

THE
OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects



The Seventy-first Convention

*Notes on the Advisability of Two-Stage Competitions
and Other Methods of Competition Procedure*

Payment for Plans and Specifications

Expediting Election Procedure

Members Elected—With the Chapters

Volume 11

FEBRUARY

1939

Number 2

CHAPTERS AND OFFICERS

PRESIDENTS (*) AND SECRETARIES (†) LISTED AS OF FEBRUARY 10, 1939

- ALABAMA**—*Jack Bass Smith, Steiner Bank Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.; †Marshall E. Van Arman, 1202 Martin Bldg., Birmingham, Ala.
- ALBANY**—*Gilbert L. Van Auken (Acting), Delmar, N. Y.; †August Lux, 100 State Street, Albany, N. Y.
- ARIZONA**—*Leslie J. Maboney, 1109 Title Bldg., Phoenix, Arizona; †Fred W. Whittlesser, 900 Security Bldg., Phoenix, Ariz.
- ARKANSAS**—*Harry Wanger (Acting), 1816 Donaghey Bldg., Little Rock, Ark.; †Lawson L. Delony, 2407 Louisiana St., Little Rock, Ark.
- BALTIMORE**—*John H. Scarff, 1012 Keyser Bldg., Baltimore, Md.; †Lucien E. D. Gaudreau, 827 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Md.
- BOSTON**—*John T. Whitmore, 50 Congress St., Boston, Mass.; †Howard T. Clinch, 177 State St., Boston, Mass.
- BROOKLYN**—*Ralph M. Rice, 655 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.; †Henry V. Murphy, 1 Hanson Place, Brooklyn, N. Y.
- BUFFALO**—*Paul H. Harbach, 505 Franklin St., Buffalo, N. Y.; †Stanley C. Podd, 1876 Amhurst St., Buffalo, N. Y.
- CENTRAL ILLINOIS**—*Bryant E. Hadley, 1005 S. 4th St., Springfield, Illinois; †F. M. Lescher, 304 Architecture Bldg., Urbana, Ill.
- CENTRAL NEW YORK**—*Egbert Bagg, 258 Genesee St., Utica, N. Y.; †Clement R. Newkirk, 258 Genesee St., Utica, N. Y.
- CENTRAL TEXAS**—*Goldwin Goldsmith, Dept. of Architecture, Univ. of Texas, Austin, Tex.; †Clifford H. James, 310 E. 14th St., Austin, Tex.
- CHICAGO**—*Elmer C. Roberts, 82 W. Washington St., Chicago, Ill.; †Carl E. Heimbrodt, 20 No. Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
- CINCINNATI**—*John Becker, 800 Broadway, Cincinnati, Ohio; †H. Richard Elliston, 1113 Tractor Bldg., Cincinnati, Ohio.
- CLEVELAND**—*Joseph L. Weinberg, 1886 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio; †Francis K. Drax, 18124 Shaker Square, Cleveland, Ohio.
- COLORADO**—*Roland L. Linder, 507 Insurance Bldg., Denver, Colo.; †R. Ewing Stiffler, 1928 Ivanhoe St., Denver, Colo.
- COLUMBUS**—*Harry F. Reichard, 2302 N. Fourth St., Columbus, Ohio; †Ralph Chas. Kempton, 50 West Broad St., Columbus, Ohio.
- CONNECTICUT**—*Lorenzo Hamilton, 187 Colony St., Meriden, Conn.; †Harold D. Hauf, Weir Hall, Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn.
- DAYTON**—*Clifford C. Brown, 1129 Reibold Bldg., Dayton, Ohio; †Geo. T. Neuffer, 487 Ludlow Arcade, Dayton, Ohio.
- DELAWARE**—*Reah de B. Robinson, 312 Equitable Bldg., Wilmington, Del.; †John F. Mullins, 917 Shipley St., Wilmington, Del.
- DETROIT**—*Arthur K. Hyde, 3105 E. Grand Blvd., Detroit, Michigan; †Taimage C. Hughes, 120 Madison Ave., Detroit, Mich.
- EASTERN OHIO**—*Charles F. Owsley, 211 N. Champion St., Youngstown, Ohio; †Robert F. Beatty, Potters Savings & Loan Bldg., E. Liverpool, Ohio.
- FLORIDA CENTRAL**—*Franklin O. Adams, 306 Morgan St., Tampa, Fla.; †Norman F. Siz, 213 Franklin St., Tampa, Fla.
- FLORIDA NORTH**—*LeeRoy Sheftall, 305 Main St., Jacksonville, Fla.; †Joseph H. Bryson, 925 Barnett Bldg., Jacksonville, Fla.
- FLORIDA SOUTH**—*August Geiger, 731 Lincoln Rd., Miami Beach, Fla.; †Miss Marion I. Manley, Aclisair Ave., Coral Gables, Fla.
- GEORGIA**—*Samuel I. Cooper, 827-30 Forsyth Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.; †J. Warren Armistead, Jr., 1330 Candler Bldg., Atlanta, Ga.
- GRAND RAPIDS**—*Warren L. Rindge, 740 Michigan Trust Bldg., Grand Rapids, Mich.; †John P. Baker, 756 Bristol Ave., N. W., Grand Rapids, Mich.
- HAWAII**—*Claude Alton Stehl, P. O. Box 82, Honolulu, T. H.; †Raymond L. Morris, 300 Boston Bldg., Honolulu, T. H.
- INDIANA**—*Edward D. Pierre, 909 Architects & Builders Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind.; †John R. Kelley, 1034 Architects & Builders Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind.
- IOWA**—*John Norcist, 511 Hubbell Bldg., Des Moines, Iowa; †Amos E. Emery, 826 Locust St., Des Moines, Iowa.
- KANSAS CITY**—*A. W. Archer, 916 Pioneer Trust Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.; †Romer Neville, 4 West 13th St., Kansas City, Mo.
- KANSAS**—*Chas. W. Shaver, 828 United Life Bldg., Salina, Kan.; †Thomas Larrick, 1021 Massachusetts Street, Lawrence, Kan.
- KENTUCKY**—*Elliott Lea, 1830 Starks Bldg., Louisville, Ky.; †Bergman Letzler, 612 South Fifth St., Louisville, Ky.
- LOUISIANA**—*Arthur Feitel, Carondelet Bldg., New Orleans, La.; †Douglas V. Freret, 620 Audubon Bldg., New Orleans, La.
- MADISON**—*Arthur Peabody, State Capitol, Madison, Wisc.; †Edward J. Law, First Central Building, Madison, Wisc.
- MAINE**—*John Howard Stevens, 187 Middle St., Portland, Me.; †Josiah T. Tubby, 21 Free St., Portland, Me.
- MINNESOTA**—*Roy C. Jones, School of Architecture, Univ. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; †Edwin W. Krafft, 715 Rand Tower, Minneapolis, Minn.
- MISSISSIPPI**—*Eugene D. Drummond, Old Merchants Bank Bldg., Jackson, Miss.; †R. W. Naef, 411 East Capitol St., Jackson, Miss.
- MONTANA**—*Fred A. Brinkman, Kallispell, Mont.; †W. E. Plew, Bozeman, Mont.
- NEBRASKA**—*Linus Burr Smith, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.; †William L. Younk, Dept. of Roads and Irrigation, Lincoln, Neb.
- NEW JERSEY**—*Arthur B. Holmes, 18 Burnside St., Upper Montclair, N. J.; †Clement W. Fairweather, Metuchen, N. J.
- NEW YORK**—*Arthur Loomis Harmon, 11 East 44th St., New York, N. Y.; †Robt. B. O'Connor, 101 Park Ave., New York, N. Y.
- NORTH CAROLINA**—*George Watts Carr, 111 Corcoran St., Durham, N. C.; †Roy Marvin, 111 Corcoran St., Durham, N. C.
- NORTH LOUISIANA**—*Edward F. Nelid, Shreveport, La.; †Edward F. Nelid, Acting Secretary.
- NORTH TEXAS**—*Walter C. Sharp, 707 Construction Bldg., Dallas, Tex.; †Geo. L. Dahl, Insurance Bldg., Dallas, Tex.
- NORTHERN CALIFORNIA**—*James H. Mitchell, 369 Pine St., San Francisco, Calif.; †John D. Young, 2002 California St., San Francisco, Calif.
- NORTHWESTERN PENNSYLVANIA**—*Clement S. Kirby, 4502 Homeland Avenue, Erie, Pa.; †J. Howard Hicks (Acting), 124 West 7th Street, Erie, Pa.
- OKLAHOMA**—*John Wesley Robb, 1114 S. Boston St., Tulsa, Okla.; †Leonard H. Bailey, Colcord Bldg., Oklahoma City, Okla.
- OREGON**—*Leslie D. Howell, 404 U. S. National Bank Bldg., Portland, Ore.; †Roi L. Morin, 1603 Public Service Bldg., Portland, Ore.
- PHILADELPHIA**—*Roy F. Larson, 1700 Architects Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.; †Thomas Fym Cope, Architects' Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.
- PITTSBURGH**—*Lawrence Wolfe, 119 East Montgomery Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; †Rody Patterson, 2422 Koppers Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
- RHODE ISLAND**—*Wallis E. Howe, 1014 Turks Head Bldg., Providence, R. I.; †J. Peter Geddes, II, 840 Hospital Trust Bldg., Providence, R. I.
- SAN DIEGO**—*Sam W. Hamill, Bank of America Bldg., San Diego, Calif.; †Louis J. Gill, Sefton Bldg., San Diego, Calif.
- SANTA BARBARA**—*Ralph W. Armitage, 235 W. Victoria St., Santa Barbara, Calif.; †Chester L. Carjola, 209 Picacho Lane, Santa Barbara, Calif.
- SCRANTON-WILKES-BARRE**—*Arthur P. Coon, Union Bank Bldg., Scranton, Pa.; †Searle H. Von Storch, Union Bank Bldg., Scranton, Pa.
- SOUTH CAROLINA**—*J. Whitney Cunningham, 2 Pierson Bldg., Sumter, S. C.; †G. Thomas Harmon, III, Valley Road, Hartsville, S. C.
- SOUTH GEORGIA**—*Morton H. Levy, 8d Floor, Levy Store Bldg., Savannah, Ga.; †Walter F. Marshall, 228 E. 51st St., Savannah, Ga.
- SOUTH TEXAS**—*John T. Rafter, Jr., 500 Stuart Ave., Houston, Texas; †Theo. F. Keller, 6551 S. Main St., Houston, Texas.
- SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA**—*Eugene Weston, Jr., Architects Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.; †Ben H. O'Connor, 458 S. Spring St., Los Angeles, Calif.
- SOUTHERN PENNSYLVANIA**—*James W. Minick, 605 No. 2nd St., Harrisburg, Pa.; †Rolf G. Loddengard, 306 Park Ave., New Cumberland, Pa.
- ST. LOUIS**—*George W. Spearl, 1696 Arcade Bldg., St. Louis, Mo.; †F. Ray Leimkuehler, 2825 Olive St., St. Louis, Mo.
- ST. PAUL**—*Roy H. Haslund, 2026 Juliet St., St. Paul, Minn.; †Paul M. Havens, First National Bank Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.
- TENNESSEE**—*Charles I. Barber, 517½ West Church Ave., Knoxville, Tenn.; †William F. Bealer, 1547 West Clinch Ave., Knoxville, Tenn.
- TOLEDO**—*Timothy Y. Hewlett, 303 Richardson Bldg., Toledo, Ohio; †Mark B. Stophlet, Security Bank Bldg., Toledo, Ohio.
- UTAH**—*Lloyd W. McClenahan, 610 Utah Savings & Trust Bldg., Salt Lake City, Utah; †William E. Nelson, 1529 S. 5th St., East Salt Lake City, Utah.
- VIRGINIA**—*Walter R. Crowe, 609 Krise Bldg., Lynchburg, Va.; †Louis Philippe Smither, 112 Kirk Ave., Roanoke, Va.
- WASHINGTON, D. C.**—*Louis Justement, 1223 Conn. Ave. N. W., Washington, D. C.; †Alfred Kastner, 2 Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C.
- WASHINGTON STATE**—*F. A. Naramore, 514 Central Bldg., Seattle, Wash.; †Victor N. Jones, 504 Republic Bldg., Seattle, Wash.
- WEST TEXAS**—*Harvey P. Smith, National Bank of Commerce Bldg., San Antonio, Tex.; †Glenn C. Wilson, 404 West Laurel Place, San Antonio, Tex.
- WEST VIRGINIA**—*Frederic Paris, 1117 Chapline St., Wheeling, W. Va.; †Albert Ford Dickey, Professional Bldg., Huntington, W. Va.
- WESTCHESTER**—*Lewis Bowman, 59 White Plains Rd., Bronxville, N. Y.; †William C. Stohldreier, Peoples Bank Bldg., White Plains, N. Y.
- WISCONSIN**—*Richard Philipp, 707 North Broadway, Milwaukee, Wisc.; †Alexander H. Bauer, 606 West Wisconsin Ave., Milwaukee, Wisc.

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.

The Seventy-First Convention

SECOND NOTICE TO MEMBERS

TIME AND PLACE

THE January number of THE OCTAGON contained the first official notice with respect to the Seventy-first Convention.

The appearance of this second notice is necessary at this time, many months in advance of the Convention, because some of the chapters are now electing delegates and making arrangements for group attendance at the Convention and the XV International Congress of Architects.

The March and April numbers of THE OCTAGON will be devoted to other matters, and will contain few references to the Convention.

Beginning in May, when the program will be in more definite form, extensive advance information concerning the Convention and the Congress will appear in each number of THE OCTAGON.

This and the January number should be consulted by chapters and members for the "Notice of Number of Delegates", and with respect to general arrangements for the meetings in Washington in September.

DATES AND PLANS

See the January number, under the above sub-head, for a general outline of Convention and Congress arrangements.

The Convention will be held in Washington, D. C. on September 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28.

Registration will begin on September 24.

The trip to Williamsburg and the trip to the

New York World's Fair follow the adjournment of the Convention.

Monday, October 2, has been set aside as "Architects' Day" at the New York World's Fair.

The Congress will be held in Washington, D. C. on September 25, 26, 27 and 28, with sessions that parallel or merge with sessions of the Convention.

The distinguished foreign architects will join with us in the trip to Williamsburg by steamer, and in the trip by special train to New York.

A preview of the Congress program by the able chairman of The Institute's Committee on International Congress of Architects, Richmond H. Shreve, appears on page 10 of the January OCTAGON.

ELECTION OF DELEGATES

Special attention is called to the notice in the January OCTAGON concerning the number of delegates which the corporate members of each chapter are entitled to send to the Convention.

It is important that delegates be elected well in advance by the corporate members of chapters and by the state association members, so that all delegates who come to Washington will be conversant with the views of those whom they represent, and with the matters to be considered and acted upon.

Chapter and state association presidents are charged with an important duty in this respect. They should see to it that delegates are elected in strict accordance with the By-laws of The Institute

and the by-laws of their respective organizations.

PROCEDURE FOR ELECTION OF DELEGATES

The By-laws of The Institute, Chapter VI, Articles 1, 2, and 3, state in full the requirements for corporate meetings of The Institute. They set forth the authority and power of delegates; the procedure for (a) fixing the number of delegates entitled to be elected and the number of votes that may be accredited from each chapter, and (b) accrediting and registering such delegates to the meeting.

The number of state delegates to which state association members are entitled, their qualifications, and voting privileges are set forth in Chapter II, Article 2, Sections 5 and 8 of The By-laws of The Institute and the procedure for accrediting state delegates is set forth in Chapter VI, Article 3.

All chapters and state association members are advised that these requirements are mandatory and will be strictly enforced.

Every member who is a delegate must be in *good standing* in The Institute.

Under the definition of *good standing*, Chapter XVI, Article 1, Section 2, paragraph (d) of the By-laws of The Institute, a corporate member is *not* in good standing in The Institute or in any of its chapters or state association members if he is in default to The Institute or any of its chapters or is under suspension.

PROCEDURE FOR NOMINATING OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS BY PETITION

The Secretary hereby advises the members of their privilege of nominating by petition officers and directors, and regional directors, under the provisions of Chapter VI, Article 4, Section 1, paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) of the By-laws of The Institute.

Nominating petitions will *not* be valid as nominations of officers and directors, or of regional directors, unless they meet with the following requirements:

The petitions must be in writing and be filed with The Secretary of The Institute on or before forty days prior to the opening day of the convention or meeting whereat the elections are to take place. (This makes August 15, 1939, the last day for filing nominations at The Octagon.)

Not more than one member shall be nominated

in any petition, and the petition shall contain only his name, the office or directorship to which he is nominated, the signatures of the nominators, and the name of the chapter to which each belongs.

Each such petition must contain the signatures of five or more members, and a petition or petitions containing the signatures of *not less than fifteen corporate members*, comprising not less than five members of one chapter, not less than five members of a second chapter, and not less than five members of a third chapter must be filed with The Secretary before the candidate named by the said members is nominated.

An additional requirement, for petitions nominating regional directors, is that all signers thereof must be members of chapters of the regional district whereof the term of office of the regional director is about to expire.

It is mandatory that each signer of a petition be in *good standing*, which means that he is not in default to The Institute, or his chapter, and that he is not under suspension.

OFFICES AND DIRECTORSHIPS BECOMING VACANT

The offices and directorships to be filled by election at the Seventy-first Convention are indicated by the following list:

Offices (One-Year Terms):

President, Vice-President, Secretary, and Treasurer.

Regional Directorships (Three-Year Terms):

Candidates for regional directorships shall be selected from the members of the regional districts where the vacancies are about to occur. Retiring regional directors are not eligible for immediate reelection unless serving an unexpired term.

The four regional directors to be elected at the coming convention for the three-year terms will represent the four districts named as follows:

Sierra Nevada District

States: California, Nevada, Arizona, Hawaii, and all insular possessions in the Pacific.

Chapters: Arizona, Northern California, South-

ern California, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Hawaii.

Gulf States District

States: Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas.

Chapters: Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, North Louisiana, Tennessee, North Texas, South Texas, West Texas, Central Texas.

Central States District

States: North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma.

Chapters: Iowa, Kansas, Kansas City, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oklahoma, St. Louis, St. Paul.

South Atlantic District

States: Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Florida, Georgia.

Chapters: Alabama, Florida Central, Florida North, Florida South, Georgia, South Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia.

CHAPTER MEETINGS ON CONVENTION BUSINESS

There is a lot of time between now and September—but not too much to give early attention to the question of chapter meetings to be devoted to Institute affairs.

A primary purpose of THE OCTAGON is to keep the members and chapters informed about Institute affairs. That objective is followed consistently from one convention to another.

Those members who have read the notices, statements and articles in THE OCTAGON, published since the New Orleans Convention in April, have a background of facts and opinion from which to crystallize their own views with respect to the problems of the architectural profession and of The Institute.

A CORDIAL INVITATION

The Convention last year in New Orleans was an unqualified success.

The total registration was 700, which exceeded the attendance of all conventions of The Institute in the past twenty-five years, except the one in New York in 1925.

This year The Institute is inviting the entire architectural profession in the United States to attend the Washington Convention, to participate in its formal and informal sessions and parties, and to join with representatives of the federal government in welcoming the distinguished architects from other nations of the world who will be in attendance at the XV International Congress of Architects.

It is particularly incumbent upon members of The Institute—regardless of whether or not they are official delegates—to come to this Seventy-first Convention.

We must do our part as hosts to the International Congress, and we must welcome the non-members of The Institute who will respond to The Institute's invitation to join with it and with its members on this occasion.

As previously stated, the March and April numbers of THE OCTAGON will not contain extensive Convention or Congress material. Beginning in May, detailed information will be published up until the time of the Convention.

Meanwhile, this cordial invitation to the meetings in Washington in September is extended to every member of The Institute, and to any guests whom he may wish to bring.

Take that vacation in September and meet with us in Washington and New York!

CHARLES T. INGHAM,
Secretary.

The Competition for the Smithsonian Gallery of Art

IN response to inquiries which have been received, the following statement is made:

The American Institute of Architects does not disapprove the competition for the Smithsonian

Gallery of Art. Its members, individually, will have to determine for themselves whether or not they care to participate.

Some Notes on The Advisability of Two Stage Competitions And Other Methods of Competition Procedure

(An expression of personal opinion and not at all official)

WHAT appears below are extracts from a rather diffuse article, intended primarily as a committee record, advocating the adoption of two stages in large open competitions. As a preamble it seemed wise to outline the accepted method of jury procedure in limited competitions so as to show, by the amount of work therein involved, the necessity of the reduction of the number of competitors in the final judgment. And then other matters crept in as they always do in committee reports, observations on the excessive cost to the competitors by the mandatory submission of unnecessary and elaborate drawings, a suggestion for a triple jury, and other matters of seeming importance.

So what is written must be read as notes which need not be accepted as facts, except in a few cases, but rather as personal opinions based on experience, and being such, the use of the first person singular may be excused. (*Author's note.*)

I. Jury Procedure in Limited Competitions.

Important competitions, any competitions for that matter, deserve the fair and careful judgment of the jury. As a rule two days, or parts of two days, are allowed for the judgment; and the average number of mounts from each competitor is at least five and possibly more. That means that if there were twenty competitors there would be one hundred or more mounts, and these mounts are always of fair size, and in some cases large. This requires considerable hanging space. In my experience as a juror it is preferable to display the drawings on racks and not tacked up on a wall. The former method makes elimination easier. When a competitor is eliminated, his drawings are slid off the racks and stacked against the wall, and the empty racks are put out of the way, and the three or four best submissions, placed near together, can be judged without the disquieting influence of the discarded sets.

But even twenty submissions require considerable space for their proper display, and the process

of elimination is not always easy. As a general rule only two drawings need be considered in the elimination; an elevation, probably the front, and a plan of the principal floor; but even at that, it is a hard task for the jury. There might be a hundred and fifty running feet of racks, arranged in aisles, and half of the drawings around the corner from the other half. When the jury has got around to the center, most jurors have forgotten what the first drawings look like. The only hope is in elimination. As a rule some few of the submissions are distinctly inferior and can be rejected on the first round.

And that brings up a point. Most programs insist that all voting by the jury should be by secret ballot, and strictly that would apply to the first elimination. In my own jury experience it has been generally, if not always, the case that the first elimination is by *viva voce* vote, and often the second elimination likewise. I see no harm in it myself, and it certainly saves time, but it nevertheless is against the rules generally laid down in the program.

When the selection is narrowed to five or six, or whatever you please, a preliminary vote is taken by secret ballot after a careful consideration and discussion of all the drawings in each submission, checking them with the program requirements. And at this point I have found the presence of the Professional Adviser is a distinct help. He has previously checked the drawings and if he is a good man, as he should be, he is in a position to call the jury's attention to any slips or omissions, or any tricky presentation. Not that the jury couldn't discover these things for themselves of course, but it's a time saver.

And then there is often a feeling on the part of the jury that reconsideration should be given to some of the eliminated schemes, and very likely there will be some shifts; some of the discards may be promoted and some of the original selections discarded. All in all it's a long job and a tedious one, and any jury with twenty submissions will do well to get this far on the first day. And as a

rule it's a good thing to break the judgment at this point. Things take on a different aspect in the morning. *La nuit porte conseil*, or something of the sort. I am never certain about Greek quotations.

Suppose, for the sake of argument, that there are six out of twenty submissions left on the racks in the morning. The usual course would be a recheck of these six, which might result in further shifts from the discard up, and possible further eliminations. Then another tentative secret ballot placing the six in order of preference. This may disclose that the jury are unanimous in the selection of first place; if so, a motion would make this the final ballot. As often as not there are divergent views, a situation which may result in protracted discussion.

The preparation of the report of the jury is then in order; and this report has to be written with great care, particularly if the competition is for some public project, and is a report to an elected or duly appointed Commission. As a rule these Commissions take the stand that they cannot delegate their authority, unless, of course, the Commission itself is the jury, with the inclusion of one or more professional members, and has been appointed with power to select an architect.

In the case of a report from an architectural jury to a Commission having the authority of final selection, the Program of Competition should contain a clause to the effect that the Commission agrees to accept the jury's report unless in their opinion there are good reasons to the contrary, and that in their own report of their decision, they will state these reasons in writing. This stipulation has a good restrictive influence. It is one thing for a Commission to state boldly that they have selected No. 13, but quite a different matter to make a public announcement in writing that they have selected No. 13 instead of No. 10, the jury's choice, for the following reasons, etc. It is a chance that few Commissions care to take. The fourth estate is always on the job, scenting the possibilities of sensational headlines.

But in any case, this architectural jury report is an important matter and should be edited with great care. In my opinion it cannot be a collaborative proposition, the first draft. I've seen it tried often and it always ended in a mess. One juror

suggests one thing, and someone else another, and finally one unfortunate is delegated to go in the next room and make the draft, and bring it back for discussion. It is a better proposition to appoint one juror as secretary at the start, and after a general discussion by the jury, for him to write or dictate the draft in peace and quiet. And the Professional Adviser should see to it that efficient stenographic service is available and that ample time is allowed for the preparation of the report, before the Commission arrives to receive it.

I have known two or three unfortunate occurrences that have arisen from the lack of such precautions. In one case the Commission was informed in advance by the Professional Adviser that the jury's report would be ready for them at, say 4 P. M. on the second day of judgment, and promptly at the appointed hour the Commission, a goodly number of large important men, all smoking Lottie Lees or Judge's Caves or some other local atrocity, stalked majestically in and demanded to know where the something-or-other was that adjective report. And at that particular moment the jury member delegated to write the report, was struggling to dictate it to a blondined, gum-chewing young person who was the public stenographer in the hotel; and who had never bothered to master shorthand but wrote directly on the machine, her repertoire limited to *yours of the 11th instant rec'd and contents noted*.

It was a painful scene. The Professional Adviser, a gentle soul, fluttered like a distracted dove up and down the elevator from the jury room to the mezzanine, the business location of the young person aforesaid; while the Commission sat glowering, and gloomily contemplated the designs with much unsubdued profanity. The senior member of the jury had retired discreetly to his room and his bed, with what he said was a case of incipient flu, and left the third member, the subscribed, cowering in a corner of the jury room. An hour passed, and then the Chairman said he'd be adjetived if he'd wait any longer and he'd pick that one in the corner, a particularly loathsome rendering by some local practitioner undoubtedly, and the rest of the Commission agreed with him.

A tense moment indeed. Finally the third member, who had been secretly fortifying himself for the ordeal, said haltingly that they couldn't do

that, that under Part II, Section 12, of the Program they must first approve or disapprove the report of the jury, and on being asked how they could do that same when there *weren't no report*, agreed to give the report verbally. For some reason, not understandable at the time, perhaps their better nature came to the surface, the Commission reversed their decision and accepted the jury's verbal report and a prominent New York firm was awarded the commission. It was a narrow squeak but the honor of the profession was saved.

Now it sometimes happens that in a competition such as has been above described there is a stipulation in the program that a certain number, or perhaps all, of the competitors shall be ranked by the jury in order of excellence. This is generally because a limited number of prizes are given by the owner in lieu of payment to each individual competitor, and in that case it is the duty of the jury to make this ranking, and it should not be done perfunctorily as is sometimes the case. In some few instances there seems no reason for such ranking, and the demand should be frowned on by the Professional Adviser as an unnecessary waste of the jury's time. But in any case it takes time, and in many cases the jury finds it easier to select the winner than to rank the competitors.

II. A. Reduction of Submissions in Open Competitions—Necessity of.

The procedure to be followed by the jury in a limited competition of twenty competitors has been detailed above to show the vast amount of work that the jury must face in a two-day judgment. The number, twenty, has been used because, in the writer's opinion, that is the maximum number of submissions that can be properly handled in the time allowed. Any number less than that is preferable. And that, also in the writer's opinion, is why some method of reducing the competitors to that number should be adopted in important open competitions.

In the old days when work was plenty and the talented young men not as ambitious as they are now, the number of competitors applying for admission to an open competition rarely exceeded one hundred, and there were few competitions that were wide open. Nowadays work is scarce and the number of talented young men is legion, and

in some of the recent open competitions there were not under a hundred, but well over a thousand competitors, and in a one-stage competition, at that. The idea is appalling. I haven't heard the details of the judgment, so I have no idea how they did it, the jury, that is; but I do know from experience that such a judgment would be sketchy, to say the least, provided of course only two days were allotted. A full week would be all too short; but how could a jury be held together for a week?

II. B. Suggested Method of Reduction.

It is my firm opinion, and I have been in the competition business for forty-odd years, that all open competitions should be held in two stages. The details of arrangement would naturally vary in accordance with the nature of the subject and its importance. A minor subject such as the small Post Office competition recently held by the Government, is one thing; a major project such as a public building, costing half a million and upward is another. Suppose for example the project is a County Court House costing upward of two million, and that for political or other reasons the Commission decides to hold a state-wide competition; my idea of the procedure is as follows:

A competent and experienced Professional Adviser should be appointed, and when I say competent and experienced, I mean just that. Only too often an Adviser is appointed through friendship or from political pressure, a man of no competition experience whatever and with no inclination to seek advice from those qualified to give it. The Committee on Architectural Competitions of The American Institute of Architects always stands ready to give such advice and I only wish more such requests were made to it. Many architects are qualified to give advice, I know, but the chances are that an inexperienced Adviser would prefer to go to an official source.

Nothing can wreck a competition more thoroughly than an incompetent Adviser, and nothing could do more harm to The Institute and the profession.

I recall a case in point, using a different subject and locality of course. A Commission was appointed with power to select an architect for a two million dollar public building in the West. It was a good Commission, of very prominent and

able men, and having decided to hold a competition limited to architects in the county, they sought the advice of local chapter officials of The Institute. One of these officials, with political affiliations but no competition experience, had himself appointed Professional Adviser, and immediately proceeded to make all sorts of outrageous demands on the Commission, who after many weeks of controversy came to the sad conclusion that The Institute was only a *trade union* and a poor one at that, and were on the verge of deciding to make a direct appointment when some local architect urged them to refer the case to The Institute's Committee on Architectural Competitions. This Committee wrote a scathing letter of criticism to the official, had him discharged by the Commission, secured a competent man for Adviser, gave him much help in the development of a very complicated program, and one of their members served on the jury. The result was eminently satisfactory, and The Institute has now no warmer supporters than that building commission, and the whole county for that matter. And The Committee on Architectural Competitions is only too anxious to be of similar service to any who apply to it.

But to return to the conduct of this hypothetical competition: Notice would be given in the papers that all architects in the state wishing to compete should file their application with the Commission before a certain date, and with their application a brief but comprehensive statement of their architectural experience and three photographs of their completed work. With the advice of their Professional Adviser the Commission would approve the applications of those architects whose past performances and general reputation would warrant the Commission in employing them to build the building if the final award was in their favor.

It could be assumed some sixty were admitted to the first stage of the competition; and in the program all competitors would be obliged to affirm that the drawings submitted were made in their own office and from their own design. This affirmation would be difficult to check, but it would carry weight and might be useful in case of future dispute. There would also be a stipulation as to possible association with architects outside the State.

The program for the first stage would be short

and the drawings few, the renderings in pencil on tracing paper mounted, or on white board. A plan of a typical Court Room floor and a front elevation at 1/16 scale; the plan might be at 1/32 if the building was large in area. (I have done three or four competition plans at that scale, and some side elevations and sections too, in the final presentation, and found it quite feasible; simply drawn, it shows the scheme perfectly well and is a great time saver.) There might be a plot plan at 1/64 if there were any peculiarities of the site. No cubage diagram and no description. A month would be ample time for presentation. The usual anonymity provision of course.

The jury should preferably be professional, reporting to the Commission for their final approval, but it might consist of the Commission, if a small one (a big jury is unwieldy and in every way unsatisfactory) with the addition of one professional member and possibly of the Professional Adviser. As a rule I don't entirely approve of the inclusion of the Professional Adviser in a jury; he sometimes has preconceived ideas; and sometimes his actual presence at the judgment is unadvisable; but in a case like this, it might not be a bad idea. In some cases I've known, his inclusion, or at any rate his presence at the judgment, would have led to a more logical decision. In these cases the Commission had definite views as to historical style or the way the building should face, and the Adviser filled many pages in his program developing the local history and preferred arrangement on the lot, all of which was completely disregarded by the professional jury; they may never have even read it, and the result was not at all what the Commission had in mind. The ways of a jury with competition drawings are more unpredictable than the flight of swallows or the way of a man with a maid.

In the judgment of the first stage, the jury would select the ten schemes which, in their opinion, showed the greatest possibilities of development, for it should be remembered that this first stage is for scheme only, and as an indication of the ability of the competitors; and there would be no stipulation that any architect admitted to the final stage would be obliged to adhere to the original scheme in its entirety.

The jury would also select a second block of ten, ranking them in order of excellence. Then

the Professional Adviser and the jury would open the envelopes of the first ten and compare the names with the list of past performances and photographs of executed work submitted by each competitor with his application. If the jury and the Professional Adviser agree that the records of the first ten were sufficiently good to warrant their inclusion in the final stage, the list would be submitted to the Commission for its final approval. But if in the jury's opinion, the Professional Adviser concurring, any of the first ten failed to qualify, other names would be taken from the second block of ten according to rank, and the ten finally selected would be the competitors in the final or second stage, with the Commission's approval, of course.

There are some objections to this method of selection for the first stage. The identity, and to some extent the schemes, of the ten finalists would be known to the Professional Adviser, to the jury and to the members of the Commission. It has been held that previous knowledge of their identity might influence the selection, that individual prejudice might control. It is conceivable that it might, not so much in the case of a professional jury, who probably would be outsiders, but rather by the Commission who were local, and yet I don't think it would govern often. There would certainly be three, and in some cases ten, members on the Commission, and personal prejudice would have to be strong to influence the entire Commission. I have known of a case in which one of the partners of a firm was considered antagonistic to labor, and the Commission, for obvious political reasons, refused to approve him, but by some devious mental convolution, admitted his partner as a competitor.

And of course it is conceivable that a submission might show clever drawings and a good general scheme, and its author prove to be a person or firm of bad repute, a condition not known, or overlooked at the time of approval of his application to compete. And then again, an excellent scheme might be presented by an architect of little or no actual experience, or by one who had built only small work, whose application had been leniently considered, and the Commission, for their own protection, would have to consider this point carefully. There are many who can conceive an in-

teresting scheme at a small scale, but who could not develop the working drawings properly to reproduce that design in the actual building; nor does it follow that an architect who can build attractively a small country house, can be equally successful in large monumental work.

This statement I fear opens up a very controversial point. How can a younger man gain experience if he is not allowed the opportunity, and is not a fresh point of view desirable, and could not the inexperienced author of a fine design be associated with an architect of experience? Reference is made to the English open competitions, instancing St. George's Hall in Liverpool, the Cathedral there, and the County Council building in London.

As to the first instance, St. George's Hall, the exterior is a masterpiece and Elmes was young and had slight experience when he won the competition. I have never seen the competition drawings but the general scheme is undoubtedly his; however, the scheme is so simple that it could be carried out by skillful masons and they had a tradition of good masonry over there at that time. The interior is not very good. They say it is Elmes' scheme, but his early death placed the development in other hands and probably Cockerell was to blame. Gilbert Scott was a young man when he won, but he had tradition behind him. His father and his grandfather were well-known architects; he was brought up in his father's office and undoubtedly had the assistance of that organization. And when the Cathedral was actually built, he had gained experience as the design shows. As for the other structure, the less said the better, and that is the case in other recent English competitions.

As to the association with a more experienced architect, that depends upon the attitude of the individuals; they might work well together but again they might not. I have heard of instances in which there was much friction. If they both fancied themselves as designers, there would certainly be questions on which they would fail to agree, and the Commission would be drawn into the dispute. I have heard of cases where the association was merely perfunctory; the associate bothered little about the job, merely lending his name and moral support.

I would not want to go on record definitely, but

on the whole I think association is of questionable value, particularly to the owner. I have myself had a number of associations with architects of my own selection and the result has been very satisfactory, but the cases were quite different. As a rule the design, working drawings, details and specifications were made in my office and the superintendence and conduct of the actual building, done by the associate. And in one case the design was mine and we made tracing paper developments of fragmentary 1/4 scale elevations, 3/4 scales and full sizes; the actual working drawings and specifications, etc., were made by the associate.

In the hypothetical case we are considering, the winner would probably feel that the drawings and specifications should be made by him, while his more experienced associate might resent that attitude. It's a difficult matter to adjust any way you look at it, and if the associate did the superintendence he might take it on himself to make changes, and one might accuse the other of undermining him with the Commission. If it is hard for the members of a firm to work in harmony, so is it naturally harder for an association.

As for the value of the fresh point of view, there can be no question; the question is how to obtain it. And as to the other point, experience, the word itself is the answer. Experience can only come from experience. And by experience is meant not only in construction, very necessary but purchasable, but in the development of the design which comes only by long practice, and in the handling of the work on the job and in Commission meetings, a very important matter in public work, and sometimes a dangerous one. The architect must not only keep himself out of trouble but he must know how to keep the Commission itself out of trouble on occasion. As a rule the members of the Commission have had little or no previous experience in practical building. They may, quite unwittingly, enter into commitments, or make decisions, the result of which might be unfortunate, and their records and minutes might not be kept in proper order, sometimes forgetting that those minutes and records are subject to public scrutiny. It takes experience plus a good deal of tact to handle such matters.

But a great deal of experience can be obtained at other people's expense; that is a blunt way of

saying in other architects' offices. If a man has never worked in a big office and helped in the handling of important work, he is certainly handicapped when he starts out for himself, but if he has been ten years or so in a large office and is observant and not merely a draftsman, he may well qualify as experienced. I recall the men who were in McKim's the ten years I was there; when they set up for themselves after as long, or longer, an apprenticeship, they were qualified to handle any project. It was old stuff to them. It is true that not many of us had much to do with Commissions, but the gossip in the office taught us a good deal and I myself had the good fortune to hear Mr. McKim hold forth on a number of occasions, and there never was a better man.

And I think it is an assured fact that Commissions or Committees appreciate the help they get from their architect and feel they are in a position to demand it. I recall a case some time ago in a competition for a very large public building. The Commission, in an interview, expressed the hope that in their proposed nation-wide competition they would discover some unknown genius as the winner, some inspired ploughboy as they put it, and their name would go down in history as the discoverer. But when they had talked with The Institute's Committee and had been told what would undoubtedly happen to them and to the state in that case, they were most anxious to find a way to prevent at all cost the emergence of this embryonic genius, and to keep the ploughboy in the barn.

II. C. Alternate Method of Selection.

Objection has been made that the scheme outlined above for the selection of competitors for the second stage, discloses to the jury and the Commission the schemes of the various competitors, and that that would nullify the provision of anonymity, and that if sufficient care is used in the approval of applications to compete in the first instance, then the Professional Adviser only would open the envelopes, and the Commission and the jury would merely know the names of the selected ten finalists, and there would be no need to look up the records as all admitted had qualified.

This objection seems reasonable enough at first glance, but I am inclined to think that the first idea is more practicable. Commissions have ideas

of their own, and I think they would insist on a re-examination of the records of the selected ten, selected merely on the scheme. I think the chances are that any Commission would be inclined to look with a lenient eye on applications to compete. (Some member would say, "Why, Jones and Smith are friends of mine; they're not such hot architects but hell, if they want to compete, I say let 'em; they won't win any way, and I did sorta half promise 'em"). But in the final selection they would be very careful.

And I don't think that anonymity would suffer. I don't believe any of the Commission would remember the schemes well enough to connect them with the names of their author, for the drawings I've proposed are simply presented and one would seem much like the other to them. The Professional Adviser would know, but he would know in any case, and, as a rule, he has no vote. And the jury would not know because my suggestion would be to have a separate jury for the two different stages.

I don't think two juries are absolutely necessary; the same jury would of course be familiar with the conditions and this might simplify the judgment, but they might have preconceived ideas.

And then again the selected ten might change their schemes materially in their restudy for the final stage.

A somewhat moot point in the selection of competitors in the first scheme is the relative importance to be given to architectural ranking and to past performances. I'm inclined to think this should vary with circumstances. A scheme might show evidence of hasty preparation and not in itself be particularly attractive, yet contain the germ of an idea, and its author might be a distinguished architect who had a number of successful buildings to his credit. His inclusion in the final stage would be of advantage to the county. And again a good and well-presented scheme might have an author of little experience and reputation, and a serious doubt might arise in the minds of the jury as to the authenticity of the authorship and his ability to build a really good building.

The jury and the Adviser must realize their responsibility and decide what is to the best interest of the county, and should lead the Commission in their ultimate decision.

II. D. The Second or Final Stage.

Procedure in the second stage would be similar to that outlined for the limited competition. The drawings called for would be more complete, but I take this opportunity to call attention to the entirely unnecessary number and large scale of drawings usually called for in competitions in general.

The main elevation is important and should be rendered in ink at sixteenth scale, but simply rendered; dark backgrounds discouraged; no foliage in front of the building; openings clearly defined.

The main floor plan, not necessarily the entrance floor, but rather the typical floor, also at sixteenth.

These two are the drawings chiefly considered in the judgment. Other plans and other elevations are necessary, and a plot plan and section, but these should be unrendered and might be at a smaller scale. Some competitors and some jury members might prefer the same scale for all drawings, except the plot plan of course; the competitors, with what I think a mistaken idea that it is simpler and quicker to transfer heights, details and plan outline than to redraw at the smaller scale, and perhaps with a feeling that they were physically unable to express the design at half size; the jurors because they think they can understand the scheme better, and comparison is easier if there is no change of scale. My own experience as competitor and juror is quite the reverse. I have found no trouble using one-thirty-second scale, and prefer it for the less important drawings as a time saver.

And I don't see why pencil is not good enough for final drawings—for the elevations and sections at any rate. It is, more often than not, used for the basis of the rendered elevation which I'm inclined to think should be rendered in ink and not pencil or charcoal. This is the particular drawing that the members of the Commission are most interested in, and which they will probably publish or exhibit.

There should be no printed matter on the plans other than the necessary designation of spaces, and no mosaic; only fixed furniture shown, and possibly a one line border around the spaces and around the exterior.

The plot plan unrendered, though roads, paths and simple indications of planting may be shown.

It would save considerable time for the competitors if the survey accompanying the program was made at the scale required for the plot plan, usually one-sixty-fourth, and this survey should be a black and white print for convenience in tracing.

No perspective should be called for. Commissions, as a whole, are inclined to demand this, but the Professional Adviser should advise them that perspectives are often distorted and can be faked, and for that reason have been eliminated from most recent competitions; and that even in the case of a large layout, an aerial perspective is of little use and apt to be deceptive, and that a plot plan is advisable for competition purposes. It could be stipulated that shortly after the award, the winner would be obliged to make a large rendered perspective for exhibition purposes.

All the mounts should preferably be kept the same size for the convenience of handling during the judgment. This often occasions difficulties in arrangement which in most cases can be avoided by placing two or more of the smaller drawings on one sheet.

As a rule public exhibition of all submissions is inadvisable. It is of interest to few but the competitors and, more often than not, the majority of the competitors are not in a geographical position to attend such an exhibition. The publication of the plan and elevation of the winner and of the premiated competitors in an architectural magazine of large circulation is preferable.

And an open exhibition of all the submissions is inviting trouble, particularly in public work. Disgruntled competitors or their friends, or proponents of a different type of architecture from that of the winner, write letters of criticism to the Commission or to the papers, and serious trouble and considerable delay may be the result.

II. E. The Cost to Competitors.

I have stated before, and I wish to emphasize the statement here, that entirely too many drawings are called for in competition programs, and generally at too large a scale, and unnecessarily rendered, and the reason for my statement is this:

Entering large competitions is an expensive habit, and most architects haven't the capital to warrant taking the risk. But they do take it, eagerly as a rule, just hoping against hope that this time they will win. The gambling instinct maybe, the

gypsy in us all, and yet that isn't always the reason. In my own case I have no gypsy as far as I know and yet I've gone in a good many, maybe fifty or so, and I would probably do it again if I thought I had a Chinaman's chance. No, I think it's because we like competitions and we go in 'em, and if we win, all right; if we don't, all right too; ready for the next one. No architect should go in such games of chance, where often there is no chance at all, if he can't take it, and post mortems are taboo, or should be.

We are children, we who fancy ourselves as designers, and as children we should be protected from the vile machinations of the Professional Adviser, who sits up nights thinking how much time and money he can make us spend. And the worst of it is that most of the time he is not vile at all, but on the contrary is a mild mannered person, a Caspar Milquetoast sort of a man, sometimes peering out through an aura of light tangled hair and straggly beard, like a rabbit in a barrel of straw, and he wouldn't know how to machinate if he wanted to. He does these things to us because he doesn't know any better; he has never made a competition drawing in his life, but he prattles away in his program about rendered plans and elevations, and often large-scale details, and in time unless checked firmly, will demand them at full size.

Now any competition, no matter how simple, costs money, to the individual competitor and in the aggregate; and it disrupts office practice, and that costs money too. A large competition, such as I have used as an example, with twenty competitors, might well cost each competitor from two to five, or more, thousand dollars, a total of at least forty thousand and probably nearer seventy-five. Not all of this is lost if the competitors are paid, as they should be in competitions of this magnitude. Assume each competitor is paid a thousand dollars, that would mean a saving of nineteen thousand, and at six per cent, the winner would get a fee of one hundred and twenty thousand, out of which he might net forty or fifty thousand if he were lucky; and the result would be that nineteen men have lost from one to three thousand apiece, a total loss of say fifty thousand dollars; and including the winner's fee, the profession, as represented by the twenty competitors, is better off by about half the

amount paid as fee by the County, and only one man has profited. And if the program requirements were more elaborate than I have indicated, the loss would be proportionately greater.

Any way you look at it, no matter how simple the requirements are, the competitors lose; I have never known a case in which the fee paid unsuccessful competitors covered their expenses. And that fact undoubtedly influences the entrance of many into competitions in which the unsuccessful competitors are not paid at all, and there are many such competitions, though usually for minor projects. Knowing they are going to lose in any competition unless they happen to be the winner, architects as a rule blithely step up and take a chance. It's not fair of course; some payment should be made, but The Institute can hardly insist on that point in the mandatory requirements of the Code.

Many architects opposed to competitions in principle bolster their opposition by harping on this out-of-pocket loss to the profession, forgetting, or not realizing, the necessity of competitions and their ultimate value to the profession and to the public at large.

As to the necessity—take the example I have given above. The Building Commission might choose, or at least desire, to make a direct appointment of an architect. If they did that, they might, from political pressure or from personal reasons, appoint an incompetent man, or some one whose willful or inexperienced actions might result in an investigation by the courts. It is too great a risk for them to take, and nowadays it seldom happens that a direct appointment is made; and in any event there is bound to be criticism and public careers may well be blasted.

And then too, it is very difficult for a Commission, or even the Building Committee of a small project, to agree on an architect; each member favors a different man; there is a stalemate, and a competition becomes a necessity. And a competition properly conducted, is a safeguard for the holders of it; the responsibility is shifted to The Institute. I think few who have not had direct experience, realize how much this shift of responsibility is appreciated. There is seldom, if ever, serious public criticism of a well-conducted competition. It is accepted by the press and by people in

general as a fair and impartial solution of the problem. Some interested parties may feel badly that their man was not appointed, but seldom are hard feelings engendered.

So much for the necessity. As to the value to the public, there can be little question. Any good arrangement that takes the appointment of an architect, or any professional for that matter, out of politics, is a good thing for the County, State or Nation; and while I do not hold that all competitions result in the selection of the best man or the best scheme, I think there is no doubt that the chances are largely in favor of a better building as the result of a competition than would happen in the case of a direct appointment.

And as to the value to the profession—It takes the award of the commission out of the hands of those inexperienced in architectural procedure, and possibly influenced by political pressure, and puts it where it should be, in the hands of the Institute and of the architects themselves. It offers the chance of successful attainment not to one man alone, but to twenty of the best architects in the vicinity, or to a hundred or more, if the competition is open, state or nation-wide. And that chance of attainment means much. The history of American architecture is full of examples of men whose reputation started from, or even rests upon, success in one important competition. Dr. Thornton is known as the successful architect of the Capitol at Washington; the New York Public Library brought Carrere and Hastings into prominence; Paul Cret—but there is no need of continuing the list; every architect knows what the winning of a big competition may mean and he knows, too, that there is something beyond the mere winning; the completed structure must be worth acclaim when he finishes it, or else his reputation is not made, but what little he has had, is lost.

And so, if it is agreed that competitions are necessary, and like the poor, will always be with us, it is for us in The Institute to spread the Gospel of competitions among our possible clients, the public, and particularly those officials charged with the selection of architects; to devise some method of explaining in the simplest and shortest terms just what a competition is, and how it should be handled; and more than all, we must educate our-

selves. We must make it definitely understood that good intentions, handicapped with lack of experience and combined with unwillingness to seek advice, are not the qualifications of a good Professional Adviser, and emphasis must be placed on the responsibility which attaches to that position, and to the professional members of the jury; and to be fair to the great body of competitors, we must see to it that program requirements are simplified, that fewer and less elaborate drawings are required, that the judgment is made less onerous and that the expense of competing and the ultimate loss be minimized.

III. Predilections of the Owner.

I have above briefly referred to the fact that the very definite ideas of the Owner sometimes given prominence in a program, are often totally ignored by the professional jury. It is a serious matter, and may do great harm to the profession. Occasionally the Owner, through his Commission, asserts himself, but more often the Commission feels bound to accept the jury's decision though they may not entirely agree with it, and dissatisfaction is the result.

Generally this is the fault of the Adviser; he, too, is submerged by the perhaps better-known jurymen and makes no protest, although he feels the decision is wrong. And then it may be that the Owner's ideas are not always definitely expressed in the program; there may be a casual mention, but too great latitude is allowed. The Owner decides that to be in character with the locality, a simple Colonial style is required, and that may be the strong feeling of the townspeople. If so, this should be definitely stated in the program, perhaps made mandatory. After all, whether you like Colonial or not, the Owner does, and the town does, and it is the business of the Adviser and the Jury to see that they get it.

And such definite statements help, and not hinder the competitors. If they know that this church for example has to be Gothic, they can either do a Gothic church or stay out of the competition, if they hate Gothic enough to do that.

And such definiteness broadens the competition. If it is decreed that the church be Gothic, then all the submissions will be Gothic; if there is merely a feeble suggestion, or the matter is left open, three

submissions may be Gothic, three Colonial and three Modern. And how can that be judged? And the Owner, instead of having a choice of nine, has only a choice of three.

IV. Appointment of the Jury.

There is always a question as to the method of selection of the jury, and whether their names should appear in the program. On this point I am not sure. If the Adviser is experienced and knows good architects who are available, the simplest procedure is for him to appoint. In some cases he nominates five or six names and the competitors ballot by mail for three, this method being possible only in a limited competition, or perhaps in the second stage of an open one. I have seen good results either way, and other results that are not so good. Often a very good architect is a poor juror, and I've been on juries on which a member who was not well known, and who had never done any large work similar to the subject of the competition, proved to be a most valuable juror, logical and of excellent taste. And a very prominent architect is sometimes too opinionated and tries to run the jury. It's a toss-up and you never can tell. As a rule I've taken it as it goes, and the few times I have voted for a juror, I've generally regretted it.

As to publishing the names of the jury in the program, I am inclined to favor it. The complexion of a jury does influence the competitors, there is no doubt of that. It's all well enough to say that it shouldn't, that every man should do what he thinks is the best scheme, but after all, the man wants to win and it's natural for him to take the course that seems to lead to the winning post.

For example, suppose the competition was held years ago for a church and the late Henry Bacon was a jury member. Every one who knew Harry Bacon, even slightly, would know that he would be the dominant figure on the jury, and that the winning design would be Classic or Georgian and extremely simple and austere. Harry would make up his mind in the first half hour and nothing could change it.

On the other hand, suppose Bertram Goodhue or his partner, Cram, were the dominating figures; in that case the style would be Gothic. All this on the supposition that the style was not rigidly

insisted on in the program.

Or in a modern competition; if the complexion of the jury was New-Dealerish no submission using columns or without cantilevers would be in the running.

To be sure there is danger in playing up to a jury. I recall a melancholy example of my own. It was way back in prehistoric times, 1910, I think, and for a Post Office and Court House in New Haven. It was announced in the program that Cass Gilbert would be a juror. Now Cass had recently done a Library on the green opposite the site of the Post Office and his design was Colonial, in brick and marble, and very small in scale. And I knew, and most of the competitors knew, that Gilbert would dominate the Jury, and that he would have no truck with any scheme that had a big order and that was big enough in scale to dominate his Library, and we governed ourselves accordingly.

And then—a week before the judgment Cass sailed for Europe, and the winner had an enormous order of forty feet or more and a ten columned portico. Oh well, competitions are a gamble, aren't they all?

V. A Suggested Form of Jury.

I have long had in mind, but never had a chance to try it out, a new idea to prevent snap judgments or unduly influenced judgments. I have always had the feeling that the same jury, meeting a couple of weeks or so after the judgment and reviewing all the submissions, might reverse their judgment and select a different scheme. Of course that is not a practical solution; no Commission would stand for the delay.

Now my suggestion is not practical either, or might not be considered so, as it would take more time and be more expensive than the usual method. But it's a better and safer scheme than the others. I would have three juries of three members each, entirely professional, or dominantly professional, and these three juries would hold separate meetings on separate days and render separate judgments. If they were identical, the judgments, and that would be unlikely unless one submission was outstanding, if they were identical there could be no question as to the decision; but if they were not, then the three juries would hold a joint meeting

and thrash the matter out. It would be cumbersome I admit, and expensive, but in a very important national competition, it's worth trying.

VI. Examples of Two-Stage Competitions.

There have been a good many cases, I suppose, of two-stage competitions with which I am not familiar, but there are a few that I know more or less about.

In 1912, in Missouri, a State Capitol Building Commission, a bi-partisan committee of four, was appointed to select an architect by competition, a method stipulated in the legislative act. It was not an alteration, but an entirely new building on the old site, as the former Capitol, the central portion of excellent design dating back to 1830, was struck by lightning and completely destroyed by fire. As this happened in the dead of winter, and a winter of record cold at that, the occurrence was hailed generally as an act of God, with added qualification that the good Lord would have done a better job if He had waited till the Legislature was in session.

The Commission decided to hold a nation-wide open competition, and having wisely sought the advice of The Institute, also decided to hold the competition in two stages. Applications were received from all over the country, and some seventy firms qualified to enter. The submissions for the first stage were very simple, a plot plan at sixty-fourth and a plan of the main or legislative floor at one-sixteenth, all in pencil, no elevations required. There was an advisory architectural jury of three, holding, I believe, joint sessions with the Commission, and the selection of ten firms to go in the final stage was governed by the architectural merit of the submissions plus the experience and reputation of their authors. Which of these governed most in the selection, I don't know, but from the fact that no elevations were called for, I assume that the latter was the dominating factor, and as a matter of fact the final ten were all well established firms who had done important work.

There was an incident at this judgment which showed the far-reaching influence of The Institute. When the idea of a competition was being considered, The President and other high officials of The Institute made a special trip to Missouri, and labored long and successfully to get the Commis-

sion to eliminate from the program some provisions not in accord with established practice; and when the Jury and the Commission were walking down High Street after a long day's judgment, there was a clatter of hoofs and a pair of runaway mules dashed round a corner. One of the jury, Magonigle, it was, for some unaccountable reason, (after a day of looking at seventy submissions a man is not responsible for his actions), stalked majestically out to the middle of the street and brandished his light bamboo stick, and believe it or not, those mules stopped as if they'd run into a freight train. "Man, that was a risky thing to do," said one of the Commission. "Oh, I don't know," said the Chairman, "those mules knew he was a member of The American Institute of Architects."

There was one interesting and unusual provision in the program. The original site which was to be used for the new Capitol, was not large and was encumbered by several old buildings used by the State which had to remain until the new Capitol was ready for occupancy. Considerable adjacent property had to be bought, and the grade conditions were unusual, and so it was made mandatory for the ten finalists to visit the site and confer with the Commission and the Professional Adviser. A very wise provision, and as I have said, quite unusual.

Something of the same thing was obligatory in the case of the Nebraska Capitol somewhat later, although that was a one-stage invited competition, and also for the two-stage competition for the Harvard Business School.

The Missouri final stage was similar to a closed competition. There was a professional jury of three, but of different personnel from the jury for the first stage. The drawings were large in number and in size, at least five plans at sixteenth, three elevations, two sections and a plot plan at thirty-second scale. Front elevations and plot plan rendered in ink, and a quarter scale detail taken at will, and a description, too, which I understand no one read. All very expensive and unnecessary.

There was an incident in the judgment that is worthy of notice, which I heard later from the Chairman of the Commission. The decision of the professional jury was only advisory, as is usual in such cases, as the Commission could not dele-

gate their authority. And as I understand it, there was a delay of a day or so in the arrival of the Jury, and the Adviser, who was checking the cube, allowed the Commission to have a preview of all the submissions. He probably couldn't help himself, it's a ticklish thing to fall foul of a determined Commission, or perhaps, not being very experienced, he didn't know such a thing was not according to Hoyle. However that may be, the Commission considered the drawings at length and decided on motion that they would only accept No. 8, no matter what the Jury decided, but they didn't tell the Jury this. And by a strange coincidence the Jury also picked No. 8 and departed serenely unconscious of their narrow escape from a possible serious controversy. I know personally of another case practically similar, and there may be others, but I don't recall a case in which the decision of the Jury was overthrown.

Another large two-stage competition was held in 1925 for the Harvard Business School. I'm not familiar with the details of this, although I did qualify for the final. As I recall it the drawings in the first stage, though simple, were considerably more elaborate than in the Missouri example. I think there was a plot plan, as the site was large and a number of buildings contemplated, and there was an elevation or two, or perhaps only an aerial perspective. I don't know how many applications there were, nor how many were selected for the final, nor how the selections were made, but I have a vague idea the number was five or six. There were, I believe, an equal number especially invited, who did not have to enter the first stage. And here again the finalists were obliged to visit the site.

In 1928 a two-stage competition was held in New Haven for a large City Hall, with a Hall of Records and an Auditorium. The first stage was open only to architects established in New Haven, who were permitted to associate with outside architects. I don't know how many were in the first stage, but only three were selected for the final, and with these three, were three specially invited from outside the State, six in all. It was a good program, the final one I mean. There were three elevations at sixteenth, rendered in ink, but the plans and sections were at thirty-second scale, a very good idea as the ground area was large and

irregular, and the plan showed up very well at that scale and was much easier to read than if at sixteenth, and of course much easier to make. There was a professional jury, but as usual, the final decision was in the hands of the Commission, who accepted the Jury's report.

VI. Association.

I have mentioned above the permitted association of local and outside architects. I'm not at all sure whether it is a good idea or not. In the old days, in the McKim days, such a thing was unheard of, as far as I know, and it certainly was not a common practice until ten or fifteen years ago. By that time there had developed what might be called specialists, with apologies to Chic Sale of course, clever designers who had gained experience in many competitions and had developed a technique in scheme and presentation. Their submissions had a finished, professional sort of look that stood out beyond the run of ordinary submissions. They were not always successful, but always potentially dangerous. A competition might be held, for example, in which the competitors were limited to architects practicing in an outlying State in which there were few who knew the competition game. The wise architects there would associate themselves with one of these specialists and the other local men didn't have a Chinaman's chance. Unfair perhaps in a way, but the State was certainly the gainer; they got a better building than they otherwise would, if of course the association continued for the life of the job, a stipulation which should always be in the program. This intended association should always accompany the application, and the names of approved competitors should be published in the program, or if that was not possible, in a bulletin to all competitors; but even so, many of the local men would not wake up to the possibilities of such an association until it was too late.

There is no implied criticism intended in what I have written above; it is a mere statement of fact. Those I have referred to as specialists, are not merely clever men who make a practice of ghost work for firms who need outside assistance, but on the contrary are well-known and established firms who have had a long and successful practice, and they certainly do not make a habit

of seeking such association; their assistance is sought because of their reputation for good design, their experience and their success in competitive work, and they are often associated in work not competitive. And so jealous are they of their reputation that they usually insist on practical control of the design as developed in the working drawings if the association is a winner. And this association is known in advance and approved by the Owner, who generally understands that the design is not entirely, or perhaps even partially, the work of the local man.

But there may be another side to it. The Owner, or his Commission rather, may know the true authorship of the design but the majority of people in the City or State don't know it, or have forgotten it even if they ever did know it. Smith and Jones, the local firm, get the credit of it generally. And there may be other local firms more competent architecturally than Smith and Jones who didn't know about, or care to take advantage of, the possibilities of such an association. It seems rather unfair, but I don't know what can be done about it, or whether it would be a good idea to try to do something about it. In any case the State is the gainer, and a better building is the result. For purely personal reasons I'm for it, for although I'm not in the specialist class, I have been associated a number of times, chiefly in non-competitive work, and the result has been satisfactory, to me at least.

VII. An Example of a Good Simple Program.

One of the first, and in many ways the best, competition programs I ever worked under, was written by Knox Taylor, then Supervising Architect of the Treasury. It was some thirty years ago, before many of the modern competitors were born, and it antedated the Competition Code by many years. It was for a large Post Office and Court House in Denver, and was a limited competition of twenty held under the Tarsney Act.

The program consisted of but two printed pages, perhaps equal to four or five pages in a typewritten modern program. The drawings called for were a front elevation, rendered at sixteenth, a side elevation and a section in line at the same scale, and only two plans, one of the Post Office floor and one of the Court Room floor. The dimensions of

the building were roughly two hundred by three hundred and forty feet, occupying an entire block. Actually there were four full floors and some roof space, but Knox, with his usual common sense, said that the basement requirements were highly technical and would be worked out afterwards by his departmental experts, and a plan of it was not necessary for the competition, and that the floor over the Court rooms, and the roof space were for the accommodation of various Governmental departments the detailed arrangement of which it was not necessary to show in the competition drawings, but that merely an allowance be made for a given area, well lighted and suitable for subdivision into offices.

And this proved to be all that was necessary. The winner was given a list of these departments and the area they asked for, and was instructed to go out to Denver, taking with him a number of white prints of the competition plans in outline indication; and he was to see all the departmental heads, assign the space to each, and make a layout for them to approve. Knox, being experienced and practical, said they would all ask for five or six times the space they then occupied, and would all want to be on a corner near an elevator, but that they would have to take what they could get, and the Government would back up any arrangements made.

Knox was quite right. For example, the Animal Industry was found to have two office workers and three or four field men who were always away somewhere, and they occupied one room about twenty by twenty over a drug store, as happy and contented as an animal crowd could be, but they asked for sixty or seventy running feet of office space, all outside light, and on the southwest corner, next the elevator of course, and with two private lavatories. Actually they got maybe half the space, on a court, and no lavatories of their own, and the Animal man said, "Oh well, that's O. K. with me, mor'n I expected to get anyway," and cheerfully signed the assignment plan, and extended a cordial invitation to drive out on the hills about a hundred miles and inspect a herd that had contracted some loathsome form of foot and mouth disease.

And so with all the other departments. Some kicked a bit, but when shown there was no more

room in the building than there was, all signed their layout, which was approved by Washington and built that way.

Now I only mention this to show the practical side of working drawing development after the award, and to show how unnecessary it was to show a plan of this floor in the competition drawings. It took a week of hard work to get that result, and any competitor's layout would be futile and a waste of time. And that would apply to any competition, and in the judgment the jury would never consider that plan at all; what do they care about the Animal man and his demand for a corner and a johnny or two of his own. The main thing to be brought out in a competition is the scheme, the important features of the plan, the looks of it and the style of it, and a monumental interior shown by a section or two, and if the site presents unusual conditions, a plot plan. And all Knox Taylor demanded for the Post Office work room was a clear, well lighted area of a given size and minimum height; no indication of Post Office boxes or racks or conveyors or spy galleries; all that they would do later, and they might have to make that layout a dozen times before it was built; and the basement arrangement was equally technical. And yet most of the competition drawings, except that of the winner who didn't know enough to attempt it, showed the work room filled to the nozzle with indications of furniture and fixings, the arrangement of which must have taken weeks of study.

VIII. Adherence to the Winning Scheme in Principle.

John Carrere used to say that a competition was for the selection of an architect, and that, when selected, the winner would have to start all over again, and his thesis was that if the ultimate structure was a Library they might well hold a competition for a supposititious City Hall, and then the winner could start his Library scheme *ab ovo*, or words to that effect. A quaint and fanciful idea which does not work out in practice. I know of no case where the winning design was not substantially followed in actual construction. And I found the reason was this.

In a particular case, the Commission and the Adviser had spent several months in study of the problem, and had visited a number of similar build-

ings throughout the country, and the program they issued was based on the information they thus received, and the requirements were definite and mandatory, certain floors contained certain departments of fixed area, so that virtually all submissions were substantially similar in plan and in arrangement, and the elevations ran to a type. The winner had an entirely different scheme in mind from the first, but he couldn't use it in the competition because of definite location of departments and floors, and after the award he thought he could put his original scheme over, and he presented a draft of it to the Commission.

The Commission agreed that his ideas though novel were on the whole preferable, less expensive to maintain and certainly no more expensive to build, but—always that deadly word—but they had spent much time and much public money in trips of inspection and in the preparation of the program, and had called for certain definite arrangements, and had selected the scheme that best met these requirements, and more than all, the winning scheme had been widely published in the papers, and if they actually built an entirely different scheme, they would stultify themselves in the eyes of their constituents, there would be much public criticism and possible injunctions; minor changes might be considered but no radical change.

And from their point of view they were right, and in nine cases out of ten that point of view prevails. And, as I have said, I know of no instance in which a substantial departure has been made from the winning scheme.

IX. Danger of Guessing the Winner.

A favorite indoor sport that often enlivens the end of a judgment, is the generally futile attempt of the jury to pick the name of the winner. In the old days before associations became prevalent and a new lot of renderers appeared in the lineup, it was not such a difficult matter in a limited competition. We knew the names of the competitors, and we knew, or thought we knew, their individual preference in design; and in some cases the rendering was a dead giveaway. Any child could spot Eggers' method and his trees a mile away, and the submission might just as well have been signed in large red letters. Harry Bacon didn't compete often, but his design was characteristic, and his in-

scriptions starting A B C etc., usually ended in a declaratory statement, easily decipherable if you transposed the letters. I remember one read, IHA TECOM PETITIO NSIR EAL LYDO. But there was one man you never could spot and that was Henry Hornbostel. "Henny" varied his entire presentation in every competition he went in, in one case making all his drawings in red crayon; it was technically monochrome, and he got away with it and won, but I don't think it's ever been done before or since. I recall a case in which one jurymen successfully named all seven competitors, but I refuse to give his name.

Now that's quite wrong, of course, but I'm sure it never made any difference in the judgment. Juries are a conscientious lot as a rule. I know cases where the entire jury voted first place to a submission we all confessed afterward we were confident was done by a man we did not care for and who we knew couldn't produce a good building, although his scheme was so outstanding there was no second choice. And when the envelope was opened the figurative birds began to sing, because it contained the name of an entirely different person, a good man and a friend. You never can tell, and guessing is dangerous.

Dangerous in this way. The envelope containing the winner's name is not always opened in the presence of the jury. The Adviser does that later in the presence of the Commission, who authorizes the announcement when they are good and ready, and that may be weeks later. And some of the jury, who should know better, guess at the name of the winner and tell him confidentially. If they are right, it doesn't make much difference, but if wrong, it's sad. There was a big Government competition, many, many years ago, and a jurymen coming up from Washington just after the judgment called up dear old Walter Cook at his country place on Long Island at three o'clock in the morning, got him out of bed and passed on the glad tidings that he'd won. And it wasn't for two weeks or more that Uncle Walter knew that he hadn't.

And in another Government competition, a Post Office in New Haven, a jurymen called up Magonigle and asked if his scheme had a ten columned portico, big columns, and when "Miggle" said that was God's truth, he got the good news and weeks

later got a shock when he learned that another competitor, who also had a ten columned portico, (I know that sounds strange to modern ears, but we all did that in competitions in those days), had his name in the right envelope. There ought to be a

law against such things; an open season for foolish jurymen, and perhaps, though I shudder to think of it, for elderly prattlers who take competitions seriously.

EGERTON SWARTWOUT.

Payment for Plans and Specifications

RECENT P. W. A. RULING

THE national office of the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., was recently advised by one of their chapters that in connection with the construction of certain P. W. A. non-Federal projects, the general contractor had been required to purchase from the architect sets of plans and specifications need to prosecute the work.

The facts were submitted to officials of the Public Works Administration with the request that such practice be prohibited, inasmuch as the costs of plans and specifications necessary for use by the general contractor constituted a fair and proper charge payable by the owner.

The Public Works Administration has instructed its regional directors that the cost of plans and specifications necessary for use in the construction of any P. W. A. project is to be construed as a part of the job cost and must be paid for by the owner, and that contractors shall not, under any circumstances, be required to pay for such plans and specifications as may be needed in prosecuting their work.

The P. W. A. headquarters recommended that violations of this ruling be reported to the appropriate regional P. W. A. office in such cases where such violations cannot be settled locally.

Expediting Election Procedure

NOTICE TO THE CHAPTERS OF THE INSTITUTE

IN order to expedite the election of applicants for corporate membership in The Institute, The Board of Examiners of The Institute—beginning in the month of March, 1939—will hold regular monthly meetings at The Octagon.

The fixed day for these meetings will be the first Tuesday after the first Monday of each month.

The Board of Examiners consists of Edward W. Donn, Chairman, and Robert F. Beresford and

Frederick V. Murphy, members.

Chapter officers, executive committees and membership committees are requested to bear in mind the desirability of filing applications at The Octagon sufficiently in advance of the regular meeting day of The Board of Examiners to permit the necessary completion of details.

CHARLES T. INGHAM,
Secretary.

Gifts to The Institute

IN the November, 1938, number of THE OCTAGON an announcement was made calling attention to the possibilities of tax saving through gifts and legacies to The Institute.

Owing to a recent ruling by the Treasury Department the notice mentioned above, concerning

tax exemption, is hereby amended.

Certain gifts for specified purposes may continue to be exempt, but rulings will have to be secured on each proposal, and it is requested that The Institute be consulted before making any positive disposition of proposed gifts.

Members Elected

EFFECTIVE JANUARY 23, 1939

Chapter	Name	Chapter	Name
<i>Baltimore</i>	WILLIAM F. STONE, JR.	<i>Kansas City</i>	JOSEPH WM. RADOTINSKY
<i>Boston</i>	PAUL F. NOCKA	<i>Minnesota</i>	WILBUR AUGUST BACKSTROM
<i>Chicago</i>	JOHN STAFFORD CROMELIN, ARTHUR GEORGE EPPIG, ISRAEL SIDNEY LOEWENBERG, GEORGE W. MURISON, JR., RAYMOND JOHN SCHWAB, DAVID H. SMITH	<i>Scranton-Wilkes-Barre</i>	*DONALD F. INNES
		<i>Southern California</i>	CHARLES ORMROD MATCHAM
		<i>Utah</i>	*LORENZO YOUNG
		<i>Wisconsin</i>	HERBERT J. GRASSOLD ELMER A. JOHNSON
<i>Detroit</i>	OTIS WINN		

* Reinstatements.

British Architects' Conference

DUBLIN, JUNE 21-24, 1939

THE Annual Conference of British Architects and the Centenary Celebration of the Royal Institute of the Architects of Ireland will take place this year in Dublin from June 21 to 24 inclusive, when the Royal Institute of the Architects of Ireland will be the hosts of the Conference.

Members of The American Institute of Archi-

ects who may be in Britain at the time mentioned will be heartily welcomed at the various functions which will form part of the program.

Copies of the program with full particulars may be obtained from The Secretary of the Royal Institute of British Architects, 66 Portland Place, London, W. I.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY SCHOLARSHIPS

Schermerhorn Traveling Fellowship.

Open to graduates of the School of Architecture who are citizens of the United States, for a period of ten years following the first conferring of a degree of architecture.

University Fellowship.

Awarded annually by the University Council to a graduate student who is especially fitted to pursue courses in higher study and investigation in architecture. The stipend does not exceed \$1,500.

Tuition Fellowship.

Several tuition fellowships of \$400.00 each are

also offered by the School of Architecture to holders of the first architectural degree, for graduate study in general architectural subjects, planning and housing, or design correlation.

There are also several special tuition scholarships available to candidates who are eligible for entrance to the School of Architecture. These candidates must have completed a minimum of two years of academic work, including English, foreign languages, and mathematics.

For further information apply to Dean Leopold Arnaud, School of Architecture, Columbia University, New York City.

GEORGE G. BOOTH TRAVELING FELLOWSHIP

Offered by the College of Architecture, University of Michigan.

The competition for the fellowship is open to all graduates of the school less than thirty years of

age, and will be conducted during the two weeks beginning April 7. For further information apply to Dean Wells I. Bennett, College of Architecture, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

With The Chapters

NEWS NOTES FROM CHAPTER SECRETARIES

Baltimore.

The annual meeting of the Baltimore Chapter was held at the Hamilton Street Club on January 25.

The retiring President, D. K. Este Fisher, Jr., in a valedictory outlined some of the more important achievements of the chapter during the year just ended. He announced that under the chairmanship of Lucien Gaudreau, the committee that had been at work for several years in collaboration with all the building trades, had just about completed its labors on the long awaited "Standard Specifications" and that only the relatively simple considerations of publication and sale remained.

The Committee on the Washington-Baltimore-Annapolis Regional Plan has been continuously at work under the indefatigable leadership of William Ellicott. Edmund R. Purves, Regional Director, and Dr. Abel Wolman, Chairman of the Maryland State Planning Commission have collaborated most generously, and through the interest of the Women's Clubs the problem has been enlarged to include the design and control of county roads throughout the state.

Mr. Fisher mentioned that during the past successful year John H. Scarff had been chairman of an interim Trustees' Advisory Committee in charge of the operation of the Baltimore Museum of Art and that he would continue his services until next September, when the new Director, Mr. Leslie Cheek, Jr., will assume the responsibility.

The following officers were elected to serve during 1939:

John H. Scarff, President; C. D. Loomis, Vice-President; Lucien E. D. Gaudreau, Secretary; T. Worth Jamison, Treasurer.

Mr. Scarff announced that Sir Raymond Unwin, British architect and authority on housing, had accepted an invitation to talk at the Baltimore Museum of Art on March 10, on "Low Cost Housing in England and America". All members of the Chapter are invited to attend the meeting, which promises to be an outstanding event of the season.

LUCIEN E. D. GAUDREAU, *Secretary*

Boston.

The annual meeting and election of officers of the Boston Chapter was held on January 10, and the following officers were elected:

John T. Whitmore, President; Eliot T. Putnam, Vice-President; Howard T. Clinch, Secretary. Stanley E. Davidson, Clifford Allbright, and G. Holmes Perkins, were elected to the executive committee for terms of three years.

A review of the reports of standing and special committees showed that the Chapter had actively participated in the advancement and welfare of the profession.

The committee on registration has again started an active campaign to secure passage in the Legislature of a bill for the registration of architects. The committee on publications and information has started a campaign of publicity in cooperation with the newspapers and the publication of vital news items and activities in the "Bulletin".

The Chapter looks forward to a good year.

STANLEY E. DAVIDSON, *Secretary*

Central New York.

At the January meeting of the Chapter, Dr. Sidney Poole, of the Department of Geography, Syracuse University, gave a most interesting talk on his explorations of Mayan civilization in Yucatan, illustrated with moving pictures.

The Chapter voted to give to the College of Architecture, Cornell University, and the Department of Architecture, Syracuse University, fifty dollars each to be used for student prizes for the current year. The method of awarding was left to the discretion of the faculties of the schools.

Following the business meeting, members were given the opportunity to inspect the new building of the School of Medicine, Syracuse University, by Dwight J. Baum and the late John Russell Pope, associated architects.

CLEMENT R. NEWKIRK, *Secretary*

Central Texas.

This new chapter of The Institute, the Seventy-first, held its first election of officers at a dinner

meeting on the evening of January 9. Goldwin Goldsmith, was elected president; Hugo F. Kuehne, vice-president; and Clifford H. James, secretary-treasurer. Members of the executive committee, in addition to the officers, are Walter T. Rolfe and Arthur Fehr.

Two days previous, members of the chapter were guests of the West Texas Chapter at the latter's annual meeting, which this year was a formal dinner-dance at the San Antonio Country Club. Up until the formation of the Central Texas Chapter, the local group was a branch of the West Texas Chapter.

Over the course of the next several meetings, representative contractors and craftsmen will be invited to meet with the Chapter in open forum discussions of joint problems in the building field.

CLIFFORD H. JAMES, *Secretary*

Detroit.

Albert Kahn spoke on "Industrial Architecture", at the Michigan Building Industry luncheon at the Detroit-Leland Hotel.

Mr. Kahn, who, with his brother Julius developed a new system of reinforced concrete construction about the time Detroit industrialists began the manufacture of automobiles on a large scale, has contributed to American industrial architecture a style that is distinctly its own.

In his talk he outlined the progress made in the design of factory buildings from the time when they were adaptations of existing structures to the most highly efficient "machines" of today, paying tribute to leaders of the automobile industry, who had the vision and courage to permit him to pioneer in new methods.

At first, Mr. Kahn related, multi-story buildings were used almost exclusively and many such large plants were erected, until it was discovered that much time and money could be saved by one-story plants. Consequently, the process of rebuilding began and one important building after another was replaced all over the country to make way for the new conception.

Mr. Kahn by no means believes that we have reached the ultimate in design and construction, pointing out that new materials, new methods and new ideas offer a challenge to the imagination of the architect.

He paid tribute to the Government for its assistance to the building industry in providing many useful projects, and emphasized the importance of cooperation of all elements of the building industry in meeting these ends.

TALMAGE C. HUGHES, *Secretary*

Florida North.

The annual banquet of the Chapter was held in the Roosevelt Hotel, Friday, January 13. Interesting reports were made of the Chapter's activities during 1938.

Officers elected for the ensuing year are:

LeeRoy Sheftall, President; Fred A. Henderich, Vice-President; Joseph H. Bryson, Secretary-Treasurer; and Harry M. Griffin, Ivan H. Smith, O. E. Segerberg, Directors.

Members of the Florida State Board of Architecture and their wives, and the wives of the chapter members, and other distinguished persons were present.

High praise was given Mrs. Ivan H. Smith for her splendid assistance in securing Mr. Serge Borowsky and his ensemble of singers and dancers. He presented a "Russian Program" in costume, with the proper setting. The show was the outstanding feature of the evening, and the Russian dancers, in their vivid colors, were most unique.

LEEROY SHEFTALL, *Secretary*

Kentucky.

A lesson was learned by the Kentucky Chapter at the First Convention of the Association of Kentucky Architects, held on January 26, 1939, that should be of value to all chapters. It is this:

Chapters should inform all the architects in their territory of the aims and accomplishments of The Institute, and of its efforts to secure more favorable legislation for the profession, and the reasons why some efforts have failed and how others could fare better with greater cooperation within the profession. Our experience has led me to believe a policy of mailing such information to all registered architects would result in greatly increased chapter membership.

The Association of Kentucky Architects was almost lost to The Institute as a State Association Member at this convention simply because we had failed to inform the members of the Association of

all The Institute is doing. The entire transaction of reviving the dormant Association, and making it an active Association member of The A. I. A. had taken place so rapidly that too few of the Association members had any idea of the benefits to be gained by this form of affiliation, resulting in an undercurrent of dissatisfaction with the entire procedure, and culminating in the proposal that they withdraw as a State Association member.

When the facts were presented the Association not only voted unanimously to remain a member, but the Kentucky Chapter received four applications for membership and a request for reinstatement from a valued former member, besides definite indication there are more reinstatements and more requests for membership to come. Our Chapter numbers twenty-two corporate members. Does not this percentage of applications at this meeting indicate the inherent possibilities of such procedure in regard to membership?

BERGMAN S. LETZLER, *Secretary*

Maine.

The Chapter is presenting to the State Legislature, now in session, a bill for the registration of architects. Every effort will be made to secure its passage at this session.

At the annual meeting the following officers were elected:

John Howard Stevens, President; C. Parker Crowell, Vice-President; Josiah T. Tubby, Secretary-Treasurer.

JOSIAH T. TUBBY, *Secretary*

Minnesota.

The regular January meeting of the Chapter was held in Minneapolis, at the Flour City Ornamental Iron Company's plant, in order to give everyone an opportunity to see the Carl Milles bronze doors which are being cast for the new Finance Building in the Capitol group at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

William Gehron of New York City, architect for the building, William N. Ludwig, chairman of the Pennsylvania Art Commission, and Marshall Fredericks, representative of Mr. Milles, each spoke briefly regarding the project. The St. Paul Chapter and other guests interested in the doors, increased the attendance to eighty-three.

EDWIN W. KRAFFT, *Secretary*

New Jersey.

A regular joint meeting of the New Jersey Chapter of The A. I. A. and the New Jersey Society of Architects was held at the Newark Athletic Club on Thursday, January 12, 1939.

After the usual dinner and the reading of the minutes covering the meeting which President Maginnis attended in November, Neil J. Convery, chairman of the Programme Committee, addressed the meeting, voicing his sadness at the passing of Kenneth M. Murcheson, who died while returning to his home, after making a brilliant and most witty speech at our Christmas party.

President Holmes, speaking in a very touching way, told of his subsequent contacts by letter and in person with Mrs. Murcheson and described the beautiful service which was held in the Cathedral of the Incarnation, with Bishop Stires officiating.

Immediately afterward, and on motion by Harry Stephens, seconded by the Secretary, the meeting adjourned out of respect for Mr. Murcheson's memory.

CLEMENT W. FAIRWEATHER, *Secretary*

New York.

The December meeting of the New York Chapter held just before Christmas was an interesting occasion. Not only did the punch bowl, presided over by our efficient executive secretary, Miss Waters, give an unwonted warmth to the occasion, but the discussion of methods of obtaining government work for private architects proceeded in a singularly orderly fashion.

William Adams Delano made the interesting proposal that all Federal building be handled by districts, similar to the Federal Reserve districts, and presided over by regional directors representing the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, who should be responsible to Washington for the success of the building program in their districts. It should then be placed upon these men to maintain an active file of registered architects qualified for important Federal work.

Where work is of sufficient size that organization and experience on the part of the architect becomes an important consideration as well as design ability, then direct appointment of qualified firms should be made from this list.

On work of relatively small size open competi-

tions might be held for the development of new talent, the winners in these open competitions thus having an opportunity on actual jobs to demonstrate their fitness for graduation to the qualified lists.

During the discussion it was also suggested that Federal work of very large size might properly be handled through a *two-stage* competition in which both an open phase and a second, or selective phase might be used to give an opportunity for recognition both to the young and talented designer and to the experienced offices, those placing in the open competition being automatically included in the selective list for the second phase.

Needless to say there was much discussion *pro* and *con* for competitions for all selection, but the conditions surrounding certain recent competitions seem, for the moment at least, to have caused some misgivings on the part of the faithful.

ROBERT B. O'CONNOR, *Secretary*

Pittsburgh.

The Pittsburgh Chapter reserved special tables at the annual Builders' Exchange banquet held on December 8 at the William Penn Hotel. Charles M. Stotz, vice-president of the Chapter, acted as toastmaster at the banquet. One of the features of the entertainment was a tableau presented by members of the Chapter and illustrating "Nellie of Meadow Farm", a song composed by Robert W. Schmertz.

This is the first year that the Chapter has

attended the banquet as an organization. Twenty members were present.

RODY PATTERSON, *Secretary*

Westchester.

At the annual meeting of the Chapter reports of various committees were read, and officers elected as follows:

Lewis Bowman, President; Robert Scannell, Vice-President; William C. Stohldreier, Secretary; Kenneth K. Stowell, Director.

The Chapter has expressed its belief that if all architects would encourage building material supply manufacturers to adopt the slogan "Consult an Architect" in all their national advertising matter, a great deal would be accomplished for the architect and for the manufacturer, in that work designed by architects would command first class materials and workmanship, and stimulate the use of better materials. Architects should encourage local building supply houses to do likewise.

Architects should also make every effort to discourage the free plan service advertised by certain nationally-known manufacturers. This can best be accomplished by impressing upon representatives of such companies, who call on architects, that such unfair competition will not be tolerated.

Institute members should write such manufacturers voicing their disapproval of this practice. Concerted action can and will benefit the profession as a whole and give it the distinction to which it is justly entitled.

WILLIAM C. STOHLREIER, *Secretary*

NATCHEZ PILGRIMAGE

The Eighth Annual Natchez Pilgrimages, under the auspices of the Pilgrimage Garden Club and the Natchez Garden Club, will be held from March 4 to April 2, inclusive.

Information concerning the tours may be ob-

tained by addressing Mrs. Charles J. Byrne, president, The Natchez Garden Club, Connelly's Tavern, Natchez, Mississippi; or Mrs. Hubert Barnum, president, Pilgrimage Garden Club, Natchez, Mississippi.

CORRECTION OF ADDRESS

The address of Horace W. Peaslee, F. A. I. A., appeared in the September, 1938 "Annuary" as Public Office, Central Housing Committee, 907

Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Peaslee's new address is 1228 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

New Books

Photography.

By C. E. Kenneth Mees, D.Sc. *The Macmillan Company, New York*—\$3.00.

Here is a book which tells the story of photography from the art of the old-time professional with his tent and burdensome pack to the modern amateur who carries his motion picture camera in his pocket. Dr. Mees, an outstanding authority, has written a comprehensive account of photographic art and industry in their many phases. For any one interested in picture-making this is a volume of rare fascination.

In non-technical language, Dr. Mees shows us the great industry at work—in laboratories and manufacturing plants, in dark rooms and Hollywood studios with their vast "sound stages" and mazes of apparatus. Interesting historical sections tell how photographs came to be made and trace the development of the art from earliest discoveries to the elaborate technique of the modern sound film. We see the working of the photographic materials, their manufacture on a large scale, their various applications to photographic uses, color photography, moving picture production, sound recording and synchronization, animated cartoons, and the methods of the director and his technicians. Special sections are devoted to amateur photography, both in stills and in motion.

In addition the book is illustrated with unusual and entertaining pictures which help in making clear some of the photographic processes and their most interesting uses.

The art of photography has had inestimable effect since its fundamentals were discovered little more than a hundred years ago. Its story is an absorbing one, which Dr. Mees is eminently qualified to tell. He has been engaged in the development of the art for the last thirty years and is at present in active charge of the organized research of the Eastman Kodak Company.

(From the Prospectus.)

Spanish-Colonial Architecture in the United States.

J. J. Augustin, Publisher, 30 Irving Place, New York, Price, \$12.00.

This volume by Professor Rexford Newcomb, A. I. A., Professor of the History of Architecture and Dean of the College of Fine and Applied Arts, University of Illinois, forms the culmination of a long series of studies in Hispanic-American architecture extending over a quarter of a century. Beginning in 1911, Dean Newcomb has worked continuously in this field writing voluminously upon various aspects of the art expression of Old Spain in the United States.

The author's *Franciscan Mission Architecture of Alta California* (1916) now long out of print, and his *Old Mission Churches and Historic Houses of California* (1925) now scarce, were important milestones in the series of monographic studies which made possible the larger synthesis set forth in this volume.

In this study, Dean Newcomb traces the varicolored Spanish architecture from its homeland, through Mexico, and into the various American states, where, introduced by Spanish priests, soldiers and colonists, it took root and where, in response to new demands, as time went on, it modelled itself into forms that the world had never before witnessed. How it diversified itself in its various provincial expressions in Florida, along the Gulf Coast, in Texas, in New Mexico, in Arizona and in California is plainly traced and a complete analysis of each regional expression is set forth. The volume is illustrated by one hundred thirty plates of carefully made measured drawings and photographs. This is the first work in any language to treat the Hispanic-American architecture of the United States in its entirety.

(From the Prospectus.)

Faint, illegible text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.

