LUDLOW, F.A.I.A.

THE Committee on Industrial Relations of the Institute was much gratified to learn of the proposed formation of a Building Congress in Chicago, under the auspices of the architects of that city. (Reported in the October number of *THE OCTAGON*.)

On behalf of the committee a communication has been addressed by me, as chairman, to the president of every chapter of the Institute. The substance of the message is covered in the following paragraphs because the Committee on Industrial Relations wants the interest and support of every member of the Institute. The fostering of a better understanding among all of those who compose the building industry is the individual duty of every architect. In addressing the letter to chapter presidents the following points were covered:

What a Building Congress can do toward putting the building industry on a firm foundation has been so many times well told, that further argument is perhaps unnecessary.

The Institute Committee on Industrial Relations has, as one of its major activities, the promotion of such organizations, and has been gratified to hear that steps are being taken in several cities to enlist the various elements of the building industry in this move toward much needed cooperation.

We realize, however, that there are many cities and towns where due to local conditions it is not feasible to organize architects, builders, producers, labor and financial interests, but that nothing can be done to bring about better cooperation and business relationship we do not admit. We want therefore to urge upon the architects of such communities a step, possible in almost any town or city, that will bring together those concerned in building to promote acquaintance and good fellowship and from these a better understanding and a desire for more pleasant and profitable business relations.

We believe that an annual or semi-annual luncheon or dinner, fostered by the architects and given by all the elements of the industry, would, by the bond of the social meal, create a spirit of friendship and camaraderie that would iron out many a subsequent rough place. Because of their leadership and authority in the building industry, the architects should, we think, initiate the move, not as hosts but as one of a group having common interests.

Such gatherings will in many instances bring the suggestion and provide the starting point for such definite organizations as local conditions may make possible—perhaps Building Congresses or less highly organized groups.

The Institute Committee on Industrial Relations sincerely hopes that many of our chapters will take this suggestion under very serious consideration, discuss it at one of their chapter meetings if possible, and take some definite action if they are as much impressed as the Committee with the fact that this is a very fundamental start on the way of making a happier and more efficient building industry.

Highway Environment

THE action of the Institute, through resolutions of its Board of Directors and Convention, in condemning billboards on the highways of the United States as an outstanding element in the destruction of the scenic qualities of those highways and as a shortsighted policy for national advertisers, has given impetus to the growing sentiment of the people of the United States that the environment of the highways and boulevards for which they have paid shall not be made hideously ugly by so-called outdoor advertising in its various forms.

The Institute has asked its chapters as a civic duty to take an active part in local movements to regulate, or control, or eliminate objectionable advertising along the highways.

For the information of those public-spirited architects and chapters who are responding to the call the following reports are offered as suggestive and as encouraging:

Roadside Improvement Notes—Sealing the Fate of Billboards.

A shield-shaped sticker, for use as a seal on envelopes to attract and spread interest in billboard

restriction, has been designed by Mrs. Edward H. McKeon of Baltimore who is state chairman for Billboard Restriction of the Garden Clubs of Maryland.

Mrs. McKeon and her committee are active participants in the nation-wide educational campaign of the Garden Clubs to rid the American landscape of billboards by pledging themselves to favor those products *not* advertised on the roadside. Mrs. McKeon states that already 24,000 stickers have been used and that a supply is available at actual cost to those who may wish to purchase any quantity. (From Civic Comment, American Civic Association.)

Note: It is understood that the American Civic Association, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C., is also issuing a letter seal poster of effective design which bears the following legend: "I favor products not advertised on the landscape."

Delaware's Governor Protests Billboards.

"Why has there not been more public indignation against roadside advertising? The signs and billboards are a blot on natural beauty.

"Nature has made Delaware a garden spot. Great sums of money have been expended to construct roads that have beauty. This beauty has been added to by the planting of trees along the highways.

"Delaware has and is taking the lead over many other states in the beautifying of its highways. The sign and billboard problem must be met with determination because we are allowing fine roads to be cluttered by these ugly objects.

"Control of the construction of signs and billboards should be in the hands of the state. Some restriction must be placed on the cluttering of the highways by these objects.

"Legislation will not be passed until the citizens fight for it. This also will mean fighting the national organization which places these signs and billboards.

"In this fight legislative bodies will hear brilliant outbursts of oratory from lawyers who will contend that such an act would be unconstitutional, even though the bill was prepared by legal minds; that a man's property is his own—and what would the poor farmer do without the rental from these signs?

"I am in favor of legislation that would place a substantial tax and also charge a license fee for all roadside advertising. In a few years this law would beautify the highways, because there would not be a sign on them.

"To this end I am willing to fight and work for such a law as has been done elsewhere. It can be done in Delaware if the public makes an issue of road advertising." (By Clayton Douglass Buck, Governor of the State of Delaware.)

State Laws Governing Outdoor Advertising.

In 1930, two states—New Jersey and Virginia—approved laws prohibiting commercial signboards at strategic points along the highway where they would constitute a menace to safety. In 1929, three states—New Mexico, Texas and Vermont—enacted legislation for the first time in their histories dealing with the regulation of outdoor advertising. Within the past two years, sixteen states passed legislation, dealing with some phase of the subject of billboard control.

According to a report lately prepared and pub-

lished by the U. S. Bureau of Public Roads entitled, "Compilation of Laws of the Several States in Force on May 1, 1930, Dealing with the Regulation of Outdoor Advertising," the following sixteen states are listed with new anti-billboard laws: Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Idaho, Maine, Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, Vermont and Virginia.

Copies of this compilation, with a digest of the state laws and an analysis of the laws in general are obtainable from the office of the Bureau of Public Roads, Washington, D. C.

Chairman, General Federation of Women's Clubs, Announces Policy.

The Chairman of the Committee on Protection of Roadside Beauty of the General Federation of Women's Clubs announces that the Federation will continue to make its big objective the complete elimination of the billboards from all but commercial districts. She maintains that there are three ways of approaching the problem. Already the public opinion of the nation is increasingly directed against the continuance of advertising signs along the highways. She urges the members to increase the momentum by never letting an opportunity pass to condemn these signs. As far as possible she hopes that the women will carry out the resolution adopted at Swampscott, Massachusetts, in 1929, to give trade to those firms which do *not* use the landscape for advertising, giving this reason whenever purchases are made. In promoting legislation to protect natural beauties she sounds a warning to take care that the legislation is constitutional.

Sources of Information.

Two excellent sources of information with regard to roadside environment, and with regard to ways and means for removing the billboards are noted below:

The National Council for Protection of Roadside Beauty, 119 East 19th Street, New York City;

The American Civic Association, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

The Detroit Chapter Entertains the Board of Directors

By TALMAGE C. HUGHES, A.I.A.

Note: The Board of Directors met in Detroit, Michigan, November 12-15, inclusive. A full report on matters of Institute business considered and acted upon by the Board will appear, item by item, in the December number of THE OCTAGON, after the minutes of the meeting have been approved by the Secretary.

During their stay in Detroit the members of the Board found opportunity to meet with the officers of the Detroit Chapter, and then to attend a dinner and chapter meeting. A report on the dinner party and chapter meeting has been received from Talmage C. Hughes, who is also editor of the Weekly Bulletin of the Michigan Society of Architects, and with his kind permission his report is published in full, as follows:

THE eyes of the architectural world were on Detroit last week. The Officers and Directors of The American Institute of Architects held their fall meeting in Detroit, November 12 to 15.

On the evening of Friday, November 14, they were guests at a dinner given by the Detroit Chapter at the Hotel Statler.

Mr. Branson Gamber, President of the Detroit Chapter, introduced Mr. Frank Eurich, Chairman of the Committee on Entertainment, or maybe it was vice versa. Anyway, this part of the program was particularly unintelligible to this scribe. Something was said by one of them about the office of Robert O. Derrick, killing the fatted calf, and confidential entertainment on the top floor of the Union Trust Building during the afternoon.

There were some seventy-five present which, according to our good friend, Max Grylls, is a record for thirty-five years.

The writer had the pleasure of meeting for the first time Frederick J. Winter, and Andrew Morrison remarked that this was the second occasion on which he had seen Howard Crane present. All of which points to a hopeful future.

Gamber opened the discussion by stating that there was to be no business, but characterized the dinner as a little appendage to the national meeting. "I am thrilled to the center of my being," he said, "at the opportunity, which will come only at very rare intervals, that of welcoming our distinguished guests, the Officers and Directors of The American Institute of Architects.

"They are all well known to us and therefore I am not going to ask each one to arise and introduce himself as at a luncheon club. I prefer rather to put it this way—I take pleasure in presenting the members of the Detroit Chapter to our distinguished guests." Mr. Gamber then called the roll of the A. I. A. Officers and Directors.

"Upon my recent return from Europe," said Gamber, "I was proud to feel that I was a member of the architectural profession, that I was privileged to be a delegate to the International Congress of Architects.

"I wonder if we realize what the Officers and the Board of Directors are doing for us? During

the past few days here in Detroit they have worked tirelessly and almost continuously for our benefit. They have worked for no reward except the privilege of serving our profession, and this is only one of the many meetings they hold throughout the year.

"Do we fully appreciate what it means to be a member of The American Institute of Architects? And most of all, do we realize what it means in time and sacrifice to be an officer or a member of the Board of Directors? As members we need contact here in Detroit, but more than that we need contact nationally. This is a real opportunity to realize that need, to help towards fostering an interchange of ideas.

"We welcome you guests. There is one man whose influence is vital in our community. I am going to ask him, Mr. Albert Kahn, to introduce the President of The American Institute of Architects."

Mr. Kahn, who was seated next to Mr. Kohn, stated that Gamber's introduction was flattering. "If I am not the best I am next to the best," he said. Mr. Kahn, in introducing Robert D. Kohn, paid tribute to him as a man, as a humanitarian, and to his enthusiasm and power.

Mr. Kohn then arose and placed his watch on the table. He said it was not to time himself by, as he used a calendar for that! "Mr. Gamber has asked me to touch upon professional practice," he said.

"I am not a preacher and therefore will not expostulate, but I would like to tell you some of the things you don't get through ordinary channels of the Institute.

"Since we registered at the Statler early Wednesday morning we have been going full tilt, about twelve hours a day, on Institute matters. You might ask, What is there to do? Do you quarter and hang transgressors for their crimes? No, we don't do that. There are some thirty-four hundred active members of the Institute, and a surprising amount of work to be done for them collectively or individually. Today I received the third full-page telegram in two days from one member about a thousand miles from here. There is something he is intensely concerned with on which he wants Insti-

tute action. That's just one member. Then, there are some twenty-five standing and special committees, each with its own problems. Seventeen of those committees were represented here by their chairmen—at a round table conference with the Board of Directors. They stated their problems, their programs, and how much money they wanted. It was our business to advise with them, and to refuse their monetary requests as gracefully as a banker would.

"The Board has before it reports on public affairs, on architectural education, on registration laws, on the public building policy at Washington, on public information, etc. The question of publicity is a complicated one. There is no problem of getting publicity so far as getting into the newspapers is concerned. They are glad to get news of what the Institute is doing. The Institute's Committee on Public Information is doing a wonderful work. But there is much talk of buying publicity—regular advertising space. The question is, Would it pay? The musicians have tried it. They condemn canned music in the theatres. Various industries have tried it, such as 'Eat more so and so.' The public has no interest in such advertising. It is not sinful, but it is bad taste. It is throwing money away, and is not worth a rap. Then, there is the 'Buy Now' campaign idea. It might be applied to any business, but are we sincere in applying it to building? Have we any real arguments why people should build now? We think we have.

"Statistics show building is now from 12 per cent to 18 per cent cheaper. In New York costs are 15 per cent lower than in 1927. This is interesting, and well worth while. Both public and private work if not started at once could at least be planned now, and owners should be encouraged to get ready.

"The problems of Chapters are somewhat general. Some individuals do not play the game properly, there is not close enough fellowship. The Institute is sometimes too severe, so they say, and architects could get jobs easier by going it alone without being restrained by the Institute, etc. That is what we sometimes hear. Let me say that the Institute regulations are not just a club to be held over your head. Its schedule of charges is not set up as something to be jammed down your throat, or the client's. It is just plain common sense.

"Some architects say to a client, 'I won't make free sketches because the A. I. A. forbids it.' I don't like that attitude. Why not be honest and say it is asinine, bad business, and that the architect who submits his work for laymen to judge in an irregular competition will soon hang himself."

* * * * *

"We have not solved all of the problems pertaining to the architect's conduct, his fees, his costs, etc.,

but whatever the Institute has done has been for public welfare, and the architectural profession as a whole. The Institute is not a labor union. Whatever regulations it has laid down have been issued after long experience has proven that it is foolish to do otherwise.

"A firm of young architects in New York were recently called in by a bank directorate who were going to build. They were asked to submit free sketches in an irregular competition. They said, 'No, we won't do it unless you pay us.' Not because of the Institute code, but because it was good business policy. They said, 'We will make your sketches for \$3,000, and after they are completed you can fire us if you like. But to proceed as you intend to without a program, and without a competent advisor and jury, is a waste of your money as well as the architect's. You will be getting a lot of sketches of a building you will never build.' And they got the commission on just that basis.

"This point is important. There are some four thousand architects affiliated with the Institute. Alone they are weak, but united they can wield a tremendous influence. Particularly is it important for them to join hands with the other groups allied to building.

"For the first time in the history of the industry in New York we have the labor unions interested in problems common with the architects. They are going to Albany to fight for what the architects want, and when we go thousands strong instead of hundreds legislators will listen. A few years ago this could not have happened.

"This may seem remote from the true field of architecture, but what I am intensely interested in is that from it all there may result sometime, somehow a little bit of beauty that would not otherwise have been."

President Gamber next paid tribute to our own Regional Director, Frederick W. Garber of Cincinnati. He then spoke of Frank C. Baldwin, Secretary of the Institute, and still claimed by Detroit as her own. Mr. Baldwin was introduced by William B. Stratton, his former partner. Stratton related intimate and personal connections which shed light on the character of the man who has gone out from Detroit to become a national figure in the architectural profession. Mr. Baldwin then addressed the Chapter.

"Mr. Gamber asked me to give my reminiscences," Mr. Baldwin said, "to turn back the clock and tell you something about the Chapter when I was here. My experience began in 1893 when Stratton and I hung out our shingle. He lived at a generous boarding house where they trusted him, and I had a similar arrangement at home. The first year in business we showed a slight profit, therefore I was made a member of the Chapter. I talked at every meeting and offered many cor-

rections in the minutes of Dick Raseman, who was Secretary and Treasurer.

"At the next annual meeting I was elected Secretary and continued for eight years. It might have been a permanent job but there seemed to be no future for me in it, so I declined reelection. Chittenden was made Secretary and the next year I was elected President. In 1896, when Jimmie Rogers was President and I was Secretary of the Chapter, the A. I. A. convention came to Detroit. We sought to show them a good time in Windsor and Wakerville, much as you do today. We had a number of friends among the contractors and so there were no financial problems. But the Institute at Washington got word of our methods and we were called down. We sent a telegram to the effect that all bills would be paid by the Chapter, and we had to return all the contributions made by the contractors.

"Michigan Chapter played a most important part in developing the contract documents of the Institute. It was while I was in partnership with Stratton that I conceived the idea of a standard form for general conditions, and out of this grew the Uniform General Conditions adopted and used by Michigan Chapter. The idea was taken up at the next convention of the Institute and Mr. Allan B. Pond said it was one of the most noteworthy contributions in years. President Frank M. Day appointed a committee which developed the standard forms of contract documents now in such general use.

"When I return here and see what my confreres have accomplished for the city of Detroit, and for the architectural profession it hardly seems possible. We are nationally proud of the Detroit Chapter."

Gamber then asked H. J. Maxwell Grylls to introduce a gentleman whom he designated as a silver-tongued orator, one he had been waiting all evening to introduce. His subject, he said, would be "Flivver or Whither?" Mr. Grylls thanked Mr. Gamber for the opportunity of introducing a very dear friend, but before doing so he stated that there was something he wanted to say which newspaper men would term "pertinent." It was that this meeting was the largest in attendance for thirty-five years.

Mr. Grylls next took occasion to pay tribute to his "antagonist," a gentleman with offices in the same building with himself. "Mr. Kahn," he said, "has a tremendous amount of what we all want. We admire him for what he is doing, and for his success.

"I appreciate the fact that I am a member of the architectural profession," said Mr. Grylls. "I like them all, but there is one I love very much. He stands out—Mr. Louis LaBeaume."

"To all of you, and my good friend, Maxwell Grylls," said Mr. LaBeaume, "I say that I feel no sense of embarrassment tonight. I will not

apologize for my random remarks. I am not going to make an inspirational talk. I am practical, and inspiration is the by-product! I was deeply touched by my friend's introduction. Some say we are imprisoned in vision and only see through grills. I am sympathetic with the movement of our art. Today I rose higher and higher—thirty-five stories in the Union Trust Building—being raised to that elevation by Robert O. Derrick.

"I do not apologize for the idealistic tenor of my remarks. I am a member of the Board of Directors by chance rather than by design. It is impossible for the Board of Directors to take a happy view of life. Our view is eclipsed. It is serious—but we are always in the shadow of some great natural or artificial force. The serious duties of the Board may be understood when I tell you that we arrived here at the Statler Wednesday morning and had not until late this afternoon the opportunity to intrude into the outside air. For these many days we had no contact with the outside world and not until five today did we realize that there were other influences that could contribute to our mental welfare. When we arrived at Derrick's office we understood what you mean by foreign civilization.

"For fifty-six hours we had discussed current civilization, the art we practice, and our relations to our fellow practitioners. You know, Mr. Kohn has a practical and a social mind. We discussed the present depression. We tried to consider ourselves specialists in the field of economics and finance—groping towards a solution of unemployment. We discussed education and the vital forces of public consciousness. All was in a spirit of seriousness and, we hope, constructive endeavor.

"I am not sure that all of our resolutions will bear fruit in a practical way, but in general the goal was the great future of the profession.

"Today after we adjourned we were taken for a ride. Not as you mean in Detroit or Chicago. We went to Cranbrook. The experience was far more salutary and important than our serious deliberations at the Statler. We met Eliel Saarinen and saw the noble experiment of Mr. George Booth. We saw the living and vitalizing influence of art. Saarinen is modest and restrained, but we were fired by Mr. Booth's ambitions.

"We may spend days talking of architecture, wandering into fields of education and civic progress, and going into details on how to raise the public out of indifference, but Booth has decided to do some very definite things. The Institute has been interested in educating the public to a better appreciation of the fine arts, in raising the standards of architecture. Some of its efforts have met with success, others remain to be proven. We have always had an interest in the embryo architect. We have encouraged the schools. We have realized the advantages of reaching the prospective client,

and have tried to arouse an art consciousness on the part of the public.

"George Booth is trying to interest the public by an actual experiment. It may be perilous, but we certainly wish him every success.

"Architecture today, as civilization, is toward socialization. Architecture is the mother of all the arts. The architect has a definite problem in our present civilization. Is he becoming mercenary? The painter, the sculptor and the other artists are free to express their own ideas but the architect is subjected to other influences. We are at the moment so obsessed by bigness that we lose sight of other things. We are engrossed by magnitude, the machine age, organization, production, mergers. I may be a bit iconoclastic but I believe we are losing sight of the little things of life that mean a great deal.

"We expect Europeans to thrill at New York's skyline, at its enterprise, ingenuity—pile upon pile. One is impressed, but they walk through narrow streets and go up seventy-five stories to look down. What do they see? Buildings like asparagus sprouts shooting up all about without rhyme or reason. Ragged, jagged and unformed, chaotic, with no system. Is it a good sign? I wonder. 'Flivver or Whither?'

"Flivver has been quite a word to conjure with. But whither? I may be treading on the toes of some, but haven't we lost our sense of rationalism? Of course there is a certain charm in bigness. Barnum realized that in the circus. We marvel at the fat lady because of her differential from normal. We are awed by the muscles of the strong man. But is it art? Really, is it contributory?

"Maybe I am ungracious to Detroit, with its mass production. I may be extremely impolite. Whither are we tending? When we come down

from the Chrysler building in New York where do we find ourselves? In a jungle, with shadows, and remember in the jungles only monkeys squawk and parrots talk. New York is in a restricted area. Detroit is not. Today we looked at your Fisher building. My reaction was that I wished my eyes might have been on top of my head, but Gamber explained that it was only a minor pavilion of greater structures to come. One thing I noticed, that it is surrounded by low and insignificant erections.

"If in Amarillo, Texas, they build a forty-story building, can it be that it is merely a symbol of hoped-for congestion?

"I am wondering whether the A. I. A. should lend itself complacently to this random development, or whether the architects should advise their clients as to what constitutes sane and rational development along architectural lines. It is true this is a democracy. We are free to proceed without too many excuses for ourselves, but to lose ourselves in the great whirlpool is a weakness."

And after listening to this sparkling talk of Mr. LaBeaume's we are prone to quote a little poem handed to us by Mr. Grylls. It is by Edwin Markham and pictures the new emphasis upon personality for our modern industrial world. It is called "Man-making."

"We are blind until we see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making, if
It does not make the man.

"Why build these cities glorious
If man unbuilt goes?
In vain we build the work, unless
The builder also grows."

Structural Service Department

"Architecture" for November in its Contacts Department, gives two pages to the work of the Structural Service Department. It quotes freely from the report of the Department made to the Board of Directors at its last pre-convention meeting. Those especially interested may obtain from the Secretary's office, The Octagon, copy of the last annual report of the Structural Service Committee, under date of May 12, 1930. That report gives a complete account of the organization, service, and program of the Department.

Art Directors for Manufacturers.

The intimate contacts that have been established between the architectural profession and the manufacturers of building materials and appliances through such agencies as the Structural Service De-

partment and the Producers' Council, seem to be arousing on the part of the manufacturers a greater appreciation of the importance of good taste and pleasing appearance even in connection with products and appliances generally regarded as purely utilitarian. A recent example of the growing understanding of the importance of art in industry is indicated by the appointment of Donald R. Dohner as Director of Art with the Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company. Since 1923 Mr. Dohner has been instructor in Design, Department of Painting and Decorating, College of Fine Arts, Carnegie Institute of Technology. In his capacity as Director of Art with the Westinghouse Company, Mr. Dohner will cooperate with their engineers in the design of electrical apparatus. Under Mr. Dohner's direction a course for Westinghouse de-

signers and engineers has been planned to assist them in understanding the elements and principles of design as applied to improving the appearance of industrial products to the end that all engineering departments may be afforded an opportunity to obtain a better conception of art in its relation to industry.

Plate Glass Mirrors.

The U. S. Bureau of Standards has announced the completion of a Recommended Commercial Standard Specification for Plate Glass Mirrors. These specifications contain detailed descriptions of the five grades of plate glass mirrors, and give suggestive markings for the identification of each grade. The Structural Service Department cooperated with the Bureau of Standards in the preparation of these specifications.

Preservative Treatment of Lumber.

A report has been made covering progress of the Treated Lumber Project of the National Committee on Wood Utilization. N. Max Dunning, F.A.I.A., is the official representative of the Institute on the National Committee on Wood Utilization, U. S. Department of Commerce.

A sub-committee of the National Committee on Wood Utilization, under the chairmanship of T. F. Laist, A.I.A., has recently issued a bulletin on the subject "Treated Lumber, Its Uses and Economies." The release of this bulletin (April, 1930) was followed by an intensive publicity campaign in the principal newspapers and magazines, farm, technical and business journals throughout the country. Radio addresses, exhibits, and public speeches were arranged to direct attention to this bulletin, and more than 16,000 copies have been sold by the U. S. Government Printing Office.

A noticeable demand for treated lumber, especially among the smaller users, followed the issuance of this bulletin, but with few exceptions retail lumber dealers were not carrying treated material in stock. Mr. Laist's committee, therefore, organized a sub-committee for the purpose of arranging for retail

distribution, and selected the state of Ohio as a testing ground.

The ultimate objective of the committee is, of course, to make treated lumber available through retail dealers whenever there is a real economic need for this class of product, and although the future of this activity will depend in large measure upon the results obtained in Ohio, Mr. Laist's sub-committee has not failed to take advantage of whatever opportunities were afforded for publicity for the work of the committee of which he is chairman. For example:

Exhibits: In the short time that this project has been under the chairmanship of Mr. Laist, educational exhibits featuring treated lumber have been shown to about two and one-half million persons.

General Publicity: The committee's staff has furnished news articles, press statements, etc., concerning treated lumber to newspapers and trade journals, and editors seem to be showing increasing interest in the possibilities of treated lumber for the home and for small building construction. The Architects' Small House Service Bureau has wholeheartedly cooperated in giving publicity to this activity.

Radio Addresses: The treated lumber project has been referred to in a number of radio addresses. Dr. Julius Klein, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, broadcast a review of the work of Mr. Laist's committee over forty-five stations of one of the National broadcasting chains.

Direct-by-mail: The committee has circulated bulletins to all the farm agents in Ohio, and to a number of prominent architects, and has, as a matter of course, carried on considerable correspondence with organizations in states other than Ohio.

Committee's Policy: It is not an easy task, even for an architect, to reconcile the various interests within the wood preserving industry. The committee of which Mr. Laist is chairman does not undertake to pass upon the relative merits of the various wood preservatives, but both the committee and the Structural Service Department will endeavor to refer all such inquiries to the most authoritative sources of information.

As of Interest

Exhibition of Hospital Drawings, Photographs, and Models.

Architecture was well represented at the Thirty-second Annual Convention of the American Hospital Association, held in New Orleans, October 20-24, 1930.

The exhibition was assembled and hung by a special Committee on Hospital Exhibition appointed by President Kohn. The Chairman was Moise H. Goldstein, of New Orleans, and local members of

the committee in New Orleans were Paul Andry, Charles R. Armstrong, Rathbone DeBuys, Charles A. Favrot, and Emile Weil.

Many of the prominent architects of the country were represented by exhibits.

The Hospital Association has expressed its great appreciation of the cooperation extended by the Institute and the members of the special committee. It

contemplates making these exhibitions an important feature at its meetings in the future.

The Institute Board at its recent meeting made acknowledgment to Mr. Goldstein and the members of his committee for their very capable handling of this exhibition.

New York Building Congress and Unemployment.

Unemployment was the principal business at a meeting of the New York Building Congress held on November 20, at the Commodore Hotel. Robert D. Kohn, President of the Congress, and of The American Institute of Architects, presided. The principal speakers were Nathan Strauss, Jr, and Stephen F. Voorhees, Chairman of the Building Industries Division of the Emergency Committee on Employment and also President of the New York Chapter of the Institute. Plans for aiding members of the building industry in New York City, most in need of assistance, were mapped out. It is the intention of the Congress to go the limit in this direction, as well as in the effort to aid ultimate recovery from existing conditions.

Plan of Washington.

The Chairman of the Committee on the National Capital, Horace W. Peaslee, has addressed a letter of October 29, 1930, to the directors of the schools of architecture in the United States. The following paragraphs are quoted from the letter, as of interest to the membership at large:

You will receive herewith a circular in regard to lantern slides depicting the development of the National Capital, which this committee has assembled for use in the chapters of the Institute and in architectural schools.

It is the desire of the committee to interest the present-day students of architecture in the development of Washington, so that as they in turn become practicing architects they will take up the work which the Institute has sponsored since 1900.

With this end in view, various Washington problems have been given out from time to time to different schools, as well as problems handled by chapter groups. In general, the following may be noted:

School	Problem	Chapter
	Key Bridge Terminal.	New Jersey
	16th St. High Point.	Philadelphia
Lake Forest students	North side of Pa. Ave.	Chicago
Harvard and Tech.	South Point of Mall.	Boston
Cornell	Supreme Court Building, and Memorial Building.	
	South Point of Mall.	

School	Problem	Chapter
Beaux-Arts problem	Independence Square.	
Yale School of Fine Arts	Washington Airport.	
George Washington	stadium, and Street Intersection	
	Street Intersection Rhode Island	

The various problems submitted have been taken up with the Planning and Fine Arts Commissions, and have in several cases been of very great value in showing the alternative possibilities for various sites. For additional problems, the chairman of this committee would be only too glad to act as intermediary between the schools and the Planning Commission for program requirements.

In this connection, attention is called to the fact that every year public documents are issued relating to the development of Washington, some of which can be obtained without charge and others for a nominal sum. Last year there was issued a well illustrated document, "The Development of the United States Capital," costing \$1.25 per copy, bringing the Washington situation up to date.

This year the Fine Arts Commission has issued an extract from its report, entitled, "The Central Composition of the National Capital and the Public Buildings Program." These can be obtained for twenty-five cents a copy. The committee will be glad to get this book for any school desiring it, upon receipt of the amount stated. Question is raised whether any schools would wish to be put on a regular committee mailing list for such documents as might seem desirable additions to a school library, to be sent from time to time as issued. The reports of the Fine Arts and Planning Commissions have a great deal of valuable material in them relating to monumental buildings and sculpture, and city planning.

Memoirs of Glenn Brown.

The attention of members of the Institute is called to a volume, now in preparation, which should be of great interest. It is entitled "1860-1930, Memories of Glenn Brown." Mr. Brown was Secretary of the Institute from 1899 to 1913, and took a prominent and splendid part in the many campaigns which were necessary to preserve the plan of Washington from serious impairment.

The contents of the book, which will be published if there are sufficient subscriptions in advance, are historical and reminiscent of the following topics: The Capitol, The White House, The American Institute of Architects, The Octagon, The Park Commission, The Washington Monument, The Lincoln Memorial, The Memorial Bridge, The National Commission of the Fine Arts, The American Academy in Rome, and a Memorial to Augustus Saint-Gaudens.

The price of the book is five dollars, and subscriptions should be sent direct to Mr. Brown at Corcoran Courts, 23rd and D Streets, Washington, D. C.

The Secretary's office has subscribed for three copies for the library of the Institute.

The LeBrun Travelling Scholarship Competition.

This is a reminder of the conditions relating to the LeBrun Travelling Scholarship Competition for

the year 1931. A preliminary notice, containing full information, was sent several weeks ago to every member of the Institute by Chester H. Aldrich, Chairman. Nomination blanks may be obtained from the LeBrun Scholarship Committee, Room 530, 101 Park Avenue, New York City, and all nominations must be on hand with the Committee before January 15, 1931.

British Architects' Conference—An Invitation.

To the A. I. A.:—Your members may be interested to know that our Annual Conference next year is to be held in Dublin, and a very interesting programme is being arranged. The date is from the 17th to the 20th June, 1931. We are always glad on these occasions to have the company of visitors from the United States, and if any members of the A. I. A. are likely to be in Europe at that date I hope they will communicate with me and let me send them copies of the programme of the Conference.

IAN MACALISTER,
Secretary, R. I. B. A.,
9 Conduit Street,
London, W.1.

Cards of Introduction for Use Abroad.

Those members of the Institute, fortunate enough to have in contemplation visits to foreign countries, are urged to advise the Secretary of the Institute, in order that a card of introduction to foreign architectural societies, officials of art museums, galleries, and municipal officials may be furnished to them. These cards are engraved, and have been found of considerable value.

National Commission of Fine Arts—Reprint from Report.

The eleventh report of the National Commission of Fine Arts is probably the most comprehensive

and important annual report issued by the Commission. One section is devoted to "The Central Composition of the National Capital and the Public Buildings Program." It has been reprinted as a separate document and copies can be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at a price of twenty-five cents each (do not send stamps; send a money order).

The reprint has been distributed by the Chairman of the Committee on the National Capital, Horace W. Peaslee, to the members of that Committee in each Chapter; but, of course, it was not possible to make a general distribution. Those interested in the Plan of Washington should not fail to obtain the reprint while copies are available.

An Honorary Degree to Arthur Peabody.

The University of Wisconsin has awarded the degree of Doctor of Letters to Arthur Peabody, A.I.A., and State Architect of Wisconsin.

Mr. Peabody has designed and supervised the construction of the buildings of the University of Wisconsin since January, 1906.

The Pencil Man Fraud.

Reports have reached The Octagon of a petty scheme for defrauding architects at a time when some other profession should have been selected. The racket is a very simple one. A personable young man appears at the office of the architect and describes himself as a representative of a certain supply house, usually in another city. He takes cash orders for a well-known make of pencil (or other accessories) and promises immediate delivery. Needless to say the goods are not delivered.

Applications For Membership

November 29, 1930.

Notice to Members of the Institute:

The names of the following applicants may come before the Board of Directors or its Executive Committee for action on their admission to the Institute, and, if elected, the applicants will be assigned to the Chapters indicated:

<i>Alabama Chapter</i>	- - - -	PAUL WILLIS HOFFERBERT
<i>Boston Chapter</i>	- - - -	EDWARD A. HUBBARD
<i>Cincinnati Chapter</i>	- - - -	C. C. WEBER
<i>Cleveland Chapter</i>	- - - -	GEORGE HOWARD BURROWS
<i>New Jersey Chapter</i>	- - - -	GEORGE R. JENSH
<i>New York Chapter</i>	- - - -	CASS GILBERT, JR., CHARLES LEONARDI
<i>Oregon Chapter</i>	- - - -	LESLIE D. HOWELL
<i>Tennessee Chapter</i>	- - - -	JAMES G. GAUNTT
<i>West Texas Chapter</i>	- - - -	ROY L. THOMAS

You are invited, as directed by the By-Laws, to send privileged communications before December 31, 1930, on the eligibility of the candidates, for the information and guidance of the members of the Board of Directors in their final ballot. No applicant will be finally passed upon should any chapter request, within the thirty-day period, an extension of time for purpose of investigation.

FRANK C. BALDWIN,
Secretary.

Members Elected From July 1, to November 15, 1930

<i>Alabama Chapter</i>	- - - -	ALBERT H. STOCKMAR
<i>Baltimore Chapter</i>	- - - -	HOWARD F. BALDWIN
<i>Boston Chapter</i>	- - - -	CLIFFORD ALLBRIGHT, JOHN BARNARD, ASA WHITE KENNEY BILLINGS, JR., THOMAS M. JAMES
<i>Brooklyn Chapter</i>	- - - -	CHARLES GODFREY PEKER, EDWARD F. SIBBERT, CARROLL E. WELCH
<i>Chicago Chapter</i>	- - - -	HERBERT AMERY BRAND, ANGELO ROBERT CLAS, RUBE SANFORD FRODIN, CHARLES CLINTON HENDERSON, J. EDWIN QUINN
<i>Colorado Chapter</i>	- - - -	CHARLES FRANCIS PILLSBURY
<i>Columbus Chapter</i>	- - - -	EDWARD KROMER
<i>Detroit Chapter</i>	- - - -	ELIEL SAARINEN
<i>Indiana Chapter</i>	- - - -	JOHN LLOYD WRIGHT
<i>Kansas City Chapter</i>	- - - -	ALFRED E. BARNES, JOHN R. BRUNT, CHARLES A. SMITH
<i>Louisiana Chapter</i>	- - - -	ANDREW M. LOCKETT, JR., THEODORE L. PERRIER
<i>Madison Chapter</i>	- - - -	A. F. GALLISTEL
<i>Mississippi Chapter</i>	- - - -	A. HAYS TOWN
<i>New Jersey Chapter</i>	- - - -	GEORGE VICTOR HARVEY
<i>New York Chapter</i>	- - - -	ARCHIBALD MANNING BROWN, GEORGE PRENTISS BUTLER, JR., EDWARD C. DEAN, VAHAN HAGOPIAN, WILLIAM ROYSTER JOHNSON, JULIAN PEABODY, THEODORE STARRETT, EDWARD STEESE, WALTER ANDREWS TAYLOR, ALBERT WILSON, HAROLD P. ZOLLER
<i>Northern California Chapter</i>	- - - -	EDWARD L. FRICK
<i>Philadelphia Chapter</i>	- - - -	AGOSTINO A. DE PORRECA
<i>Pittsburgh Chapter</i>	- - - -	CHARLES B. ALLISON, BRANDON SMITH
<i>St. Paul Chapter</i>	- - - -	EDGAR W. BUENGER
<i>South Carolina Chapter</i>	- - - -	WILLIAM EARLE HINES
<i>Tennessee Chapter</i>	- - - -	LELAND KING CARDWELL, SAMUEL H. COILE, HENRY CLINTON PARRENT, JR.
<i>Washington, D. C. Chapter</i>	- - - -	HOWARD W. CUTLER, ROBERT CAMILLE DANIS
<i>West Texas Chapter</i>	- - - -	JEREMIAH SCHMIDT



