

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

Vol. VI

MAY, 1918

Number 5

CONTENTS

	Page
FRONTISPIECE—ON THE SITE OF YORKSHIP VILLAGE	216
SHADOWS AND STRAWS	217
A NATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF THE BUILDING INDUSTRY	219
THE HOUSE BY THE SEA <i>S. W. H.</i>	220
THE CIRCEAN SHADOW! III <i>Richard Wallace Tudor</i>	223
THE ARCHITECT AFTER THE WAR <i>Milton B. Medary, Jr.</i>	227
THE REAL MEANING OF THE HOUSING PROBLEM <i>Frederick L. Ackerman</i>	229
DRAWINGS EXHIBITED AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE INSTITUTE AT PHILADELPHIA	233
YORKSHIP VILLAGE—A HOUSING DEVELOPMENT NEAR CAMDEN, N. J. (Illustrations and Plans)	237
PAPER ARCHITECTURE <i>A. Kingsley Porter</i>	245
THE FIRST WAR EMERGENCY GOVERNMENT TOWNS FOR SHIPYARD WORKERS. I. Yorkship Village at Camden, N. J. <i>Richard S. Childs</i>	249
AN AMERICAN COMPETITION FOR THE BEST SOLUTION OF THE HOUSE PROBLEM	252, 253
THE ARCHITECTURAL INCOMPETENCE REVEALED BY SOME REGISTRATION LAWS <i>D. Everett Waid</i>	254
LETTERS FROM AN AMERICAN ARCHITECTURAL STUDENT IN FRANCE	255
“SIGNS OF CHANGE” <i>Sullivan W. Jones</i>	259
OBITUARY	260
STRUCTURAL SERVICE DEPARTMENT	261

Published Monthly by

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

1159 Mulberry Street, Harrisburg, Pa.

The Octagon, Washington, D. C.

Committee on Publications

FRANK C. BALDWIN, *Chairman*
BEN J. LUBSCHEZ
H. VAN BUREN MAGONIGLE

CHARLES HARRIS WHITAKER, Editor
The Octagon

C. GRANT LA FARGE
CHARLES L. BORIE, JR.
THOMAS R. KIMBALL

50 CENTS A COPY. \$5 PER YEAR

Checks or P. O. orders should be made payable to The Journal of the American Institute of Architects,
and mailed to The Octagon, Washington, D. C.

Copyright, 1918, by the American Institute of Architects. Entered as second-class matter, December 20, 1912, at the
Post Office at Harrisburg, Pa., under Act of Congress of August 24, 1912

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

The labor situation is wholly beyond the control of any contractor. Knowledge of these things will not deter the contractor from making competitive bids or signing lump-sum contracts. It will, in fact, encourage the most reckless kind of bidding by the most undesirable element in the contracting fraternity, actuated by the sole aim of securing work. The inevitable sequel to such a process will be protracted disputes, delays, and complete failure on the part of the Government to secure housing accommodation quickly.

Competitive bidding and lump-sum contracts will neither answer the needs of the Government nor the demands of the unemployed contractors. Unless these contractors are suffering from distorted reason through brooding over their grievances, and have learned nothing from past experience, they must certainly prefer working under the cost-plus form of contract to working under the lump-sum contract in these days, crowded as they are with uncertainties. What these contractors really want, and what Congress is trying to secure for them, is a more equitable distribution of contracts, and we cannot help feeling that the contractors would have placed themselves in a stronger position and might have exerted a far greater influence for improving the Government's methods if they had frankly talked the real issue instead of resorting to the obsolete, back-door methods of the old-time politician.

Some of the Government departments, particularly the Construction Division, require education on matters of policy and method, and these contractors might have rendered a service of inestimable value to the Government, directly, and indirectly also, through helping themselves and the whole building industry by intelligently applying pressure where it is needed. Their cause is a just one, and has our whole-hearted sympathy, but we are entirely out of sympathy with their methods. A determined and persistent effort ought to be made to convince those Government officials who formulate policy that they are adding fuel to

the fire of unrest, and depriving the Government of very great benefits, by failing to use the greatest possible number of existing productive agencies. One official, who has much authority in the selection of contractors, is quoted as saying, in effect, that it was the policy to keep the number of contractors serving the Government down to the smallest possible number, and to confine that number to those who had "made good." What about the hundreds of other contractors who have had no opportunity to demonstrate their ability? And what about cases where second and third contracts have been given to contractors who have not "made good" on the first? The size of an organization, in these days when contractors underwrite construction projects, is no indication of organization efficiency. As some of the senators have said, the cost of the work has been inordinately high. The contractors' overhead expense, paid by the Government, has been, as a rule, out of all normal proportion to the cost of the work. The Government has paid liberally for services which, in many cases, it has not received.

The Government cannot escape its share of responsibility for the existence of these conditions. It has failed to check or correct them. In some cases the officials in charge in the field have dictated to the contractor the method of handling the work and the character of his organization, both of which indicate an absolute ignorance of the usual methods and of organization. In some cases the Government has duplicated the contractor's organization. The Government's field expense has run as high as 10 per cent of the cost of the work, and this does not include the overhead expense in Washington. If work were conducted by private individuals during peace times on any such wildly extravagant scale, there would be no building industry. The unemployed contractor has a splendid case, and he ought to present it properly, unselfishly, on the ground that it is his right and privilege to serve the Government at this time.

Obituary

George W. Rapp

Elected to the Institute as a Fellow, 1882
Died at Cincinnati, Ohio, January 10, 1918

Goldwin Starrett

Elected to the Institute in 1915
Died at New York City, May 9, 1918

Goldwin Starrett was born in Lawrence, Kan., September 29, 1874. His education began in his mother's school for girls in Chicago, where he enjoyed those unique advantages which, as a child, left that impress upon his nature which made him so beloved by those whom he gathered about him. His studies were pursued under special tutors, and he then entered the Engineering Department of the University of Michigan, from which he was graduated in 1894.

Thence to the office of D. H. Burnham in Chicago, where he remained for four years, leaving there to join the George A. Fuller Company, where for two years he was superintendent and assistant manager. During the next four years he associated himself with the Thompson-

Starrett Company as secretary and assistant general manager, and another four years were spent with the E. B. Ellis Granite Company.

In 1908 he established himself as an architect in New York City, and shortly thereafter formed the firm of Goldwin Starrett and Van Vleck. About a year thereafter, Mr. Orrin Rice was admitted to partnership, and, in 1914, Mr. (now Colonel) W. A. Starrett joined the firm, which then became known as Starrett & Van Vleck, Mr. Goldwin Starrett becoming the senior partner.

The Philadelphia Chapter Medal Awarded to Messrs. Day & Klauder

At the last meeting of the Philadelphia Chapter, the report of the Jury to award the Chapter Medal was read in connection with the recent annual Architectural Exhibition. The medal was awarded to Messrs. Day & Klauder for the Princeton University dormitories and dining-halls. The Jury was composed of Bertram G. Goodhue and John Wyncoop, of New York City, and Thomas L. Kellogg, of Philadelphia.