

THE
OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects



On National Planning

Vitality of Idealism

This Profession of Ours

Survey of Institute Affairs

Filing System for Plates

Preparation for Practice

Your Address in the New Anniversary

Volume 6

AUGUST
1934

Number 8

OFFICERS OF THE INSTITUTE

<i>President</i>	ERNEST JOHN RUSSELL, Chemical Building, St. Louis, Mo.
<i>First Vice-President</i>	CHARLES D. MAGINNIS, Statler Bldg., Boston, Mass.
<i>Second Vice-President</i>	M. H. FURBRINGER, 110 Porter Bldg., Memphis, Tenn.
<i>Secretary</i>	FRANK C. BALDWIN, The Octagon, Washington, D. C.
<i>Treasurer</i>	EDWIN BERGSTROM, Citizens National Bank Bldg., Los Angeles, Cal.
<i>Executive Secretary</i>	EDWARD C. KEMPER, The Octagon, Washington, D. C.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

For One Year (1934-35)	For Two Years (1934-36)
RAYMOND J. ASETON, 312 Vermont Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah (West.Mt.Div.)	RALPH H. CAMERON, P. O. Box 1063, San Antonio, Texas (Gulf States Div.)
JAMES O. BETTELS, Chamber of Commerce Bldg., Newark, N.J. (MiddleAtl.Div.)	WILLIAM T. WARREN, Protective Life Bldg., Birmingham, Ala. (S. Atl. Div.)
HERBERT E. HEWITT, 1600 Peoria Life Bldg., Peoria, Ill. (Great Lakes Div.)	DAVID J. WITMER, Architects Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif. (Sierra Nevada Div.)
For Three Years (1934-1937)	
GERRIT J. DEGELLEKE, 152 West Wisconsin Ave., Milwaukee, Wis. (Central States Div.)	
HUBERT G. RIPLEY, 45 Bromfield St., Boston, Mass. (New England Div.)	
STEPHEN F. VOORHEES, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (New York Div.)	

LIST OF CHAPTERS 1934

<p>ALABAMA—*Frederic Child Biggin, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.; †Hugh Martin, 910 Title Guarantee Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.</p> <p>ALBANY—*Frank A. Ward, Telephone Bldg., Albany, N. Y.; †Clarence H. Gardiner, 54 Bellview Terrace, Rensselaer, N. Y.</p> <p>ARKANSAS—*Harry Wanger, 1316 Donaghey Bldg., Little Rock, Ark.; †Lawson L. Delony, 2407 Louisiana St., Little Rock, Ark.</p> <p>BALTIMORE—*William G. Nolting, Keyser Building, Baltimore, Md.; †Francis H. Jencks, 113 West Mulberry St., Baltimore, Md.</p> <p>BOSTON—*H. Daland Chandler, 75 Newbury St., Boston, Mass.; †Isidor Richmond, 248 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.</p> <p>BROOKLYN—*Herbert C. Bowman, 200 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; †George Francis Kiese, 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.</p> <p>BUFFALO—*Frederick C. Backus, 360 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y.; †Benning C. Buell, 547 Franklin St., Buffalo, N. Y.</p> <p>CENTRAL ILLINOIS—*E. E. Lundeen, 710 Peoples Bank Bldg., Bloomington, Ill.; †E. L. Stouffer, 256 Administration Bldg., University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.</p> <p>CENTRAL NEW YORK—*James A. Randall, Sedgwick, Andrews & Kennedy Bldg., Syracuse, N. Y.; †James R. Vedder, Sedgwick, Andrews & Kennedy Bldg., Syracuse, N. Y.</p> <p>CHICAGO—*Emery Stanford Hall, 175 W. Jackson Blvd., Chicago, Ill.; †Carl E. Heimbrodt, 20 No. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.</p> <p>CINCINNATI—*Edward J. Schulte, 2435 Reading Road, Cincinnati, O.; †Alan K. Laing, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, O.</p> <p>CLEVELAND—*James H. Luthus, 3200 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, O.; †Travis G. Walsh, 6709 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio.</p> <p>COLORADO—*George H. Williamson, Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.; †Roland L. Linder, Insurance Building, Denver, Colo.</p> <p>COLUMBUS—*Charles L. Inescho, 1200 Brunson Bldg., Columbus, Ohio; †Ralph Chas. Kempton, 21 West Broad St., Columbus, Ohio</p> <p>CONNECTICUT—*Douglas Orr, 956 Chapel St., New Haven, Conn.; †Lorenzo Hamilton, 22 Church St., Meriden, Conn.</p> <p>DAYTON—*Freeman A. Pretzinger, 1155 Reibold Bldg., Dayton, Ohio; †Geo. T. Neuffer, 437 Ludlow Arcade, Dayton, Ohio.</p> <p>DELAWARE—*Roscoe Cook Tindall, 914 Orange Street, Wilmington, Del.; †Walter Carlson, 3085 du Pont Bldg., Wilmington, Del.</p> <p>DETROIT—*C. William Palmer, 120 Madison Avenue, Detroit, Mich.; †Talmage C. Hughes, 120 Madison Avenue, Detroit, Mich.</p> <p>EASTERN OHIO—*Charles F. Owsley, 211 N. Champion St., Youngstown, O.; †Elias M. Keppel, Second National Bank Bldg., Warren, Ohio.</p> <p>FLORIDA CENTRAL—*Franklin O. Adams, 509 Twigg Street, Tampa, Fla.; †Frank A. Winn, Jr., Stovall Office Bldg., Tampa, Fla.</p> <p>FLORIDA NORTH—*Bernard W. Close, 1005 Bisbee Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.; †Jefferson D. Powell, Professional Building, Jacksonville, Fla.</p> <p>FLORIDA SOUTH—*E. L. Robertson, 310 Calumet Building, Miami, Fla.; †Robert L. Weed, 2620 Biscayne Blvd., Miami, Fla.</p> <p>GEORGIA—*A. TenEyck Brown, Forsyth Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.; †H. C. McLaughlin, Commercial Exchange, Atlanta, Ga.</p> <p>GRAND RAPIDS—*Harry L. Mead, 902 Michigan Trust Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.; †Roger Allen, 610 Lafayette Ave., S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich.</p> <p>HAWAII—*Hart Wood, 617 Hawaiian Trust Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.; †Herbert Cayton, 324 S. M. Damon Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.</p> <p>INDIANA—*Warren D. Miller, 819 Ohio Street, Terre Haute, Ind.; †Herbert Fotta, Architects & Bldg. Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind.</p> <p>IOWA—*Karl K. Keffler, 292 Masonic Temple, Des Moines, Iowa; †Edwin H. Wetherell, 506 Shops Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa.</p> <p>KANSAS CITY—*Raymond L. Vockamp, 4 West 13th St., Kansas City, Mo.; †Roy E. Crans, 1412 Knoc, Northern Kansas City, Mo.</p> <p>KANSAS—*J. Stanley Hagan, Citizens Bank Bldg., Emporia, Kansas; †George M. Deal, 305 Marvin Hall, Lawrence, Kansas.</p> <p>KENTUCKY—*Carl J. Epping, 808 East Broadway, Louisville, Ky.; †Ossian F. Ward, 1002 Washington Bldg., Louisville, Ky.</p> <p>LOUISIANA—*N. C. Curtis, c/o Tulane University, New Orleans, La.; †Alan C. Reed, 401-2 Nola Bldg., New Orleans, La.</p> <p>MADISON—*Frank Riley, 24 E. Mifflin Street, Madison, Wis.; †James R. Law, First Central Building, Madison, Wis.</p> <p>MINNESOTA—*Robert T. Jones, 1200 Second Ave. So., Minneapolis, Minn.; †Albert O. Larson, 305 Baker Bldg., Minneapolis, Minn.</p> <p>MISSISSIPPI—*C. H. Lindsey, Tower Bldg., Jackson, Miss.; †James R. Stevens, III, 948 Bellevue Place, Jackson, Miss.</p>	<p>MONTANA—*Chandler C. Cohagen, Box 1305, Billings, Mont.; †W. E. Flew, Bozeman, Mont.</p> <p>NEBRASKA—*James M. Nachtigall, 512 Paxton Bldg., Omaha, Neb.; †N. R. Brigham, 607 Keeline Bldg., Omaha, Neb.</p> <p>NEW JERSEY—*Wilson C. Ely, 15 Washington St., Newark, N. J.; †Clemens W. Fairweather, Metuchen, N. J.</p> <p>NEW YORK—*Ralph T. Walker, 101 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; †Eric Keibson, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.</p> <p>NORTH CAROLINA—*L. A. O'Brien, Reynolds Bldg., Winston-Salem, N.C.; †Eric G. Stillwell Hendersonville, N. C.</p> <p>NORTH LOUISIANA—*C. W. King, 1029 Daiseil St., Shreveport, La.; †Edward F. Neild, Shreveport, La.</p> <p>NORTH TEXAS—*Walter C. Sharp, 609 Construction Bldg., Dallas, Texas; †Geo. L. Dahl, Insurance Bldg., Dallas, Texas.</p> <p>NORTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Albert J. Evers, 525 Market St., San Francisco, Calif.; †James H. Mitchell, 369 Pine St., San Francisco, Calif.</p> <p>NORTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA—*Walter Monahan, Palace Hardware Building, Erie, Pa.; †J. Howard Hicks, Palace Hardware Building Erie, Pa.</p> <p>OKLAHOMA—*Leon B. Senter, 306 Philtower Bldg., Tulsa, Okla.; †Ashby Endacott, 625 Wright Building, Tulsa, Okla.</p> <p>OREGON—*Jamieson Parker, Spalding Building, Portland, Oregon; †Llew D. Howell, 404 U. S. National Bank Bldg., Portland, Oregon.</p> <p>PHILADELPHIA—*C. C. Zantsinger, Architects' Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.; †Edmund R. Purves, Architects' Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.</p> <p>PITTSBURGH—*Harvey A. Schwab, 1114 Koppers Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.; †Raymond M. Marlier, Empire Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.</p> <p>RHODE ISLAND—*Albert Harkness, 1428 Industrial Trust Bldg., Providence, R. I.; †J. Peter Geddes, II, 840 Hospital Bldg., Providence, R. I.</p> <p>SAN DIEGO—*H. W. Whitsett, Rancho Santa Fe, Calif.; †Frank L. Hope, Jr., Commonwealth Bldg., San Diego, Calif.</p> <p>SANTA BARBARA—*Louis N. Crawford, 8 Gibson-Drexler Bldg., Santa Maria, Calif.; †Henry W. Howell, 157 Cheltenham Drive, Santa Barbara, Calif.</p> <p>SCRANTON-WILKES-BARRE—*Charles L. Levy, 176 So. Main St., Wilkes Barre, Pa.; †Thomas H. Atherton, 139 South Main St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.</p> <p>SOUTH CAROLINA—*Albert Simons, 42 Broad St., Charleston, S. C.; †Samuel Lapham, 42 Broad St., Charleston, S. C.</p> <p>SOUTH GEORGIA—*Cletus Bergen, 1013 Liberty Bldg., Savannah, Ga.; †Percy Sugden, 125 East 49th St., Savannah, Ga.</p> <p>SOUTH TEXAS—*Maurice J. Sullivan, 4301 Main St., Houston, Texas; †J. Russ Batsy, 506 Bankers Mortgage Bldg., Houston, Texas.</p> <p>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA—*Sumner M. Spaulding, 220 California Bank Bldg., Beverly Hills, Calif.; †Eugene Weston, Jr., Architects Building, Los Angeles, Calif.</p> <p>SOUTHERN PENNSYLVANIA—*Frederick G. Dempwolf, Cassett Bldg., York, Pa.; †John G. Todd, 253 Cumberland St., Harrisburg, Pa.</p> <p>ST. LOUIS—*W. Oscar Mullgardt, 1620 Chemical Bldg., St. Louis, Mo.; †Fred R. Hammond, 7020 Waterman Ave., St. Louis, Mo.</p> <p>ST. PAUL—*G. A. Anderson, 1509 Pioneer Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.; †Thomas F. Ellerbe, 1100 Minnesota Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.</p> <p>TENNESSEE—*J. Fraser Smith, 400 Goodwyn Institute, Memphis, Tenn.; †R. J. Regan, 736 Bank of Commerce Bldg., Memphis, Tenn.</p> <p>TOLEDO—*Charles A. Langdon, Security Bank Bldg., Toledo, Ohio; †Earl B. Hoke, 1118 Madison Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.</p> <p>UTAH—*Edward O. Anderson, 925 Continental Bank Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah; †John Fetsar, 506 Templeton Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.</p> <p>VIRGINIA—*M. C. Lee, Builders Exchange, Richmond, Va.; †W. R. Crow, 610 Kruse Bldg., Lynchburg, Va.</p> <p>WASHINGTON, D. C.—*Irwin S. Porter, Metropolitan Bank Bldg., Wash. D. C.; †Thomas R. Edwards, 1707 Eye St., N. W., Wash., D. C.</p> <p>WASHINGTON STATE—*Robert F. McClelland, 504 Republic Bldg Seattle, Wash.; †Arthur P. Herrman, Dept. of Architecture, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.</p> <p>WEST TEXAS—*Robert M. Ayres, Smith-Young Tower, San Antonio, Texas; †Marvin Eichenroht, 710 Maverick Bldg., San Antonio, Texas.</p> <p>WEST VIRGINIA—*C. C. Wood, Lowndes Bldg., Clarksburg, W. Va.; †C. E. Billing, 14 Hubbard Court, Charleston, W. Va.</p> <p>WISCONSIN—*Alexander Eechweiler, Jr., 720 East Mason St., Milwaukee, Wis.; †Alexander C. Guth, 1249 N. Franklin Place, Milwaukee, Wis.</p>
--	--

*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.

On National Planning

BY FREDERIC A. DELANO, Honorary Member A. I. A.

Dedicated to The American Institute of Architects

MORE than seventy years ago the great Lincoln, then only half appreciated, called attention to the fact that as a Nation we were dedicated by the Founders of the Republic to the proposition that "all men are created equal," and that we must therefore dedicate our lives to bring about "a new birth of freedom and that the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the Earth."

In the years that have since passed, these words have more and more sunk into our souls, yet we now interpret them more in the spirit of our greater knowledge and scientific research.

So it is that while we may, in all honesty, admit that all men are not created equal, we believe that we are committed to the proposition that in so far as in us lies, it is our duty to give to every man the opportunity "for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Furthermore, our definition of liberty comprehends at least that modicum of self denial which grants to every man only so much liberty as will not infringe upon the just rights of his neighbor.

Surely, this high resolve must require far more than lip service if it is to mean anything in real accomplishment.

National Planning, as I see it, must do something substantial for the underprivileged. This does not mean that we intend injustice to the favored few, but that we must invite and persuade the more fortunate in talents, be they talents of gold or talents of brains, to help those whose standard of living has been below normal.

War, we know, makes a great appeal to most men, and yet it is not the killing of their enemies that allures men to enlist in the ranks. They like, as all real men must, the enthusiasm of true comradeship. They like the idea of a single and clearly defined objective; that appeals to us all. They want a cause and a leader. Only when we have found some great moral objective worthy of our adoption, can we say that we have what William James chose to call "the moral equivalent of War."

That, as I see it, is necessarily the foundation stone of a National Plan; a plan which must be Physically, Socially, Economically and Spiritually adequate to the American people.

At the Sixty-sixth Convention Mr. Delano said: "National planning has never been considered in this country with any label. That does not mean that our forefathers did not think of the growth and development of the country in a national way. Many examples could be given to show that not only physically, but economically and socially the scheme for the development of this country was a subject of very deep thought. But it is also interesting to note that when the crisis of that early beginning was over, and the people of the country began to get on the smooth water of plain sailing, concerned with enriching themselves, they became indifferent to the country's future. As I study history I am impressed with the fact that it has only been in times of crises that the people in general have given serious thought to the real importance of nationwide planning."

This Profession of Ours

An Enquiry into the Employment, Remuneration and Status of Architects

BY FREDERIC E. TOWNDROW, A. R. I. B. A.

NOTE: Through the courtesy of Frederic E. Towndrow, A. R. I. B. A., Editor of *Architectural Design and Construction*, of London, England, the Institute is republishing a series of papers by him under the title, "This Profession of Ours."

Chapter One, "The Earning Power of Architects and Assistants," and Chapter Two, "The Amount of Work Available and Who Gets It," appear in this number of THE OCTAGON.

In September will appear Chapter Three, "The Architect in the Balance," and Chapter Four, "Egoism versus Cooperation."

In October will appear Chapter Five, "Corporate Propaganda," and Chapter Six, "Architectural Education."

These frank discussions are commended to the chapters and the individual members of The American Insti-

tute of Architects and to those Institute committees whose subjects are involved.

England has had a severe depression for a much longer time than the United States. The difficulties of architectural practice in that country are closely analogous to those in the United States. It will be easy to apply Mr. Towndrow's analyses to our own conditions. We may agree or disagree with his premises and conclusions. The fact remains that the English architects are alive to the dangers which threaten their profession, and are meeting them realistically. The sooner the architects in this country quit indulging in the national failing of beating around the bush until the very last minute before facing facts the sooner the architectural profession will be on its way to security and opportunity.

FRANK C. BALDWIN, *Secretary.*

The Earning Power of Architects and Assistants

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

THE difficulties of professional life have become abnormally acute. A large number of architects in private practice are without work, and hundreds of assistants are unemployed and almost destitute. Yet it is not the purpose of these articles to deal with this abnormal situation, for that is a discussion which lies within the realms of national politics and economics. In any case, it is hoped that in the course of time matters will improve, at least to the condition which was prevailing two or three years ago. In these articles we will consider how we normally stand even during periods of comparative prosperity; though it is in times of acute difficulty such as this that we are made to think and review our position—unclouded by any false optimism which will tolerate a doubtful existence by living on hopes for the future.

In this we must here ask ourselves a number of questions, and we must not flinch either from the questioning or the answers. We must ask ourselves whether this calling of architecture is really good enough, whether it ever provides a sufficiently good living for the larger number of its members in relation to the social position they are expected to keep. If the answer is in the negative, we must ask ourselves whether such poverty of recompense is a matter of moribund professionalism or bad organization on the part of the professional bodies, or whether it is due to the encroachments of others into the fields of building, or whether the fault is not in ourselves,

in our own peculiar mentality and make-up, or in our methods of training.

THE ARCHITECT AND THE PUBLIC

Why does Architecture so Languish? The art most obvious in its relations with life and the art least understood. Why does the architect so remain unfixed in the popular mind that no one ever thinks of employing him except by the fortuity of chance acquaintance or the accident of knowing his father?

This we know, that dozens of men each year leave architecture and go into business or into some form of speculative building (officially or unofficially). This we know also, that the larger number of qualified assistants are, in spite of their educational qualifications, much worse off than the average bank clerk or policeman. Moreover, whether we are successful or unsuccessful, there is little appreciation or understanding for the work we produce. At the unveiling of the town hall the architect has to sit on a back seat with his tongue in his cheek whilst the colonel of the local militia, or the mayor's wife and the aldermen occupy the center of the picture, and in the Press reports the man who designed the building is rarely mentioned—but sometimes that is his own fault.

POVERTY OF RECOMPENSE

But what of the following, the younger and less prosperous (not very young maybe) who form the bulk of our profession?

(a) The average assistant of marriageable age earns from £3 to £5 per week (after deducting travelling costs and income tax); and in too many cases this is the maximum income he can look forward to for the rest of his days. Is this good enough?

(b) What of the small practitioner who works twice as hard as your tired business man, and three times as hard as a stockbroker? If a census were taken of a thousand architects under the age of fifty who were attempting to practice on their own, it would be found that the average *net* income per architect, after deducting taxes, travelling, and office expenses, was less than £400 per year.

(c) What of the salaried architect and assistant, one of the many increasing hundreds whose identity and gifts are becoming lost in Government, municipal, railway, and business combine offices, many of whom are either working very much "under the city surveyor or chief engineer," or are at the beck and call of a permanent under secretary "just down" from the university? What of them?

(d) And what of the architectural "ghosts" who go on ghosting until they literally become ghosts? What do they all think and say?

EDUCATED TO PRODUCE WHAT?

I will try to set down what many architects must be asking themselves at this time:

(1) I was given an education at a secondary or public school up to the age of about eighteen in order to fit myself for the business of life. The cost to my parents of this upbringing and education might have been anything between £3,000 and £4,000. To what purpose?

(2) Why did I spend five years and about £300 on architectural training, and let myself out "getting experience" at a nominal salary of practically nothing per week for a further period of two or three years, in order to earn about £5 per week at the age of thirty? An upbringing that has cost my parents a grand total of about £4,000 just to set me on my feet, and even now with nearly half my life spent I am not properly self-supporting.

(3) Why did I pass those stiff exams to qualify myself for work which nobody wants?

(4) Why do I carry letters after my name which mean a great deal to me, but which to nine-tenths of prospective building owners mean absolutely nothing?

These are the questions which architects should ask themselves. Architects, qualification for qualification, are paid less and more grudgingly than any corresponding professional man. In Government offices the architectural assistants are paid less than the clerks, the architects are paid less than the secretarial staff.

BROAD GROUNDS OF COMPLAINT

We have here two broad grounds of complaint. The first, the lack of public interest in architecture with which may be linked the general lack of interest in the work of the contemporary architect; the second is that, even where the work of the architect is somewhat understood, there is an insufficiency of recompense leading in many cases to conditions bordering upon great hardship or poverty.

These grounds of complaint are, of course, bound up together; though here for convenience

they are considered separately. The matter of the public interest in the *Art* of architecture (chiefly ancient architecture) as distinct from the public interest in the work of contemporary architects, is not primarily our concern in these articles. Unfortunately, one issue has obscured the other; and all that has been aroused is a maudlin antiquarian interest which would, in fact, not build up anything because it means pulling down something.

This being so, the basic questions to which I address myself are, how shall the architect get:—

- (a) More work?
- (b) More steady work?
- (c) Better remuneration for that work?

For me these are the vital questions. All questions as to the Art of architecture, its rational development and its significance in the State, can be considered in relation to the well-being of the individual architect, and that is how I propose to consider them.

INQUIRY INTO CAUSES

According to this method of approaching the subject (which at least has the merit of originality) our first statement is that remuneration in the great mass of the profession is insufficient and uncertain. From this we look for causes; and the main cause may be found in the broad process of supply and demand in architectural services. Here we may bring our questions under two headings: The first is upon the assumption that the amount of architectural work cannot be increased to any appreciable extent by corporate propaganda or by other methods. And here we ask ourselves:—

- (a) Is the profession overcrowded?
- (b) How is the work divided?
- (c) Does too much of it fall to one or two fortunate individuals?
- (d) Are strangers unlawfully encroaching into the legitimate fields of the qualified architect?
- (e) If the above is true, does the fault lie with the individual or with the general character of the profession?
- (f) Assuming that the amount of work is normally sufficient, is the remuneration for it too low considering office expenses, etc.?

Secondly, assuming that the total amount of architectural work *can* be increased, we also ask ourselves:—

- (a) How can we get a greater public interest in the work of the architect?
- (b) How can we break down the superstition that his services are unnecessary or costly?
- (c) Should we reorganize ourselves in our methods of training so as to fit in with what is required by the modern economic methods of production?
- (d) What are the best methods of propaganda?
- (e) Is organized corporate propaganda sufficient by itself?

The Amount of Work Available and Who Gets It

THE whole state of the architect obviously devolves on the question of the supply of architectural services as against the demands of building activity. Therefore it will be necessary now for us to arrive at some estimate of the amount of building work carried out in this country annually, and then give consequent consideration to the potential possibilities in the employment and remuneration of architects. In the statistical abstract published by the Board of Trade no figures are given in point of value for the building work carried out in the years since the War. Figures are given in respect of the number of building projects in the different years, and also of the plans approved; but this gives us little idea as to the actual amount of money spent on building. In fact, as I have ascertained from a leading economist, the annual national expenditure on building since 1920 may best be computed in relation to the national wage bill in building. We will therefore first consider this.

THE BUILDING INDUSTRY AND UNEMPLOYMENT

One of the most interesting things which we are only just beginning to learn is the size and importance of the building industry. It employs a larger number of *male* workers than any other industry in the country, and the figures from the *Ministry of Labor Gazette* of November, 1932, are as follows (they cover Great Britain and Northern Ireland):—

	Males	Females	Total
Building.....	846,830	10,080	856,910
Public Works Contracting...	289,150	1,220	290,370
Constructional Engineering..	28,100	1,200	29,300

Thus the grand total in the Building and Constructional Industries is 1,176,580 insured workers.

It should be noted, incidentally, for it does not affect the main purpose of these articles, that at present the percentage of unemployment in the building industry is higher than any other industry. According to the *Ministry of Labor Gazette* for November, 1932, the number of "Wholly Unemployed Males" in the Building and Public Works Group was 367,137, representing 29.0 per cent of building workers, and 41.9 per cent of workers on Public Works.

"It might also be noted that of the total of unemployed insured workers in the whole of the nation, the largest number of wholly unemployed *males* in any single group is in the Building and Public Works Group, viz., 18.5 per cent. of the whole total of unemployed. Next in order are: Mining, 13.4; Transport and Communication, 9.9; Distributive Trades, 8.8; Engineering, 8.3; Shipbuilding and Repairing, 5.6. No other group exceeds 4.0 per cent."*

*See *Ministry of Labor Gazette*, Nov., 1932, also Memorandum No. 1 of the Building Industries National Council.

But in these articles, we are considering a comparatively normal situation such as existed say in 1929 and 1930.

NATIONAL EXPENDITURE ON BUILDING

In arriving at the total national expenditure on building, it is customary to assume that 40 per cent is expended in weekly wages, 40 per cent in materials, and 20 per cent in salaries, overheads and fees. This would, of course, vary considerably with the kind of work undertaken, for in big constructional work the weekly wage bill will be proportionately larger, while the overheads and fees comparatively small.

The average weekly wage of the insured worker is taken as £3 per week, and by adding the proportions for materials and overheads, we may arrive at some rough estimate of building. Thus, with the whole building industry in full employment, say 850,000 workers, we would have a total national bill of expenditure of £318,000,000 per annum. Needless to say, we have not touched these figures since the War, because the industry has never been employed up to full capacity. But as large as they may seem, these figures are not fantastic, for according to a reliable statistician, Colin Clark, the nation's total bill in building and public works contracting, including road making and bridge building for 1931, was no less than £399,000,000. However, we are concerned with pure building and the lowest figures may be given thus*:

	1928	1929
New Buildings and Dwelling-houses.....	94,000,000	101,000,000
Other Buildings.....	54,000,000	62,000,000
Alteration, Repairs and Maintenance.....	80,000,000	82,000,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	228,000,000	245,000,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	1930	1931
New Buildings and Dwelling-houses.....	103,000,000	99,000,000
Other Buildings.....	67,000,000	54,000,000
Alteration, Repairs and Maintenance.....	84,000,000	86,000,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	254,000,000	239,000,000

POTENTIAL INCOME PER ARCHITECT

Thus, including a small percentage of road-making, bridge building and pure engineering work, and deducting a large percentage of the sum for maintenance work, it will be seen that normal expenditure in a year may be taken as £230,000,000 on the kind of building in which

*Colin Clark, *The National Income* (Macmillan).

the architect should be concerned. A large part of this, of course, will come under the heading of speculative building and housing, and it is interesting to note here that in the year 1930 the building societies advanced £88,767,000.

In arriving at any sort of estimate of the potential share of this expenditure which might come to the architect in fees, we must first of all assume that his activities are wider than they are at present. Upon a total amount of say £100,000,000 expended annually on housing for the working classes and speculative building, we might take 1½ per cent which comes to £1,500,000, but on the amount of £130,000,000 expended in private houses, alterations and commercial building, we could take 5 per cent, that is £6,500,000, giving a total of £8,000,000 in potential gross income in fees.

NUMBERS IN THE PROFESSION

In this examination of supply and demand, we have now to consider the number of persons working as architects and assistants. The figures given in the R.I.B.A. Calendar (which for all practical purposes are sufficiently conclusive), are as follows:—

R.I.B.A. Fellows.....	1,707
" Associates.....	2,827
" Licentiates.....	2,421
	<hr/>
Total.....	6,955
" Students.....	1,482
	<hr/>
Members of the Allied Societies.....	8,437
(Not Members of the R.I.B.A.)	3,836
	<hr/>
	12,273

These figures include a large overseas membership (whether as members of Allied Societies or the R.I.B.A.), which may be taken as nearly 3,000 but they exclude the unattached architects and members of other societies. These latter, allowing for a certain duplication of membership, are not more than 1,500 architects and assistants who are engaged the whole time as architects pure and simple. Thus it may be taken that the total number of persons in the United Kingdom who are definitely members of the architectural profession is about 11,000, while the number of properly qualified men is not more than 7,500. But taking the larger figure and dividing it into the potential professional income, it gives an average of £727 per person per year. And this includes comparative beginners in the profession.

If we exclude beginners and take the men of reasonable qualification and experience as not more than 10,000 for the United Kingdom, then the average income would be £800 per annum. It is obvious that the average income for architects

and assistants alike does not reach this figure, therefore we have either to consider whether the architect is losing work which should be his, or whether the profession is over-crowded, and if not, whether the amount of work is wrongly or badly divided.

IS THE PROFESSION OVERCROWDED?

In an inquiry into this question of overcrowding recently made by the R.I.B.A., the conclusion was reached that the profession was not seriously overcrowded, and it is hardly necessary for me here to discuss the matter, because every profession is said to be overcrowded, and the view I take is that it would be better to increase or distribute our activities than to waste time trying to reduce our members. Under the Architects' Registration Bill, there will be no opportunity to make architecture a closed profession, at least not for many years to come. Those who are "registered" and who are members of the R.I.B.A. or its allied societies, will be merely placing themselves under a system of discipline which at first will not be known, appreciated or understood by the world at large. There will be no bar on a man calling himself an Architect, and, as far as the great mass of people are concerned, an Architect is just an Architect whether he is registered or qualified or self-appointed overnight. It is only when the public have learned to appreciate the difference between a qualified and an unqualified man that there will be any point in restricting the number of qualified recruits. My main point is that we shall have to teach the public this difference.

HOW IS THE WORK DIVIDED?

Assuming that the amount of work is not capable of considerable increase, can we be satisfied that the amount of work is divided equitably? At the present moment one or two fortunate people seem to get a large amount of work, quite irrespective of their merits; therefore, let us consider how this work is obtained.

There is first of all the young architect who is born to it. Either he succeeds to a practice, or by wealthy connections or family influences obtains a large amount of work. Too often this man himself is a dunderhead and hopelessly incompetent as an architect, but he is able to employ others to do the work for him at so much per week. This is a pernicious system which is still tolerated, and even applauded in the highest circles of our profession. It brings great discredit because it conveys the impression to the public that architecture is an easy matter which anyone can do. In other professions, such as medicine and the law, such a practice would be impossible. In architecture we still accept it. If in our professional life we honor men for no more reason

than that they are the sons of their fathers, how then can we blame the public for employing them?

THE "FINANCIAL ARCHITECT"

Then there is the man who is really a financier or company promoter, who, for want of a better title calls himself an architect. Very often he has no knowledge whatever of architecture or building construction. He cannot plan, he cannot draw, and I have heard cases of where this type of man has not even known the name of a setsquare. This type of man sometimes appears as a theatre architect or architect to a cinema company. He is really one of the directors who, for the time being, has appointed himself to "architect" the job. He takes on an architectural draughtsman (qualified or unqualified), sends him out to buy a drawing-board, tells him to draw out a plan similar to one he has seen in a journal. Then he gets a steelwork firm to get out a scheme for the steelwork, a marble firm to knock up a design for the marble work (and sometimes the exterior), a decorating firm to get out a scheme for the interior, an electrical firm for the lighting, and so on. What need is there for him to know anything about architecture or planning, for the result pleases everybody just the same, and is illustrated in our architectural journals. If this man or his predecessors whom I have described go on long enough and are sufficiently successful, they may

be elected as Fellows of the R.I.B.A.; and wisely, for they are likely to do less damage within the professional fold than out of it.

THE BUSINESS ARCHITECT

Then there is the man who is primarily a business man, who may have had some initial training and knowledge of architecture but who becomes successful almost entirely by his business abilities. Very often he himself initiates a building project and takes a hand in its finance. In other words, he creates work, he does not wait for it to come to him. This is perfectly legitimate so long as he plays straight in his business activities, but there are many who do not. There are too many architects who by virtue of their financial or business "pull" go out of their way to sneak work from their professional brethren.

And there are those who habitually "undercut" in the matter of fees. No doubt there are occasions where an architect cannot be too dictatorial as to fees, and where the normal 6 per cent is open to reconsideration, but I will deal with that later. In any case, this "undercutting" has become a serious matter, and should be dealt with clearly and efficiently, either by revising the scale of fees or by more stringent disciplinary action. And the same must be said of job-sneaking. These are plain words, but it is no use mincing matters.

(To be continued)

Filing System for Architectural Plates and Articles

A NEW INSTITUTE DOCUMENT

MORE than a year ago the Board of Directors appointed a special committee on Filing System for Architectural Plates, as follows: Wilbur H. Tusler, Chairman; and Roy Childs Jones and William W. Tyrie, Members; all of Minneapolis.

The Committee was given a huge appropriation—\$15.00; and a big job to do, starting from scratch.

Their instructions were to develop a filing system for architectural plates and articles, one that was not too complicated, one that was simple enough to appeal to the average office, and one that was not so simple as to be worthless in finding the right plate at the right time.

The Committee, under the able chairmanship of Mr. Tusler, went to work without much publicity, but with plenty of enthusiasm. They investigated other filing systems of various types and gave due consideration to style and substance of the Standard Filing System for Information on

Building Materials and Appliances, issued by the Institute.

At the May meeting of the Board, the Committee made its report, which submitted the new document.

The Board received this report, reviewed the proposed filing system, and expressed its gratification with the accomplishments of the committee. It directed that the "Filing System for Architectural Plates and Articles" be received, adopted and published as a first edition, for distribution to the architectural profession and the building industry; that it be copyrighted and published by the Secretary's Office, and sold at a suggested price of \$1.00 per copy.

The sub-divisions under major headings range from one number to eleven numbers, and they cover a wide field extending from the most simple types of construction to the most complicated. In some cases numbers are provided for foreign as well as for domestic data.

A quick review of the system shows the following major divisions:

A Residential	L Remedial
B Social	M Recreational
C Educational	N Religious
D Exhibitional	O Funerary
E Administrative, Professional, Financial	P Non Shelter Structures
F Mercantile	Q Materials and Details
G Industrial	R Equipment
H Agricultural	S City Planning
I Communicational	T Landscape Design
J Transportational	U Historical, Analytical and Descriptive
K Governmental	V Architectural Practice

In commenting upon the details of this new system, the Committee wrote:

In presenting the following system for filing architectural plates, we have kept in mind the fact that to be used by any large percentage of offices the system would have to be simple and direct. Any long complicated system would discourage the average architect and as a result would not be used.

Many systems were sent to us for our consideration and assistance. These we went over using parts where we could. The Dewey Decimal System we discarded outright as we felt that while it would be of benefit to a library where trained attendants with plenty of time did the filing that only a very small percentage of the architectural offices would bother with such a detailed, intricate division of architectural information.

We have laid out our proposed system to cover three or more types of offices: First, the office that files only a few plates and those under large groupings. These offices can use the alphabetical headings; such as, A Residential, B Social, C Educational, etc. For the office desiring to divide the plates further, the alphabetical and the first numerical headings can be used; such as, A Residential with sub-headings of A1 Single Family Dwellings, A2 Apartment Houses and Apartment Hotels, A3 Hostelryes, etc. Where further division is wanted the system can be used entire with the suggestion that further divisions can be made by the different offices as they see fit.

Where we have felt that there may be some confusion, we have given cross references. If necessary for clarity, more cross references can be added.

It is the suggestion of this committee that articles from magazines be stapled together and filed with the plates. The articles as well as the plates would be marked with the file number so that the office boy could replace in that file any plates or articles that had been used.

After measuring a great many plates, we recommend a trimming size of $8\frac{1}{2} \times 11$. This allows plates to be filed in the standard cabinet and makes them uniform with the A. I. A. and other documents.

It was our desire to include with this plate filing system a large and voluminous list of architectural buildings arranged alphabetically with their filing numbers following. This would be of considerable assistance if there is doubt regarding the classification of a plate or article. This can be done later if found advisable or necessary.

In accord with the resolution of the Board, the Secretary announces the publication of the first edition of the Standard Filing System for Architectural Plates and Articles.

It will be printed on Hammermill Bond paper— heavy weight, of good appearance, and with due regard for practicality and durability in use.

The price of the document is \$1.00 per copy. Postage will be prepaid. This is a low price in view of the amount of work expended in preparation, and in view of the potential value of this filing system to any office which desires an authoritative, standard, workable method for filing plates and articles which should be saved— and seldom are.

Of course, some will say that the price is too high! That it will not cost the Institute a dollar per copy to print and distribute, etc! But it is about time an example was set in the architectural profession of charging for goods and services what they are worth.

Remittances may be by check, mail-order, or cash, and orders can be filled on or about September 15th.

The Vitality of Idealism

A MEMBER of the Institute and of the Washington State Chapter, who was not at the last Convention, wrote a letter to the Secretary which refers to something we may easily overlook under present conditions. This member writes as follows:

"I have gone through everything in the report of the Convention in the May OCTAGON. It is intensely interesting and stimulating; it shows great vitality on the part of the Institute; it is excellent evidence that the profession through the Institute leadership is versatile and progressive.

"In my opinion, without doubt it is coming out of the fire with dross consumed and with a show of finer metal.

"I am very proud of the Institute and of the men who are willing to pay so heavily for the ideals of the Institute. You know, I think there is quite a tinge of unconscious religious fervor in the high attitude towards the Institute and its ideals. Perhaps this is true of any effort towards the accomplishment of higher purposes.

"What I am leading up to is the fact that I feel through the whole Convention report a fine spirit of intrepidity and catching enthusiasm, not to mention the midnight oil involved."

Survey of Institute Affairs

IN the July number there appeared an explanatory statement with respect to the Survey of Institute Affairs. This was followed by analyses of the returns on three subjects, namely: "What Is An Architect;" "The Architect and The Institute;" and "The Architects Can

Take It." Read or re-read them now.

In this number there appear three more analyses. The series will be continued for several months until the more timely and interesting of the twenty-nine subjects covered in the survey have been reported upon.

THE SCHOOLS AND THE STUDENTS

THIS ANALYSIS BY DIRECTOR GEORGE H. GRAY

Architectural Education—

The synopsis read: In the hands of the Committee on Education. You are familiar with its reports and activities.

Of the 300 questionnaires sent out, and of the 226 returns, 186 answered the question in whole or in part.

This section of the questionnaire was headed "Architectural Education," and it is to this general topic that the answers were largely directed, and not to the program of the Committee on Architectural Education.

Question: (a) Is the program in respect to architectural education correct?

Returns: To this question there were 101 answers. Some of the affirmative answers were qualified; in the tabulation these were given a value of $\frac{1}{2}$; the qualified negative answers were similarly treated. On this basis the answers were as follows:

Sympathetic to the committee program... 80

Antipathetic to the committee program... 21

Question: (b) What changes do you recommend?

Returns: For the most part this was interpreted in the answers to refer to the program of the Schools of Architecture—As the answers were pertinent to the information sought, no differentiation was made in the tabulation.

Also, many of the answers to question (c) applied to question (b), and were so classified.

The answers to question (b) give us the constructive suppositions brought out by the questionnaire. Many of the replies were abbreviated theses on the subjects, the total number of which was 305. These I have classified under three general headings of recommendations, as follows:

First, The schools should be more practical—
99 affirmative.
2 to the contrary.

Sub-headings were:

	<i>Votes</i>
The general category—"more practical"...	25
More emphasis on business considerations..	32
More emphasis on engineering and construction.....	18
More emphasis on functions of the architect	26
Less emphasis on salesmanship.....	2
	—
	99

Second, Greater breadth of curricula: 135 votes
Sub-headings were:

That there be greater elasticity.....	29
That there be newer progressive methods...	25
That there be emphasis on art appreciation	23
That practicing architects participate in instruction.....	21
That more emphasis be placed on economy and sociology.....	21
That more emphasis be placed on creative imagination	6
That there be less worship of honors and the "false Gods".....	4
That there be more emphasis on residential architecture.....	4
That there be great consideration given to environment	1
That there be consolidation of architectural schools with those of engineering	1

Third, To raise quality of graduates and reduce quantity—69 votes.
To be accomplished by the following methods:

Survey of Institute Affairs—Continued

Sub-headings:

- By requiring office training prior to entertaining professional schooling.
- By requiring office training subsequent to entertaining professional schooling.
- By adding one or more years to the school term.
- By more discriminating selection of students.
- By curtailing the number of schools.

Question: (c) What are your comments on the architectural schools?

Returns: 34 of these indicated sympathy with existing school direction.

16 of these indicated lack of sympathy with existing school direction.

These replies show more than 2 to 1 approving the schools as they exist. The comments of the deans and others of the faculty indicate that they are aware of their shortcomings and in varying degrees are righting the conditions criticized.

Of greatest importance is the fact that the four professional organizations concerning themselves with architectural education have established an annual conference of these four bodies, which is addressing itself to the training leading up to the practice of architecture.

THE QUESTION OF FEES

THIS ANALYSIS BY PRESIDENT E. J. RUSSELL

Architects' Charges.

The synopsis read: At the moment the Schedule of Charges and the Fee-Plus-Cost documents represent the advice of the Institute to its members. In the near future code requirements may make revisions essential. A Special Committee is investigating proposed revisions of the Schedule of Charges and a report will be made to the Convention.

The total number responding on this subject was 223.

Question: Briefly, what change do you recommend in the Schedule?

Returns: Fully 85% recommended that no change be made in the present Schedule of Charges. Of the others, a number were in favor of the proposed schedule developed by the Committee on Schedule of Charges, while several chapters advocated their own schedules as worked out by their committees.

There was a feeling that the schedules should call for complete services, including engineering fees. Several expressed a desire to modify the wording of the established schedule in order that it might be more readily understood by the layman.

Question: In the Fee-Plus-Cost documents?

Returns: The replies indicated that these forms are seldom used and might well be eliminated. Apparently, there is no interest in these documents.

There is a pronounced sentiment that localities might well establish fees under the provisions of the Code.

Question: What "per cent" is generally recognized by the public in your community?

Returns: About 85% said 6%, and of these fully 20% raised the question as to whether it was obtainable, although recognized. About 50% of the answers indicated that more than 6% was charged for residential work—ranging from 7% to 10%. About 15% said that the 5% fee was recognized by the public and by city and municipal authorities. These replies came from certain definite localities which have never adopted a 6% fee as established by the Institute, but hoped that the Architects' Code would remedy the situation.

The deductions to be drawn from these returns indicate that the Institute may do commendable work by stiffening the backbone of many of the weak brothers.

THE RULES OF THE GAME

THIS ANALYSIS BY DIRECTOR JAMES O. BETELLE

Professional Ethics.

The synopsis read: Embraced in the Principles of Professional Practice.

Question: (a) Are these Principles satisfactory as a whole? *Returns:* 194 said the Principles are satisfactory. 3 said they are not satisfactory.

Survey of Institute Affairs—Continued

Question: (b) To what degree are they observed?

Returns: 115 indicated that observance is general.

49 indicated that observance is only fair.

17 indicated that observance is poor or limited.

Question: (c) What fundamental changes do you recommend?

Returns: 113 recommended no changes.

The principal changes recommended were:

(1) Competition provision should be made less stringent in these times of depression, and punitive measures left in abeyance for the time being.

(2) Educate non-Institute members and the public generally.

(3) Stronger statements about fees.

(4) Include appropriate portions of the N.R.A. code rules.

(5) Better policing by Chapters; stronger penalties; more enforcement; too long delay investigating violations.

(6) Modify and clarify the advertising clause.

(7) Eliminate the inference that it is unprofessional for an architect to solicit a job.

(8) Make reading clearer throughout the docu-

ment, so as to make violations more difficult by the use of subterfuge.

(9) Professional ethics should be taught in the schools of architecture.

(10) Include a stronger statement about miscellaneous free sketches.

The deductions which Mr. Betelle drew from all the returns on this subject were as follows:

Answers to the questionnaire show that a code of ethics is very satisfactory to the great majority of the Institute's members.

No *fundamental* changes are proposed. Suggestions have been mainly to clarify clauses and to modify or adjust provisions on the age-old, universal subjects of competitions, fees, and free sketches. These three items could never be satisfactorily stated for all the membership.

The Principles of Professional Practice must be enforced with discretion, and sympathy, during these times of business depression. Even under depression conditions there have been few cases of violations brought before the Committee on Practice. This indicates that the Institute can be congratulated on its code of ethics, which seems to be so satisfactory to so large a number of its members.

No recommendations for changes seem necessary to be brought before the Convention.

Preparation for Practice—Chapter Action

THE attention of the membership is called to the report of the Committee on Education, in the May number of THE OCTAGON, under the title "Report of the Committee on Education—With Reference to Preparation for the Practice of Architecture."

President Russell addressed a letter of July 16 to the President of each Chapter, the substance of which was as follows:

The Sixty-sixth Convention adopted a program which will have far-reaching effects on architectural education and the practice of architecture in the United States.

I refer to that portion of the Report of the Committee on Education which deals with preparation for the practice of architecture—as printed on page 40 of the May number of THE OCTAGON.

The resolutions adopted by the Convention with respect to that report are appended to it.

From the resolutions, it is obvious that the development of the program and the accomplishment of its objectives must rest upon the Committee on Education and the Chapters of the Institute.

Therefore, on behalf of the Board, and with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee on Education, I have placed upon the Sub-Committee on Architectural Education of the Committee on Education—of which C. C. Zantzing, of Philadelphia, is Chairman—the duty of acting for and on behalf of the Institute and the Committee on Education in establishing the new program and making it work.

*Communications with respect to it will shortly be addressed to every Chapter President by Mr. Zantzing, or by W. Pope Barney, Acting Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Architectural Education, during Mr. Zantzing's absence in the summer months.

Those letters will initiate the new program as covered in the Convention resolutions.

It will be the prime duty of Chapter Presidents to give careful attention to the requests made upon them and to cooperate in the fullest degree.

There are many who believe that the responsibility for some of the present difficulties of the architectural profession rests upon our system of architectural education and upon inadequate preparation for practice. They are convinced that far-reaching changes are essential. The Convention was of the same mind. Its resolutions are unequivocal and mandatory.

In order that you may have full information in advance of the first letter from Mr. Barney, we send herewith a reprint of the report of the Committee on Education—with the Convention resolutions attached thereto.

Please read this document carefully, and be prepared to give your official and personal support to the establishment of this vitally important Institute program.

This program for strengthening the architectural profession at its foundation is the concern of every practicing architect.

Members of chapters and of chapter committees on education are expected to function.

* Such letters have been sent to all chapter Presidents.

Your Address in the New Annuary

Notice

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE INSTITUTE:

THROUGH the generous gift of an Institute member the Annuary for 1934-1935 will be printed. The last edition was for 1932-1933. The new Annuary must be prepared, printed and distributed on the most economical basis possible.

The usual return cards to secure correct addresses and firm names will *not* be sent out.

Therefore, if you have *not* advised the Institute of any change in your address or firm name, please send the following information:

- (1) Your address to be listed in the new Annuary, and to which THE OCTAGON and

other official communications of the Institute should be sent;

- (2) Your firm name, be it partnership, association, or incorporation, if it has been changed since the last Annuary was printed.

Members *not* responding to this notice on or before *September 20* will be recorded in the new Annuary, as to name, address, and firm name, in exactly the same manner as in the last Annuary, or in accordance with notice of change already given.

FRANK C. BALDWIN
Secretary.

City and Regional Planning in the United States

IN the JUNE OCTAGON, reference was made to the brochure on "Status of City and Regional Planning in the United States", issued by the National Planning Board.

This extensive review and bibliography, with maps, tables, and analyses, make an unusually valuable document.

Through the courtesy of Charles W. Eliot, 2d, Executive Officer of the National Planning Board, the Institute has half a dozen copies of this brochure for distribution on request to chapter committees or officers seriously engaged in planning work.

New Opportunities for City Planning

THE Construction and Civic Development Department Committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce has issued a pamphlet entitled "New Opportunities for City Planning", which it believes to be the most significant expression of the interest of business in city planning yet made by the Chamber. Included is a resolution, adopted at the last Annual Meeting, urging chambers of commerce to take an active interest in making city planning an effective part of local government procedure in their communities.

The topics covered are as follows: What Is Meant By A City Plan; Practical Values of a City Plan; Requirements for Effective Planning Frequently Neglected; Burdensome Taxes Reflect Lack of Effective Planning; Two Requirements for Effective City Planning; Official Status for City Planning; and Citizen Support for City Planning.

Those interested may obtain copies from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, at Washington, D. C., or from its local bodies.

A. I. A. Standard Documents

Chapter VI of the Code of the Construction Industry—the Electrical Contracting Division—contains the following:

"Article IV, Section 16—Standard Documents—

"The Standard Form of Contract Documents of The American Institute of Architects is recommended to be the basis for all contracts."

(NOTE: This endorsement speaks for itself.)

With the Chapters

Buffalo.

At the June meeting the Chapter approved a plan for securing funds through arrangement for architects' and builders' exhibits.

It was agreed to assist, in all proper professional ways, in increasing the number of exhibits and encouraging the use of the exhibits by the public, architects, and engineers. The exhibitors thus will realize that the exhibit is a paying proposition and far excels any other method of advertising.

It is believed one hundred exhibitors will average a yearly rental of \$15,000, Mr. Myron O'Neill stating that at present some exhibitors are paying as high as \$300 a year and others less than \$100.

The securing of these exhibits will entail considerable work and all members of the Chapter were advised that they must assist in this matter in order to increase the average.

Under the agreement the first \$6,000, or such portion as is necessary, will be for the expenses of the Architects' and Builders' Exhibits, Inc., not including any expensive advertising in the papers, etc. This will have to be provided for otherwise. The exhibitors might increase their rental to cover such an expense. No conclusion was reached on this question of advertising. The second \$6,000, making a total of \$12,000, is to go to the realty company for rent. Anything

received over \$12,000 is to be divided between the Chapter and the realty company, 25% and 75%, respectively. This division is made because the realty company takes all the risk.

North Texas.

Lester N. Flint reported at the meeting held on June 15 (and attended by about twelve architects from Dallas, Fort Worth and Denton) for the purpose of discussing ways and means of securing a Texas Architects Registration Law. Mr. Flint and Edwin Bruce LaRoche attended the meeting as representatives of the Chapter.

The sense of the meeting was to bring about an organized, state-wide movement, to assist in every way possible the Texas Architects' Registration Committee now functioning.

A committee to organize a method of procedure met on July 19. Mr. Flint attended this meeting.

The following committee was appointed to consider the policy of the City of Dallas relative to doing its own architectural work, as evidenced by a published design made by a City Department for an Administration Building at Love Field: Messrs. LaRoche, Lang, Flint, Lemmon and Thomas.

This committee was instructed to write a letter to the City Council protesting such policy.

As of Interest

Architect's Fee on "Buildings and Their Equipment."

The Comptroller General of the United States, rendered a decision of June 23, 1934, relative to a contract between the Government and a private architect, which provided that "the party of the first part (the Government) also agrees to pay the parties of the second part, as compensation, an amount equal to six per cent (6%) of the total cost of the buildings and their equipment."

The building in question was a conservatory.

The Comptroller General holds that the removal of plants, cost of top soil, and the cost of sidewalks shall be excluded in computing the fee to which the architects are entitled.

The decision states that a building is a structure or edifice enclosing a space within its walls and usually covered with a roof, and that the term, "equipment," as applied to buildings also has an established meaning and does not include plantings, top soil, or sidewalks.

Perhaps these points should be borne in mind by the private architect if, under some rare circumstances, he should be called upon to make a contract with the Federal Government.

From "Construction"—Bulletin of the Construction League of the United States.

"Coordination of all the branches to present a solid front on important national problems must be made an accomplished fact. The industry must know and see itself in retrospect—and it is fact that construction does not know itself, its market, or its enormous power to act as an economic stabilizer for all industry."

"The Construction Code Authority is making progress on the many problems connected with the administration of the Construction Code. . . The Executive Committee of the Code Authority has approved six explanations concerning the operation of

the construction code. All are with regard to the bidding practices section of Chapter I."

"The Compliance Division of N. R. A. has issued a memorandum of instructions on the Construction Code to its state directors, warning them against assuming authority in appointing administrative agencies, bid depositories, or otherwise taking functions which belong strictly to the Code Authorities."

"The Assembly elected three new State Construction Leagues—North Carolina, Colorado, and Missouri—bringing the total to eight."

"Planning and Adjustment Board—Sullivan W. Jones appointed Chairman of the National Construction Planning and Adjustment Board. The construction industry gave a dinner in honor of the members of the Board Thursday evening, June 14, at the Willard Hotel in Washington."

"Real Property Inventory—Reports for 36 of the 63 cities have been issued by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and reveal a tremendous field for modernization and renovation; number of houses in need of repairs range from 30% to 70% of all structures, varying in sections of the country."

(These inventories have been sent to Chapter Presidents by the Institute—just as rapidly as they became available.)

Chicago Metropolitan Housing Council.

The Council was organized in response to the instructions of a group who met January 19, 1934, at the Palmer House. They were representatives of some forty commercial, civic, social, and political groups. Speakers there emphasized the lack of cooperation between groups struggling with parts of the housing problem, the wasteful duplications of effort which are being made daily in these matters, and the failure to utilize existing information just because no one organization is gathering it together. A committee was appointed at that time to investigate the desirability of forming a group which might bring these activities into such coordination that they would supplement each other and advance

the cause of better housing more rapidly. That committee consisted of John R. Fugard, President of the Illinois Society of Architects; Alfred K. Stern, Chairman of the State Housing Board; Jacob L. Crane, Jr., Federal Adviser to the Illinois Planning Board; Edward L. Ryerson, Jr., President of the Council of Social Agencies; Joel D. Hunter, General Superintendent of the United Charities of Chicago; Arthur Bohnen, Vice-president of the Chicago Real Estate Board; Edgar S. Nethercut, Secretary of the Western Society of Engineers; W. W. DeBerard, ex-President of the American Society of Civil Engineers; and Albert J. Weisberg, President of the State Realty Trust.

This committee canvassed the situation and decided that a group should be formed for the purpose of coordinating the housing activities of existing agencies. Incorporation under the name, Metropolitan Housing Council, was completed March 12, and the Council's offices located at 1 No. La Salle Street.—*Illinois Society of Architects—Monthly Bulletin.*

Bargain Homes.

If present plans to stimulate construction mature, a typical home that would have cost \$9,500 in 1929 will cost less than \$7,000 in 1934, according to the *American Builder*. Financing charges will be 18 to 25 per cent less. Real estate costs will be lower, by as much as 50 per cent in some cases. And more efficient equipment and better planning will also produce substantial dividends for the home-builder.

During the depression construction has stood still—but architects and designers haven't. The five-room home of today has the same efficiency as the six-room home of a few years back, due to better arrangement. New methods have been evolved, new ideas created. That means that the home-builder gets a better break than he ever got before.

There isn't an industry that wouldn't benefit from stimulated domestic construction. Insurance, steel, electric, railroad, lumber, paint, cement—every time a home is built money is released that goes into their coffers and thence to the pockets of workers. It is reliably estimated that a potential \$1,500,000,000 of capital exists that could, under favorable circumstances, be turned into the channels of home construction. If that is done, employment and hard times generally will take a serious set-back.—*Michigan Society of Architects—Weekly Bulletin.*

BOOKS AND DOCUMENTS

STANDARD CONTRACT DOCUMENTS

Agreement and General Conditions in cover.....	\$0.50
General Conditions without Agreement.....	.35
Agreement without General Conditions.....	.15
Bond of Suretyship.....	.10
Form of Sub-Contract.....	.10
Letter of Acceptance of Subcontractor's Proposal10
Cover (heavy paper with valuable notes).....	.02
Complete set in cover.....	.75

MISCELLANEOUS DOCUMENTS

Agenda for Architects.....	\$.40
Review of the Standard Documents.....	1.00
Standard Filing System.....	.50
Alphabetical Index to Standard Filing System.....	.50
Standard Filing System and Alphabetical Index (combined)	1.00
Filing System for Architectural Plates (new).....	1.00

BOOKS

HANDBOOK OF ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICE.....	\$5.00
THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF AN IDEA— <i>Louis H. Sullivan</i>	3.00
A SYSTEM OF ARCHITECTURAL ORNAMENT— <i>Louis H. Sullivan</i>	15.00
CHARLESTON, S. C. (Vol. I—Octagon Library of Early American Architecture).....	20.00
BERTRAM GROSVENOR GOODHUE—ARCHITECT AND MASTER OF MANY ARTS.....	30.00

These books and documents are published and endorsed by The American Institute of Architects. They are highly commended to the membership.

A discount of twenty-five per cent is given to members of the Institute, on the Handbook, and on the Standard Contract Documents in lots of 100 or more, when ordered direct from THE OCTAGON.

Transportation prepaid on order amounting to \$1.00 or more net. Orders, communications and remittances (checks, money-orders, cash or stamps) should be sent to The American Institute of Architects, The Octagon, 1741 N. Y. Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C.

