

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

Vol. III

APRIL, 1915

No. 4

War Monuments

THOSE who had hoped that men would not again seek to perpetuate the memories of war by monuments, will find little encouragement for their hope in the outlook of "The Builder."* We are inclined to doubt whether its contention is true that "deeds of valor recorded by poets and writers are more effectively symbolized by architects and sculptors," although perhaps it would be in order first to decide upon what "effectively" means. But the doubt of which we speak seems to find its own echo and a partial explanation, in somewhat paradoxical form, it is true, in the added admission that "perhaps in the latter case the symbolism is vaguer, the hint of trial less apparent, but posterity receives its chief impressions from the concrete legends of tradition." On the whole, one is left to a more or less vague surmise as to exactly what is meant.

But there can be no lack of sympathetic understanding when "The Builder" deplores the form of monumental symbolism which so many previous commemorative efforts have produced. One thought of the "soldier's monuments" which disfigure our own country is sufficient to cause us ardently to join in the hope that if war monuments are still to be demanded by civilized peoples—a demand which

*London.

"The Builder" seems to take for granted—there shall be "a readjustment of our views concerning the nature of monumental sculpture and war memorials; . . . there must be a controlling agency."

With equal ardor will we approve the suggestion "that the deans of cathedrals and the rectors of parish churches will use their authority with discretion regarding the introduction of wall tablets and memorials into the buildings under their charge." We have strong misgivings as to the security against disfigurement which would obtain in the discretionary power here implied, and would suggest some central body of authority upon which competent architects and sculptors might have representation. We can conceive situations wherein the difficulty of resisting the united appeal of a bereaved and influential family might be greater than even the sternest and most conscientious of deans would find it possible to overcome. Surely the further disfigurement of English churches and cathedrals is a matter that may well engage attention when the time comes.

At the same time, might it not be well to inquire whether we have not yet reached a state of existence where war may be symbolized as other than a valorous and praiseworthy achievement of nations and men. Might it not be possible for our

THE QUANTITY SYSTEM—OBITUARY

never be used again. But we find that the habit of drawing details, always in the order of the plan first, then the section, and then the elevation, at a scale $\frac{1}{2}''=1'0''$ to $3''=1'0''$, on small sheets, simplifies the work very much, and we feel sure that if the contractor has practically all the information at the start, an appreciable saving is the result.

Must not this then be the logical first step toward the reform which the quantity system is designed to secure? For surely if the surveyor is to make up an accurate statement of materials, he must first have full and precise information, and that means that the architect must reduce his vague ideas to accurate scale details. No quantity surveyor can aid us here. Conferences at this time are a nuisance.

Work is to be done; work must be done before the commission is completed; why not do it at the start and render the contractors or the surveyor an accurate set of $\frac{1}{4}''$ scale drawings corrected to agree with details?

Whatever the result of the discussion of quantity surveying, we shall have done our part if we can arrange practically to complete our work in one operation. If then the Quantity System should be adopted, we are ready for it; if it fails of adoption, we have answered hostile criticism; and, quite apart from either of these considerations, to give full information to contractors before estimates are made saves money in the execution of the work and enforces a better organization of our offices.

Obituary

William S. Eames

Admitted to the Institute as a Fellow in 1890.

President of the Institute 1904-05.

Died at St. Louis, March 5, 1915.

Thirty years ago the Middle West was architecturally an almost uncharted country, and the American Institute of Architects but recently enlarged through amalgamation with the former western association.

Mr. Eames, with a few others composing the St. Louis Chapter in those days, brought to the new organization an enthusiasm and inspiration which soon made its influence felt not only in the architectural profession, but in artistic circles and in social life.

He served several terms as President of the St. Louis Chapter and as a Director of the Institute for many years. He was elected President in 1904 and again in 1905. He served as a delegate on the part of the United States to the Sixth International Congress of Architects, held at Madrid, Spain, in 1904. He was a member of the Architectural League of New York, and a life member of the American Academy at Rome.

Mr. Eames' influence was always exerted for the advancement of the highest professional standards both in ethics and design, and his personality was such as to endear him to all with whom he came in contact.

Through his association with a number of St. Louis artists, many of whom have since become famous, he acquired a knowledge of art outside of his own profession, which, with his cultivated taste, soon caused him to be regarded as an authority in

art. Among this group of young enthusiasts were Harry Chase, Duvenek, Howe, Ruckstuhl, and Augustus Thomas, the playwright.

The firm consisting of William S. Eames and Thomas C. Young was organized as an equal partnership in 1885, neither partner having previously practised his profession independently. This partnership continued unaltered until September of 1914, when the firm was incorporated under the title of "Eames & Young, Architects, a Corporation."

In addition to a long list of important private works executed under the direction of Eames & Young, the firm also received a number of important commissions from the United States Government.

At a special meeting of the St. Louis Chapter, held on March 5, it was

Resolved, That it is the sense of this body of his fellow architects that we, as well as the entire community, have suffered an irreparable loss in the untimely death of William S. Eames. And further, that we owe to the memory of his example a debt of gratitude too heavy to be discharged by merely making a record of our respect.

We feel that only by our efforts to uphold the highest principles of our profession may we, who have followed his leadership, repay in some measure our obligation to the pioneer who helped to raise the standards of the art of architecture.

And further, we trust that an ever-broadening devotion to all that is enduringly best, both in art and in life, will most fittingly indicate our city's appreciation of the legacy he has left behind.