

THE
OCTAGON

A Journal of The American Institute of Architects



The President's Message
The Architect of Tomorrow
Second Annual Midwest Conference
Notice — Meeting of Jury of Fellows
With The Chapters

Volume 12

JULY
1940

Number 7

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

THE OCTAGON, WASHINGTON, D. C.

OFFICERS, 1940-1941

President EDWIN BERGSTROM, 3757 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, Cal.
Vice-President WALTER R. MACCORNACK, Cambridge, Mass.
Secretary CHARLES T. INGHAM, 1211 Empire Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Treasurer JOHN R. FUGARD, 520 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

REGIONAL DIRECTORS

For One Year (1940-1941)

CLAIR WILLIAM DITCHY, 333 State Street, Detroit, Mich. (Great Lakes Dist.)
ROBERT K. FULLER, 503 Insurance Building, Denver, Colo. (Western Mountain Dist.)
EDMUND RANDOLPH PURVES, Architects' Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (Middle Atlantic Dist.)

For Two Years (1940-1942)

BENEDICT FARRAR, 1367 Arcade Building, St. Louis, Mo. (Central States Dist.)
GORDON B. KAUFMANN, 627 S. Carondelet Street, Los Angeles, Cal. (Sierra Nevada Dist.)
J. FRAZER SMITH, 404 Goodwin Institute, Memphis, Tenn. (Gulf States Dist.)
RUDOLPH WEAVER, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla. (South Atlantic Dist.)

For Three Years (1940-1943)

PETER BRUST, 135 W. Wells Street, Milwaukee, Wisc. (Illinois-Wisconsin Dist.)
H. DALAND CHANDLER, 75 Newbury Street, Boston, Mass. (New England Dist.)
CLEMENT R. NEWKIRK, 258 Genesee Street, Utica, N. Y. (New York Dist.)

State Association Director

For One Year (1940-1941)

LEIGH HUNT, 152 W. Wisconsin Avenue, 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. Twenty-five Cents the Copy. \$1 per Year. (Foreign \$2.) Checks or Money Orders should be made payable to The American Institute of Architects. All communications for publication should be sent to The Secretary, The A. I. A. Copyright, 1929, by The American Institute of Architects. Entered as second-class matter, February 6, 1929, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C.

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 President's Message

IN the June OCTAGON I promised to keep the members of The Institute informed of the progress of its preparedness program and the position of the profession with respect to the building work of the national defense program. That position has not been sufficiently crystalized heretofore to make any statement, and the July OCTAGON has been held from day to day until a definite announcement could be made.

Even now the situation has not cleared with respect to all phases of the building work, and any statement I make in this message may be inaccurate tomorrow, so rapidly do situations change.

The Preparedness Committee.

The work of the Preparedness Committee of The Institute has been extremely arduous and has required the greater portion of the time of its members during the last month.

The chairman of the committee, past president Stephen F. Voorhees, became one of the six members of the civilian committee appointed by the government to advise the Joint Army and Navy Munitions Board. This Construction Advisory Committee, in addition to Mr. Voorhees, consisted of the following men eminent in the construction industry:—Col. John P. Hogan, president of the American Society of Civil Engineers; Alonzo J. Hammond, president of American Engineering Council; E. J. Harding, general manager of the Associated General Contractors of America; E. P. Palmer, former president of the Associated General Contractors of America; and Malcolm Pirnie, gen-

eral chairman of the Construction League of America.

The Joint Army and Navy Munitions Board consists of the Assistant Secretaries of War and Navy and their aides. It has conferred with the Construction Advisory Committee almost weekly since late in May on matters concerning the relations of the construction industry to the defense program. A month ago Mr. Voorhees was appointed to another governmental post and he was succeeded on the Construction Advisory Committee by past president Ernest J. Russell. Hereafter, it is the intention of that committee to meet fortnightly.

The construction industry became represented on the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense about a month ago when Mr. William H. Harrison, vice president of the American Telegraph and Telephone Company, was appointed by Mr. Wm. S. Knudsen to be head of the construction division of the production department of the Commission. Mr. Harrison immediately appointed past president Voorhees as his consultant, and Mr. Voorhees has been spending not less than three days every week in Washington performing the duties of his new office. Under the general procedure of the defense program all matters of general policy relating to building construction for defense will be cleared through the construction division of the Council of National Defense, and architects, engineers and contractors selected for defense projects, and their contracts, must have the approval of the Council before the contracts go into effect.

The Preparedness Committee of The Institute has done an effective work. Two past presidents of The Institute have been placed in important key positions in the defense program, and the survey of the profession has been completed. The ten members of the committee received and classified more than 7800 questionnaires and returned them to The Octagon. The committee has completed its duties exceedingly well, and The Institute extends to its members its great appreciation of the services they so conscientiously and ungrudgingly furnished.

To carry on from where the Preparedness Committee completed its work, The President, The Secretary, and Director Edmund R. Purves, will act from day to day on the situations that arise in respect to the defense program.

Mr. Purves is not new to the defense program work for, since the first of July, he has been spending approximately four days a week in Washington on it. He has been ably aided by Frederic A. Fletcher of Baltimore, who has spent almost as much time in Washington as Mr. Purves, and by Harry G. Stewart of Philadelphia. The Institute is again fortunate that these members have been willing to give so much of their time and service to this particular work. They have carefully watched the situations from day to day and their watchfulness and persuasion have produced direct results that will become more and more evident as the defense work expands. This constant daily supervision of the Washington situation will be continued and nothing that can properly be done to bring about the architects' full participation in the defense program work will be left undone.

Questionnaires.

In my June message I recounted what had been done up to that time by The Institute with respect to the national defense program, explained the questionnaires sent you and their purposes, and indicated the classes into which the replies would be classified.

The questionnaires were sent to approximately 14,500 architects. To date 7814 of them have been returned, classified, and filed. This is a splendid response to the call and indicates the wide desire of the profession to serve the nation.

The classification of the replies was first made by the regional representatives of the Preparedness Committee, and their A and B classifications were

reviewed at The Octagon, by direction of the Executive Committee and under the direct supervision of a member of that committee.

The architects who indicated they maintained going organizations at the moment and included *within their organizations* the personnel and facilities to render complete architectural, engineering, and similar services and had the experience and financial and other resources to render quickly and competently complete architectural and engineering services on any emergency construction work were designated under A-Class. The number so designated was less than 3% of the number who returned their questionnaires.

The architects who indicated they had the competency but *not the complete organizations* of those included in the A-Class and gave definite information concerning their offices, personnel, facilities, and their experience and the names of the structural, mechanical, electrical, and other professional engineers and assistants who would aid them in making a complete organization were designated under B-Class. The number so designated was less than 24% of the number of those who returned their questionnaires.

The individual architects who indicated they did not have office organizations of either A-Class or B-Class nor the inclination or means to build them up were designated under C-Class. The number so designated was approximately 73% of the number of those who returned their questionnaires.

The June message stated that these files would be made available to the Government. This has been done, for the federal departments and agencies concerned with the awarding of building work under the defense program have the files. It is my information that the survey and classification is being of great service to them and that they are being used in the manner intended.

The Institute had hoped that recommendations of architects, engineers and contractors for employment might be made to the federal departments concerned by a recommending committee composed of an architect, an engineer, a contractor and a layman. On July 21, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, announced he had appointed a Construction Advisory Committee of civilian experts to recommend to the Quartermaster General the architects, engineers and contractors who appeared best

qualified and equipped to handle each particular construction project for the army. It is expected that this board will recommend for each project three architects or engineers, as the particular project requires, and three contractors, and from these the Quartermaster General will select the architect, engineer, and the contractor for the project who will then be cleared through the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense. To date the members of this advisory committee are: Francis Blossom, member of the New York engineering firm of Sanderson & Porter; Forrest S. Harvey, former assistant to the corporate chief engineer of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and recently associated with the Los Angeles firm of Leed, Hill, Barnard & Jowett; and F. J. C. Dresser, head of the Dresser Company, engineers and builders, at Cleveland.

Under the procedure as now set up by the committee, it would be advisable for those who submitted questionnaires, particularly of the A- and the B-Class, to now supplement them by presenting to the committee further evidence of their practices, putting the evidence in a good presentable form for filing. The evidence should comprise data concerning the organization, experience, resources, facilities, and professional qualifications of the architect, and include a general description and list of the principal buildings he has designed, with their costs and a list of the present work in his office. He should file that data with the advisory committee, together with a formal application to be allotted the defense work checked on the questionnaires, addressed as follows:

Construction Advisory Committee,
Office of the Quartermaster General,
Room 1125, Munitions Building,
Washington, D. C.

I am informed that it is not essential that architects appear in person before this advisory committee, although there is no reason why they should not do so if they so desire. Their applications with accompanying data and their returned questionnaires will be before the advisory committee, in any event.

Building Construction Work of the Defense Program.

To date, construction work announced in connection with the national defense program, on which architects are qualified to serve, falls primarily within

the War Department under the jurisdiction of the Construction Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General and within the Navy Department under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. Brig. General Charles D. Hartman is Chief of the Construction Division of the Quartermaster General's office, and Rear Admiral Ben Moreell is the Chief of Bureau of Yards and Docks.

As to that work, I must call to your attention that the number of building projects in connection with the defense program on which architects can serve is relatively small and will call for the employment of comparatively few architects. Housing, particularly civilian, will give opportunity for their greatest employment, and Congress has not yet authorized the great bulk of this.

The total volume of building construction work is not available and in fact is not yet determined. The Institute has not been able to obtain any estimates of what the aggregate amount of that work may be nor of the amount that will be given out by any department, or in any locality.

The Federal Agency to handle civilian housing has not been announced, but it seems obvious that at least the emergency housing will be placed within the Federal Works Agency, under the jurisdiction of the United States Housing Authority, the Public Buildings Administration, or the Works Progress Administration. The United States Housing Authority has already been assigned some housing work in connection with the program, for which it has "recaptured" funds. Also, it would not be surprising if the Federal Housing Administration functions with respect to a portion of the housing program. As this is written, announcement is made that the President has assigned ten million dollars to navy defense housing projects, but no particulars are given.

The laws authorizing expenditures by the War and the Navy Departments are not alike, and each Department has its own procedure concerning work to be allocated to architects in private practice, the methods of selecting them, and the forms and terms of the contracts with them.

Building Construction Program of the Army.

The Construction Division of the War Department has for many years maintained its own designing bureau in Washington, in which many buildings

for the Army have been designed. I do not find in the Office of the Quartermaster General any disposition to enlarge this designing bureau but rather I believe it is that Office's present intention to employ architects in private practice to design the Army buildings under the defense program. The Construction Division will furnish to such architects the data necessary to ensure that the buildings they design will conform to War Department standards.

Representatives of The Institute and of the engineering societies jointly have discussed with the officers of the Construction Division the relations of the professions to the defense work and the terms of their employment. The representatives met with the utmost courtesy and a wholly professional attitude on the part of those officers.

As a result of the conferences, and speaking to the architectural profession only, it is our understanding that the Construction Division intends:

1. To distribute geographically the architectural work by employing architects resident within the locality of each project, if the Construction Division finds there are architects within that region who can furnish the necessary professional services at the required speed and efficiency.

2. To employ architects on a Cost-plus-Fixed-Fee basis. They will be selected and their contracts made by the Construction Division in Washington;

3. To require the architects to provide all design and supervision services.

4. To place each project under a representative of the Construction Division who will be resident on the job or in its vicinity. He will make all decisions relating to the architect's contract and his work, thereby making it unnecessary for the architect to look to or travel to Washington for approvals and decisions.

5. To require each architect to maintain a field office at the site of his project, which office must be under the direct personal charge of the architect, unless the job representative of the Construction Division permits the architect to place a highly qualified associate or assistant in charge of the office at the expense of the architect.

Except under special circumstances, all architectural drawings and specifications are expected to be prepared in the field office, and the Construction Division at its expense will equip that office, pay all the architect's costs of maintaining and operating it,

and pay all direct costs of the architect in performing his contract services.

6. To place each project on its own merits as to the reimbursable items of costs and the amount of the Fixed Fee to be paid its architect.

Each item and the amount of the Fixed Fee will be determined for each job according to the conditions and the circumstances. The Construction Division has set up a schedule of Fixed Fees which it will use as a guide in determining proper and justifiable remuneration for the architects, and the reimbursable items will cover the usual items of direct costs in architectural practices, corresponding in general to those set out in The Institute's Manual of Accounting.

Considering the circumstance they reflect and the assumptions on which they were based, the schedule of Fixed Fees, the list of reimbursable items, and the form of contract developed as a result of the conferences by the Construction Division to serve for the architectural and engineering professions seem fair to both the public and the professions.

The essence of each construction project is to be the speed with which it can be completed. The unusually short periods within which the architects and engineers will be required to complete their services and the fact that payments to them will be on a fortnightly basis, making it unnecessary for them to provide large cash outlays, were important factors in the determination of the Division's Fixed Fee Schedules.

A common schedule of Fixed Fees, list of reimbursable items, and form of agreement will be used for both architectural and engineering services. The architect and the engineer must join in a common contract if both architectural and engineering services are required on a project. The projects will be awarded in as large units as practicable and it is the intention to have not more than one professional service contract nor more than one construction contract on any project. It is *not* the intention that architects and engineers shall be employees of the contractor, and it is the intention to engage design services and contracting services *under separate contracts*. In some instances, a contract has been made with contracting organizations who have maintained designing and construction facilities and other such contracts may be given out. But we are informed they will be the exception.

We have also been given to understand that it will be the policy of the Division to distribute awards as widely as possible and not to employ the same architect, engineer or contractor on two or more projects. Obviously this commendable policy cannot be a fixed one for the Division must ensure the quickest possible completion of its projects and may find that it will have to repeat employment in some instances in order to obtain this.

The Institute's file of C-Class questionnaires, and the lists of architect reserve officers compiled by The Institute from the information given it by chapters and state association members in response to its call, have been made available to the Executive Officer of the Quartermaster General in charge of the personnel for the offices and agencies that will be set up to carry out its defense work and to the Personnel Division of the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Building Construction Program of the Navy.

The representatives of The Institute and the engineering societies also have been in consultation with the Bureau of Yards and Docks. That Bureau has not maintained as large an architectural drafting force as the Construction Division, and there is no evidence of any intention of the Bureau to enlarge its building design facilities. The Bureau has been employing architects in private practice to design its building construction work and it is our best understanding that will continue to be its policy.

The Bureau has been employing architects on a percentage basis as a general rule, but it is my impression that its future contracts will be on a Cost-plus-Fixed-Fee basis, and it is our hope that the form of contract developed with the Construction Division of the Army will be the basis of the contracts with the Navy. I believe the Bureau has heretofore awarded general construction contracts which included design services, although we are aware of no cases in which that has been done under the defense program. We believe its policy will be to award separate contracts for professional and for construction services.

No board has been set up by the Navy Department corresponding to the advisory board of the War Department, to recommend architects, engineers and contractors for employment by the Bureau.

The Bureau has before it lists of the classified questionnaires returned by the architects to The Institute, but there is no reason why architects should not file their formal applications and supporting data with the Bureau, in the manner recommended for filing with the Construction Division of the Quartermaster General.

Housing Work Under the Defense Program.

I have stated that the housing work may comprise the greatest field in which architects may serve in the defense program. The housing projects will be for various purposes; principally to provide quarters for enlisted and for conscripted personnel, for officers and their families, for those engaged in the defense industrial program and their families, and for administration, hospital, mess, and other incidental purposes.

The quarters for Army and Navy enlisted men and officers and personnel with the incidental buildings may be designed by the War and the Navy Departments, but it seems likely that the civilian housing will be placed under the jurisdiction of one or more of the other existing federal agencies having to do with building construction.

The defense housing program is more or less nebulous and in the making. Mr. Charles F. Palmer, chairman of the Housing Authority of Atlanta, Georgia, has been named very recently as Coordinator of Housing. His duties will involve, primarily, the expedition of housing developments which may be undertaken by the federal authorities in connection with defense activities, particularly with respect to industrial plants. Mr. Jacob Crane, former Deputy Commissioner of United States Housing Authority, has been made assistant to Mr. Palmer, and undoubtedly it is intended that the organization they set up will have an important part in the development of the defense housing program. There is no present indication, however, that the selection of architects, engineers, or contractors for the housing work will pass through their hands, nor is it clear yet how the federal departments to which housing work is assigned will function with respect to the coordinator.

The Institute's representatives in Washington are keeping in close touch with developments in this important field of service for the architect.

Lists of Projects.

It is *not* possible to secure from any of the departments in Washington, or from any central agency, lists of projects of any type under the defense program for which future contracts for architectural services are to be let. This is for reasons of public policy, and because appropriations, defense coordination, and requirements of an administrative nature are involved.

It *is* possible to secure lists of contracts awarded for architectural services, construction work, or general production, grouped by state. Such state lists are available through the departments having jurisdiction of the projects, or through the Office of Government Reports.

Members who desire information concerning particular projects, or groups of projects in their states for which contracts have been awarded may address letters requesting that information to The Institute at The Octagon. Responses will be made direct, if practicable, otherwise the letters will be referred for answer to the federal departments having jurisdiction.

Your officers will be glad to receive from any of you suggestions of what can be done by them to forward the employment of architectural services under the defense program, and if it seems feasible such suggestions will be carried out.

EDWIN BERGSTROM.

The Architect of Tomorrow

THE Board in its report to the 1940 convention reiterated the responsibility of the present generation of architects to those who are to follow them, and indicated the way in which that responsibility is to be studied and expressed. Studies for this purpose were begun intensively immediately following the seventy-first convention, and progress reports of them were made to the Louisville convention. The studies made by the Committees on Education, Allied Arts, and Registration were most effective, and the philosophies of the dozen architectural schools as presented by their deans or representatives to that convention were illuminating and important.

The philosophies will be published later, but below are the principal talks of the chairmen of the three committees named above, and excerpts from the reports of those committees to the convention.

OPENING REMARKS OF JOHN BAKEWELL, JR., CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

THIS morning's program is particularly concerned with the relationship between our educational system, including the period of practical experience following graduation, and the active practice of architecture, and we will take up one by one the preparatory steps that lead the young architect to admission to the profession, as a licensed architect.

Before starting this serious main topic, let us look for a moment on a more beguiling aspect of architecture, where it appears not as a business regulated by licenses, but as an art, as an important member of the family of allied arts.

Architecture has always relied upon its sister arts for added interest, beauty and charm, but in order that it may do this successfully, the work of these

arts must be incorporated into the architecture itself. Before these resources can be fully utilized the architect must gain a complete understanding of them and of the way that they may affect his work. Here reliance must be placed upon sculptors or painters to do the actual work and unless the architect is to lose control of his design he must be able to direct their work as it is being done, to study, criticize and make such changes as may better fit it for its place and purpose. The artists employed must work for *him* and *he* must see that their work accentuates and reinforces *his* ideas and in no way conflicts with or nullifies the lines, forms, or values of *his* scheme of composition.

What may happen when these arts are brought

into architecture without the direction of the architect is well illustrated in a great deal of the recent work under W.P.A. auspices, in much of which the architecture is simply considered as a sort of permanent billboard upon which the artist is allowed to display his work, without the slightest consideration of whether it is needed, or whether it improves or even forms a part of the architectural scheme.

Gaining an intimate knowledge of the arts is thus an essential part of the architect's education. However, this does not imply the ability of himself to create the work of these arts, but rather the ability to appreciate, evaluate and understand them. This understanding is reached through experience, through taking advantage of every opportunity to see and enjoy the effect of works of art.

The student of architecture learns and comes in contact with many things in his work that tend to attract him toward the arts and that make it easier for him to acquire an early appreciation of them. He learns to draw, and often to draw very well, and he also has some practice in sculptural modeling and in making sketches in color. As far

as he goes he is an art student and is especially well qualified to get a great deal of pleasure out of contemplation of works of art.

The appreciation of a work of art is an act of pure sensual enjoyment which becomes a delightful form of relaxation through which the student can rest from his labors and find amusement, and the longer he has experienced this pleasure the more delight he gets out of it and the better he understands to what he owes his enjoyment. If, as he progresses from student to architect, he continues to exercise this habit and continues it throughout his career, he will end by having acquired a very broad knowledge of all the branches of art that are in any way related to architecture, and when the opportunity offers can make use of these resources intelligently and effectively.

The Institute recognizes the value of these assets and encourages the close collaboration of architecture with the allied arts. It has a committee appointed for that purpose. We are now to hear from the chairman of that committee, who will give an idea of what is being done in that direction.

ADDRESS OF RICHARD KOCH, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON ALLIED ARTS

THE Committee on Allied Arts welcomes this opportunity to present to The Institute several features of its program that parallel closely the work that has been carried on so successfully by the Committee on Education. We would not duplicate this work more than to emphasize that that portion of the architect's education, where he is in collaboration with the allied arts, be broadened so that he is more familiar with the problems that confront an artist or craftsman after he has received a commission. This lack of understanding on the part of the architect is so frequent that our committee hopes to work out during the next year some means whereby The Institute would define what this relationship is and the steps necessary to coordinate the different professions.

The varied programs of the architectural schools, with their many different philosophies, show how radically the study of architecture has changed from the concepts of the beaux arts taught in the early schools. Painting and sculpture are more an integral part of a design, instead of something that might be

added if funds were available. The Committee on Allied Arts notes this particularly in the design of modern interiors and in many exhibition buildings where the intrusion of industrial designers, who have adapted themselves to the techniques of these projects, have cost us much work. These designs are more than walls; they are combinations of textures, colors, and of many new materials on the market—in fact, a collaborative effort of many artists and craftsmen.

Perhaps this suggests a school where the student will work with painters, sculptors, industrial designers and craftsmen in iron and glass. Ateliers attached to the schools is not the answer. Scholastic standards would keep many an artist away, and I doubt if the atmosphere of our schools is conducive to the development of great painters or sculptors.

As vital to the architect (and much more difficult to approach, as they have no organization), is the training of the craftsmen who are to execute the buildings that we, as architects, would design. In the Middle Ages such trades were taught in the

guilds, but today modern commercial factories afford no such opportunity, and their training must come from trade schools or art schools operated in connection with our museums or art societies. The members of our profession should be encouraged to help in the direction of these organizations, and many are doing so now. The extreme cost of using effectively the applied arts in a building has been called again and again to the attention of the committee. Artists so trained are available in a few large centers and are only known through some outstanding work. Their employment is naturally expensive, but many artists are available at moderate cost to do this work if they were but known or had had the proper training. The spreading of such craft and art schools would have a decentralizing

effect and would broaden architects by closer association with instructors and students of these schools.

Some features of the Works Progress Administration and National Youth Administration programs have in effect produced such results. These Federal bodies from time to time have asked our help, and we have recommended our members to serve on their advisory boards when so requested. Much good promises to come from these sources, and as they may be with us for some time, we might find in them a field for new craftsmen.

Our committee would like, in some way, to become a clearing house where information may be given the profession as to artists who are available for different kinds of work, though perhaps this is beyond the limits of our committee.

ADDRESS OF JOHN BAKWELL, JR.

THE main topic of this morning's program is *Preparation for the Practice of Architecture*. This process of preparation follows a natural order of sequence that starts with the school or apprenticeship, continuing on through various stages that are finally completed with the granting of a license to practice architecture. After college comes a period devoted to gaining practical experience in the office and in the field, in which theory is tied up with reality, and with the ordinary routine business of getting out complete working documents and seeing that these are properly executed. Then come the final examinations for admission to practice, to see whether the lessons taught at college have been learned and whether the period devoted to experience has been fruitful.

All these stages must be considered as parts of one continuous educational process, all of which should be properly coordinated so that the first step, admission to school, is tied up with the last, admission to practice. Of course the process of education does not stop when the architect receives his license. It is only its beginning that is then complete, but from this point on it becomes a process of self-instruction and development in which he must rely largely upon himself.

The Institute is peculiarly fitted to assist at each of these three stages, School, Preparation for Ad-

mission to Practice, and finally the Continuation of Education after Admission. I wish to say that when I refer to The Institute I have in mind the lay members of The Institute, including all elements that combine to make up the layman's point of view, registration boards as well as The Institute. Some of the opinions that I will set forth may be at variance with those of that very important group in our membership, the teaching profession, whose point of view is in some important respects different from that of the laity. Also, to be perfectly frank, I must say that most of the thoughts expressed are personal and not those of the committee of which I am chairman.

The two preparatory stages, school and the interval between school and practice, are both devoted to preparation for practice and the two stages combined should be designed to lead up to the ability to render complete architectural service. It is not necessary for me to point out what composes such service. It is broadly defined in the amendments to our Standards of Practice, as set forth in pages 23 to 26 of the April OCTAGON.

Certain subjects must be mastered in order that this service may be rendered most efficiently and thoroughly. There are, of course, in this list some things that can only be learned in the school of experience, but all should be included somewhere

in the preparatory curriculum, whether in school or in the post-school period of preparation for registration.

The moment that The Institute defined the duties of the architect it defined what the candidate for admission to the practice of those duties should know, and when the registration boards follow this up by demanding proofs of this knowledge, the whole preparatory educational program has been determined as well as the essential parts of its curriculum. This does not of course determine the curriculum of the schools since they form only the first part of the preparatory process. The schools themselves lay out their own curriculum, selecting the portions of the total preparatory program that they are best qualified to teach, or that they believe can be most advantageously learned in college, adding such other non-technical subjects as may appear to them of benefit as a part of their students' equipment. This will leave many things for the experience period after graduation, but although these cannot be advantageously mastered in college, they should all be touched upon, and the student introduced to them, so that at graduation he will not only have completed the college stage of training, but will know something about the subjects that he will encounter in the next stage.

Now, although the schools arrange their own courses and their own program, these must of necessity fit into the larger program of the whole preparatory period and must be affected very materially by the changes in standards and in the requirements for admission for practice that are constantly taking place, so that both Institute and registration boards may be said to have a very important, even if indirect influence upon school education.

The part played by Institute and registration boards is much more direct when the next stage—that of Preparation for Registration—is reached. In the school stage, although the school curriculum may be affected by any change in registration requirements or standards, it is the responsibility of the schools to look after this stage. In the experience period, however, the whole responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the practicing profession. We have established the registration system, and we have set standards and requirements for admission to practice. It is our responsibility to see that the candidate is given help and encouragement to meet

our demands. The schools' responsibility ceases when they have fulfilled their part of the program and have, in a preliminary way, prepared their graduates for the steps they still have to take. The very fact that they have decided that the comparatively few subjects left for this final stage cannot advantageously be taught in school should be a sufficient reason for seeking some other agency for teaching them.

The Institute recognizes its responsibility and has devised the mentor system to help the student through the interval between school and registration. However, the mentor system alone is not enough.

It would be of the greatest value to both candidates and mentors if courses could be arranged by The Institute to supplement the office work and extend the field of effort. The lessons learned in college could be reviewed and kept fresh and made much more serviceable, by application to and connection with the daily routine of the office. The one giving the course would be able to answer and point out the solution to questions that arise much better than the mentor could possibly do.

In addition to this review and practical application of college subjects, all the others postponed to this period would be covered, so that completion of the course under the instruction of teachers, and the advice and guidance of mentors would complete the whole preparatory-educational process and lead up to a thorough knowledge of all the requirements of practice.

A campaign should be conducted through the chapters toward the installation of courses of this nature, not to supplant the mentor, but to enable him to better fulfill his task.

The last stage of education—that which assists the practicing architect in his development, and keeps him in touch with new ideas and new resources—can well be expanded by The Institute. It is already doing much in this direction, directly or indirectly; in fact most of the aims of The Institute have educational significance. It automatically gives each of its members the advantage of some of the experience and some of the knowledge of every other member. It is needless to point out the many ways in which these possibilities can be developed, and there is ample evidence that the members are demanding even greater activity on the part of The Institute in offering educational opportunities.

Throughout the course of training the needs and the best interests of the men being trained should always come first, and since they are students for a short time while they will be architects for a very long time, the whole process should be conceived with a view to their welfare after they have become practicing architects; in other words, to the greatest good of the profession at large. This should be the guiding idea of the whole system and wherever a conflict may arise between interests, it is the interests of the practicing members of the profession that should take precedence.

Looking at the whole process from the standpoint of the welfare of the architect, and this is also the real welfare of both students and candidates for admission to practice, we are brought to face certain conditions that at the moment are very important. The first of these concerns numbers and the second concerns standards. There are probably too many who are trying to make a living from the practice of architecture and too many of these do not measure up to the highest standard. I make this as a statement of fact since I believe that it states a fact. It might be better perhaps to put it as a question. Are there not too many?

However, whether it is put as a question or as a fact, there can be no doubt but that this touches upon a problem seriously affecting the well-being of those who practice. The amount of work to be done will provide a comfortable living for a certain number of architects and a certain number of draftsmen. If this number is too greatly exceeded, both architects and draftsmen are bound to suffer.

The architectural profession can undoubtedly absorb a certain number of new architects each year without danger to the welfare of either those entering or of those already established. Also, a certain amount of struggle for survival is healthy and beneficial to both profession and work. However, the number of men admitted can so much exceed this number that can be absorbed as to cause a very unhealthy condition.

How can the number of new men be controlled when it seems to greatly exceed the number that can be absorbed? There has been quite a little discussion of this question in the Committee on Education during the past year. Mr. Curtis, the chairman of the joint advisory Committee on Preparation for Practice, recently issued an inquiry in which

it was included. The general consensus of opinion seems to be that this can best be done by raising standards and by eliminating those who do not reach the highest standard, provided of course that it is desirable to limit the number admitted to practice, and this is not agreed to by all. As to how standards should be raised is another question.

The easiest place to cut down numbers admitted to practice is of course at the stage when the candidate comes up for the final test for registration. This is when the standard can be placed highest and the requirements made to include the widest field of subjects.

Just as the list of things the candidate should learn in the course of preparation was based upon what constitutes the ideal architectural service, so does the standard of preparation depend upon the final test of his knowledge and ability to perform these functions, at registration. This indirectly sets the standards of the schools as it would not be fair or just for the school to permit its students to pass through the portion of the preparatory program that the school has reserved for itself without insisting that he should at least reach a sufficiently high standard to pass the final test. Up to the present time the schools have led the way and set the highest standard, and if they are to keep the prestige they have earned they will have to raise their standards even higher as the registration boards advance theirs.

In order to prevent hardships and waste of effort the elimination of the unfit should start as soon as possible. This would start it at the beginning of the school course and as a matter of fact, would make the school the place where most of it is done. There is a difficulty here as the business of the schools is to educate the students, to teach what can be best taught in the schools and to teach it as well as possible and not necessarily to find jobs for the students after they have graduated or even to adopt a policy that would make it easier for them to find jobs. Many schoolmen feel that it is the duty of the schools to teach architecture to everyone who wishes to learn, regardless of their ability, and if they would adopt some scheme by which the professional study of architecture was clearly separated from the cultural study, this would be a correct attitude to take.

There is the further complication that, whereas

reduction of numbers of those being prepared is at present for the good of the profession, it does not at first sight appear to be for the good of the schools. With a larger number of students a larger staff of higher priced men can be obtained for the faculty and better equipment, a larger library and more comfortable working quarters. However, in spite of any apparent disadvantages, the good of the profession should come first and if it requires reduction of numbers it becomes the duty of the schools to see whether this cannot be done. As a matter of fact a little ingenuity may convert the apparent disadvantages into assets. The raising of the standards of a school immediately raises its prestige, and the harder it is to enter, the more eager worthwhile men will be to enter and to graduate, so that most of those eliminated will be men who can readily be spared.

It would occur at once to the layman that there are two ways in which admission to the professional school of architecture could be controlled to some extent just as it is in most other professions. The first way would be by demanding some knowledge of architecture and drawing as an entrance requirement. Naturally, this would not be much test of ability but it would at least tend to limit the course to those who are seriously interested and would prevent drifting into the course. The next would be by dividing the course into a cultural course for the first two years and then a professional course with very rigid entrance requirements. This would permit all those who wished to withdraw, to turn to some other course without loss of credits and without the stigma of failure, and would also eliminate

those not able to pass the entrance tests to this professional course, or else require them to repeat their preparatory work until able to pass them. However, it is questionable whether either of these methods would be acceptable to the teaching profession.

After entrance if every student is required to attain a definite standard of progress before he is allowed to advance to the next year's work or to graduate, the machinery for raising standards to any height desired is present. This does not necessarily mean that the students who fail to reach these standards should be dropped. It merely means that they should be required to repeat the past year's work until they have achieved this required standard of progress.

Reference has been made to another agency, particularly interested not only in raising standards but also in advancing the interests of practicing architects. This is the registration system as represented by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards. Originally, the purpose of registration and licensing was to protect the public from dangerous work of incompetent men, but this also has the effect of automatically protecting the architect from the necessity of competing with incompetence, and its accompanying low standards of service and price. It also reduces the number of architects by the number of these incompetents.

The recently established accrediting board represents still another phase of this question. While this board has been organized and will operate for other purposes, it would seem that it must tend to raise standards even if it does not attempt to do so.

ADDRESS OF C. JULIAN OBERWARTH, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON REGISTRATION LAWS

FOR the past few days we have concerned ourselves with the problems of more immediate relation to our profession. At this time, and perhaps for the first time, we are concerning ourselves with the problems of the future of the profession of architecture. I have learned several things this morning. One thing is that architects want all the big jobs and want to have nothing to do with the little ones. The second thing is that, by and large, from the

reports of the committees that we have had this morning, there is a definite feeling not only among the architects but among our clients that the architect is not all that he should be.

I have been asked to describe the program in its relation to accrediting and to the profession and to the registration boards. I want to say that there is no more gigantic problem before the profession today than that program. We have heard today

and for the past few years a great many references to the professions of medicine, law, engineering and so on. I want to take issue with any man who thinks that the architects of this country need to bow or apologize to either of those great bodies.

I think that in public service, in educational background and facilities, and in the program of The Institute there is no greater organization in this or any other country, ethically or otherwise, technically or otherwise, than The American Institute of Architects. I pray that we keep it so.

On the other hand, we must recognize that the professions of medicine and law, and more recently of engineering, have beaten us to the post in one particular field, and that is in the universal adoption of registration laws as a means to furthering the advancement and public service of the profession. I like to think that tardiness on our part is perhaps due to the commendable idealism which was so well expressed by the Tory opposition of our late colleague and friend, C. Howard Walker of Boston. He did not like registration laws. There are lots of things some of us don't like about registration laws. I don't like them either. With all that, it seems to me it would be a rather sad commentary upon the judgment of this profession if we should continually refuse to adopt proven means of professional advancement.

Led by states such as Illinois, California and New Jersey, we gradually built up a program of registration and began to pass laws in all our various states, and finally The American Institute of Architects adopted that program and approved it and set up a committee to further and guide the program of registration. And all of a sudden today we look around and we discover that we have registration. It is here. We have registration in forty states. We have it in the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Porto Rico, the Philippines, even if we do have to wait on Massachusetts.

We have gone into those states and we have told the legislatures it is our profound belief that if you will give us this program, give us this legal authority, that we will give you protection and outstanding performance. The legislatures have said to us in effect, and with some understandable reluctance, "all right, here is what you have asked for. Here it is in legal form. Now let's see how well you handle it and how well you keep your promises of a better,

more qualified profession of architecture". They have said to us in effect, "Here for the first time in the history of your profession is the means and the legal power to set up your own formulas of what an architect should be. We won't leave it to the public any more. Here is a blank sheet of paper. Write it out yourselves".

I want to say that in my honest opinion, the Registration committee, the Accrediting board, the State registration boards, and the profession, through The Institute, are endeavoring honestly and fairly to determine what those formulas and specifications should be for an architect in the future.

I would like for you to think for a moment of the opportunity which that presents. And I would like for you to think at the same time the meaning and the staggering responsibility which has thus been conferred upon the profession.

There has been formed the Accrediting Board. We have the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, and we have the various committees of The Institute to formulate this program. We have the power through that program, through the cooperation of these bodies to say what an architect should be and to train him in methods and in the manner that will best fit him to serve the public. And we have more than that. We have set up the machinery through which he must pass to be graded when he is trained and his education is completed.

I think that responsibility must weigh heavily upon your minds if you see it with all the seriousness which I do.

In connection with this program, I want to point out the vulnerable point in the whole system, and that is perhaps in the registration boards themselves. Consider if you will the fact that registration boards are composed of political appointments, and I wish to take the profession to task in this one particular point, and that is the indifference which you have shown, which all of us have shown, to the quality and character of the men who are appointed to our registration boards. For here indeed is the gateway to practice. What good will it do the Committee on Education to set up an ideal program of training in the schools, or for The Institute to set up an ideal program of preliminary practice and practical experience, if all of these men, when through with that program must pass through a political machine? I submit to you the utter

futility of any attempt to judge the fruit of our efforts by passing it through a rock crusher?

I hope that I will not be guilty of any charge of mock gravity when I say that I hope that God's blessings will be with us, and that we will not be guilty of any selfish word or act in this work.

I call upon you and the committees to join hands, because without coordination of effort, the program is doomed to certain failure. If the colleges are

striving towards one end, and if the registration boards are going to examine men on entirely different subjects, then we might as well stop before we start. And if we are to succeed, we have got to have the coordination of all these efforts, and if we do not have that coordination, we cannot take the responsibility for which we have asked and which legislatures of forty states and territories have granted us.

CLOSING REMARKS OF JOHN BAKEWELL, JR.

THE point which I wish to make in my address is that the program of education goes much farther than the school. It starts with the schools and ends when an architect dies at the end of his career.

The two points that are very essential and can be more or less controlled are the first two steps of the educational process. They constitute the preparation of the architect for practice. The Institute has stated what the duties of an architect are. The preparation for practice enables him to fulfill those duties. The school, of course, is the one step we think of as educational; but The Institute through its Standards, and the registration boards, through their requirements for licenses to practice have really set a curriculum for that whole process of education that starts with the school and ends with the experience period.

Now, the schools collect the subjects that they think they can best teach out of that more general curriculum. After the schools have finished, then it is the duty of the profession to continue the education of the young architect. The schools have said they do not feel qualified to take up some experience subjects. Nobody has that task at present and that is the main duty of The Institute in the present educational program.

* * * * *

. . . After all, the registration system was originally devised for two purposes. One was to protect the public against the dangerous work of incompetent men. The other was to protect the profession against competition from incompetent men. I think that the registration boards all over the country are beginning to get hold of that problem, but there

is a lack of an agency to prepare the young architect to prove his qualifications for a license and for registration, and our committee has discussed at the convention that particular problem. We think that it is an activity we should take more part in; the installation of courses, not coaching courses, not courses to prepare a list of probable questions asked, but to cover all the subjects that the colleges are not prepared to teach or do not wish to teach. The only reason they do not wish to teach them is that they can be learned better in connection with experience. That is going to be one of our great activities in the coming year, and we hope to get the cooperation of all the chapters.

I heard William Emerson say at the Boston convention that, after all, the great problem of the profession at the moment was numbers. We have perhaps too many architects. We have perhaps too many men trying to be admitted to practice. We have perhaps too many men entering and going through our schools. The great difficulty with the present system is that the check comes at the end of the whole process of preparation. A man appears before the registration board who should have dropped by the way. But that is one of the unfortunate duties of the registration board—to keep men out of practice whom they think are not sufficiently qualified, and we hope the colleges will gradually lead the way to the new standards that are being established as they have in the past the old standards. The colleges have always set the way so that a man who went through college was really qualified to pass the registration board's examination. It is not always true now. Some of the boards have examinations that are pretty difficult for a college graduate to pass.

EXCERPTS FROM THE REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEES ON
EDUCATION AND REGISTRATION LAWS

Excerpts from Report of Committee on Education.

Preparation for State Examinations for Admission to Practice.

Some correspondence has been received on this subject and apparently there are already such courses in several localities. A sub-committee has been appointed to study this question but has not as yet made any report. It must be realized that it will take considerable time to organize any new courses of this kind. The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards is taking an interest in the college graduate during his period of probation and preparation for a certificate to practice, and it is probable that the best results can be obtained in cooperation with the registration boards. The movements should be extended to include not only college graduates but also draftsmen who have not been able to obtain college training.

* * * * *

The National Council of Architectural Registration Boards.

Several of the aims of the Committee are the same as those of the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards. The profession has provided the machinery for licensing architects, and examining candidates as to their qualifications. The Institute also has a great interest in seeing that these candidates have opportunity to properly prepare themselves for these examinations, especially such as are not able to take full college courses. The Secretary of the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards has recently compiled a list of 1939 graduates of our colleges, grouped according to chapters in the territories of which colleges are located and has sent copies to all chapters, asking them to assist in obtaining mentors for these young graduates and seeing that they obtain proper advice and assistance up to the time when they obtain their license. We hope that the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards will also cooperate in the preparation of non-graduate candidates. This, of course, will require a somewhat different program in addition to the one already undertaken by them.

Accrediting of Architectural Schools.

Accrediting of architectural schools is, of course, entirely independent of the Education Committee, but after the National Architectural Accrediting Board has definitely set up its system, it will doubtless automatically help to solve some of our problems. The relation of the school to the profession and the proportion of graduates to the number that can be absorbed by the profession will immediately be affected and favorably, by a rise in standards, such as accrediting should bring about.

JOHN BAKEWELL, JR., *Chairman.*

Excerpts from Report of Committee on Registration Laws.

There are now forty states operating under registration laws for architects, in addition to the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico.

The states remaining without registration laws are as follows: Kansas, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, Vermont and Wyoming.

Therefore, the requirement for registration has become an established part of the profession of architecture in the United States.

Now that there are architectural registration requirements in the major portion of the country, there should be a more serious consideration of the problems resulting from registration, of the methods of improvement in the field, of the opportunities which registration presents to the profession and The Institute, and, more important still, of the obligations thereby pressed upon us.

Some of these important considerations which should now be studied and carefully dealt with are the following:

(a) The system of "reciprocity" concerning matters pertaining to out-of-state practice. These should be simplified and made more practical, if possible.

(b) A national examination for entrance to practice should be more carefully studied and simplified.

(c) The so-called mentor system of preparing students and graduates for the national examination should be broadened or give way to something more practical.

(d) The newly created national architectural accrediting board should, with the full cooperation of all concerned, begin its work and carry out its mission.

(e) The various state examining boards should continue and enlarge their efforts to develop the best possible examinations.

(f) An effort should be made to determine the qualifications and peculiar talents of the most successful architects, and these findings used in determining the kind of examinations to be given and the kind of schools we need.

(g) *More important still*, The Institute and the profession generally should take a more definite interest in obtaining appointment of the very highest type of members of our profession to memberships on the state examining boards. All future architects must pass through these boards on the way to an architectural career, and all other work of these Boards relating to preparation for practice will fail to achieve the desired results unless more attention is given to this one matter than has ever yet been given.

The Committee on Preparation for Architectural Practice, composed of members of The Institute Committee on Education, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture, the Beaux Arts Institute of Design, and the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, has been considering many of these problems, and the newly created Architectural Accrediting Board, of necessity, will consider many of them in conjunction with its difficult task.

Our Committee has often stressed, however, the need and importance of more general interest and cooperation of members of The Institute outside the college men and the Board Members, in order that efforts to set up a more qualified profession might have the benefit of a qualified, disinterested viewpoint.

It seems evident, in other words, that it is time for examination of our entire system of training and preparing men for the practice of architecture, and that this is the joint opportunity and responsibility of the schools, the state boards, and The Institute, and not of any one of them alone.

It is to be hoped that the related work of the various committees, will tend to focus attention more directly on the whole registration problem, not only as it pertains to preliminary training in the schools, but more specifically to bring about a coordinated and harmonious effort to train men for the architectural profession in a manner which may, after thorough study, be proclaimed as the combined conclusions of the schools, the registration boards, and the most successful of our present day architects.

The Committee recommends that fresh efforts be made in practically all of the states to amend their architectural registration laws to permit better enforcement, more freedom in providing uniformity of action by state examining boards *after* such laws are in effect, to the end that such laws should regulate the practice of architecture and not merely the title of "architect," as is still the case in many states.

C. JULIAN OBERWARTH,
Chairman.

Second Annual Midwest Conference

THE Second Annual Midwest Architectural Conference will be held on September 12-13, 1940 at Cranbrook Academy of Art, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan.

The tentative program calls for regional meetings of the Illinois-Wisconsin and the Great Lakes Districts on Thursday, September 12.

The sessions on Friday, September 13, will be devoted to round table discussions of current professional problems, with special reference to their local aspects. These discussions will be open to all architects regardless of affiliation.

Guests at the Conference will have an unusual

opportunity to inspect the various buildings of the Cranbrook group as well as special exhibitions which will be on display. Arrangements are also being made for those who wish to stay over on Saturday, September 14 to visit automobile plants, Henry Ford's Greenfield Village and other points of local interest. Special features of entertainment for ladies will be offered.

A cordial invitation to attend the Conference is extended to all architects and their ladies.

CLAIR W. DITCHY, *Director*,
Great Lakes District.

Notice—Meeting of The Jury of Fellows

THE next meeting of the Jury of Fellows will be held in Yosemite Valley, California, in the early part of June, 1941, at the time of the next Convention, for the purpose of considering the qualifications of corporate members whose nominations for advancement to fellowship are now on file, and those who are nominated prior to November 1, 1940.

The Institute may bestow a fellowship on any of its members who has notably contributed to the advancement of the profession of architecture by his achievement in design, the science of construction, literature, educational service, service to The Institute or any of its component organizations, or public service, and is in good standing in The Institute at

the time of his nomination for advancement, and has been so for not less than ten consecutive years immediately prior to his nomination.

The Jury requests that nominators use nomination form A.I.A. Document S38, in proposing corporate members for advancement to fellowship. These forms have been revised and copies of the new forms can be obtained upon application at The Octagon.

Every such nomination shall be made in writing and addressed to The Jury of Fellows, The Octagon, 1741 New York Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.

FREDERICK H. MEYER, *Chairman*,
The Jury of Fellows, A.I.A.

English Publication Requests Contributions

June 20, 1940.

Editor "THE OCTAGON"
The American Institute of Architects
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

I have received a letter from the editor of the English architectural magazine, "The Builder", expressing much interest in the idea of bringing to the English profession at this time, when its own activities are suspended, a better acquaintance with

significant accomplishment in this country. I trust that this intimation conveyed through the columns of THE OCTAGON may induce members of The Institute to send photographs and plans of such works as seem characteristic.

The address to which material should be sent is—

Editor "The Builder", 4, Catherine Street,
Aldwych, London, W. C. 2., England.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES D. MAGINNIS.

New State Association Members

It is with gratification that The Secretary announces the recent elections of three new state association members of The Institute, as follows:

Mississippi Association of Architects (effective May 2, 1940)—President: Frank Fort, 1305 Deposit Guaranty Bldg., Jackson, Miss.; Secretary: Frank P. Gates, Millsaps Bldg., Jackson, Miss.

Florida Association of Architects (effective May

14, 1940)—President: Elliott B. Hadley, 211 Taylor Arcade, St. Petersburg, Fla.; Secretary: E. F. De La Haye (also treasurer), Box 3747, Daytona Beach, Fla.

Minnesota Association of Architects (effective May 17, 1940)—President: Charles A. Hausler, 1734 West 7th St., St. Paul, Minn.; Secretary: H. W. Fridlund, 5216 Upton Ave., Minneapolis.

Members Elected

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Effective May 8, 1940</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Name</i>
FLORIDA NORTH.....	William Tobias Arnett		WASHINGTON STATE.....	Elizabeth Ayer
	Frederick Tidyman Hannaford		WISCONSIN.....	Rubens F. Clas
GRAND RAPIDS.....	Sidney Eugene Osgood			Effective July 6, 1940
NEW YORK.....	Richard Marsh Bennett		CENTRAL PENNSYLVANIA.....	Frederick Emil Loescher
	Donald Thornton Graf		CHICAGO.....	Charles A. Urbanek
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA.....	Albert F. Roller		DAYTON.....	Donald D. Bolinger
TENNESSEE.....	Robert Nat Dulaney			Ralph Wilson Carnahan
	Thomas Grinter Street			Emory Jay Ohler
VIRGINIA.....	*Henry Coleman Baskerville		FLORIDA NORTH.....	Rollin LaBarr Rosser
				Guy Chandler Fulton
				Clyde Eugene Harris
			NEW YORK.....	George J. Cavalieri
				Robert Allan Jacobs
			PITTSBURGH.....	James Harold Eagen
			SPOKANE.....	Edwin John Peterson
				*Theodore Jan Prichard
				Effective August 12, 1940
			CENTRAL NEW YORK.....	John Wilbur Briggs
				Irving Edgar Horsey
				Cyril Theodore Tucker
			GRAND RAPIDS.....	Carl John Rudine
			KENTUCKY.....	Alfred E. Weinedel
			MAINE.....	Howard Morrell Peck
			NORTH LOUISIANA.....	Paul Gauss Annan
			PITTSBURGH.....	James J. Cravotta
			SOUTH CAROLINA.....	Caldwell Robertson Dial
				Albert Sidney Thomas, Jr.
			ST. LOUIS.....	Benjamin Shapiro
			TENNESSEE.....	Austin K. Hall
				* Re-elected.

Necrology

As reported to The Institute from March 27 to August 30, 1940

<i>Fellows</i>	<i>Members</i>	<i>Honorary Corresponding Member</i>
Silas R. Burns	Lawrence H. Bley	Josephus Parr
Gustave W. Drach	Edwyn A. Bowd	J. E. O. Pridmore
Alexander C. Eschweiler, Sr.	John Irwin Bright	James A. Randall
Fridolin J. Heer	Clement C. Cassell	John Ph. Voelker
Walter Mellor	Clare C. Hosmer	Julius Wenig
William S. Post	Clinton Mackenzie	Hugh E. White
		Raymond Unwin
		Honorary Members
		Bancel LaFarge
		Arthur Kingsley Porter
		Reed Smoot

With The Chapters

NEWS NOTES FROM CHAPTER SECRETARIES

Columbus.

Instead of the usual summer cessation of activities, the architects of the Columbus areas began the present summer season with one of the largest conferences ever held in local circles when fifty members of the Columbus chapter and the Columbus section

of the Ohio Society of Architects held a joint session at the Springs Country Club on June 26.

Following an afternoon of recreation on the golf course and a dinner in the club house, the evening meeting was presided over jointly by John Quincy Adams, and Kyle W. Armstrong. Mr. Adams is

Vice-President of the Columbus chapter and acted in the absence of president Edward Kromer, who has been ill for several weeks. Mr. Armstrong is President of the Columbus Section of the Ohio Society.

The principal portion of the evening program was devoted to reports by Columbus representatives to the recent convention of The Institute in Louisville. Galen F. Oman reported on several phases of the Convention, with particular emphasis upon the problem of small house construction and the profession's relations and responsibilities to it.

Howard Dwight Smith reported upon the round table sessions of the Convention, with particular emphasis upon the expanding fields of architectural service and the relations between architects in private practice and bureau architects employed by states, cities, public institutions and corporations.

Professor Chas. St. John Chubb discussed the architectural philosophies of the schools, and the attitudes of the teachers of architecture toward new or so-called "modernistic" theories of design. With reference to public-supported schools of architecture, Professor Chubb was very emphatic in his statement that a State such as Ohio should not be dissipating its teaching personnel and equipment between three separate schools as it is at present, with departments of architecture at Ohio State, Ohio University and Miami.

W. F. Breidenbach discussed the social features of the convention, and announced the fact that The Institute completed arrangements for dedicating the famous Octagon House as a national monument.

RAYMOND D. GOLLER, *Secretary*

Kansas.

The legislative committee of the Kansas Chapter and the Kansas Society of Architects met in Wichita to formulate plans for obtaining an architects' registration law. Proposed registration laws have been presented to the legislature by the Chapter during the past twenty years.

In an effort to obtain favorable consideration at the next session of the legislature, the committees analyzed the effectiveness of past efforts, and hope to profit from experience, in presenting their case.

PAUL WEIGEL, *Secretary*

Pittsburgh.

For the past several months the Pittsburgh Chapter has been engaged in an activity of much interest to The Institute.

In June, 1939, an amended Architects Registration Act was approved by the governor and shortly afterwards when the Pittsburgh Bureau of Building Inspection was asked by the writer to refuse a permit for a church building, plans for which were prepared in violation of the Act by a man not an architect or an engineer, it was found the Bureau did not have authority to change their routine procedure and refuse the permit.

A special committee was appointed by the chapter to work with a similar committee of the Pennsylvania Society of Professional Engineers, and conferences were held with the building inspector and city solicitors office, with result that a hearing was granted before City Council and they directed an ordinance be prepared directing that permits be issued only in compliance with the law.

This ordinance met with opposition from the Real Estate Board and Home Builders Association and a second hearing was held before Council. A hasty call to arms was issued to the members of architects and engineers chapters, with result that a large turnout was present at the hearing. An attorney was retained to defend the ordinance.

The attempt to build up a case against the ordinance missed fire entirely because no valid reasons could be brought forth.

The ordinance was duly enacted and approved May 15, 1940 and the following is a copy of same.

Section 1. Be it ordained and enacted by the City of Pittsburgh, in Council assembled, and it is hereby ordained and enacted by the authority of the same, That from and after the approval of this ordinance, when an application for a permit to erect or alter a building or structure is made to the Bureau of Building Inspection, any plans and specifications for such building or structure, which by the terms of Acts of Assembly approved May 6, 1927, P. L. 820, and June 27, 1939, P. L. 1188, are required to be prepared by a registered architect or a registered engineer shall bear the signature and seal of a registered architect or the seal of a registered engineer.

Section 2. That any Ordinance or part of Ordinance conflicting with the provisions of this Ordinance, be and the same is hereby repealed, so far as the same affects this Ordinance.

ALLAN H. NEAL, *Secretary*

