PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

by Jerome L. Salzman, FARA

We have just concluded the 21st Annual Convention and have taken important steps for ARA and the architectural profession.

At the annual business meeting the following proposals were passed:

1. ARA approved the concept of advertising.

2. ARA approves the concept that the architect is again becoming the Master Builder and approves of his involvement in construction management, design-build, owner and developer.

3. ARA establishes as a rule of conduct the golden rule—"architect helping architect."

Membership is to be our main thrust in 1978, and this will involve all of the membership as well as a major portion of our budget. We plan to offer our members help in all aspects of architects' involvement in the building process. You will be hearing more of this.

Men and wives all enjoyed the many seminars and field trips. The closeness and comradery that is evident to all is really an unusual phenomenon. Even though some of us only see each other once a year, we really feel a warmth that is hard to explain. We all look forward to renewing this each year.

We are looking forward to 1978 with anticipation of ARA making meaningful strides for ‘ARCHITECT,’ and are sure that one year from now we will report many successes.

THE FOUNDER'S CORNER

Wilfred J. Gregson, FARA

Growth is not a straight line curve. In natural plant life it resembles a series of hops, first with a shrinking followed by a spurt to a higher point than before the shrinking. Watch a cat going down on its haunches prior to springing upwards.

Businesses, industries and societies follow the same growth principle. They keep on growing by a series of hops, until these hops get shorter and finally may actually regress. This is not necessarily the end of growing but a plateau from which a change is required to permit the next stage of hops to be effective.

When this plateau is reached a shock wave is required. it can be a new outlook, new management, new principles or new ideas.

ARA is at such a plateau; in fact has been there for some time. The shock wave principle must be applied. A two year President's term is one of the requirements. It gives the President one year to find what needs changing and a second year to implement the change.

ARA is an architects’ service organization. Jerome Salzman, National President of the Society of American Registered Architects, has been checking with the members and Directors. How can we serve more architects better? Are we doing those things of minor importance and missing out on the greater ones? Are we afraid to take any position for fear of offending some?

We must stand behind President Salzman and help create the shock wave that will carry ARA to new heights, to greater responsibilities, greater usefulness and greater importance as the only professional architectural society that has the good of all architects as its purpose.

Your own practice, in fact your own life and everything that you do, all will follow this same law of growth. Be alert for the jumps and especially watch out for the rounding of the tops of the jumps. When the top of the last jump does not go higher than the previous jump, a decline is set in. It will be followed by senility unless prompt action is taken. It can be corrected by a shock wave, a new interest, a new activity preceded by an analysis of how you got where you are and what you must do to continue the climb. There is one simple fact to keep in mind, "be alert!"
NATIONAL BOARD REPORT

At the November 16th Board Meeting (immediately preceding the Convention) only a few significant operational matters were discussed. Principal among these were Awards Chairman John Pankovich’s report that some consideration should be given to methods for increasing the number of entries in the Design Awards Programs. For the second year in a row submissions were considerably below previous levels and it was suggested that it is probably unrealistic to continue to consider this a consequence of a depressed marketplace.

Treasurer Sidney Epstein reported that with revenues not reaching expectations and the magazine continuing to operate without advertising support, the Society was operating approximately $5000 below budget. This will require a draw on reserves in order to balance the 1977 budget.

The following activities have been scheduled by the Executive Board.

National Board Meeting—Saturday, January 14, 1978; to be held at the O’Hare Hilton in Chicago, Illinois.

National Board Meeting—Saturday, May 14, 1978; to be held in New York, New York (location to be announced).

National Board Meeting—Saturday, September 9, 1978; (location to be announced).


Board discussions concentrated extensively on means for increasing membership in the coming year. This is generally agreed to be the most desirable approach toward being able to financially achieve the expressed Society service goals. Since membership procurement discussions also occupied most of the post-Convention Board Meeting on November 20th, providing little of a reportable nature, we thought it might be more interesting to show an actual Board session. The photograph below was taken about halfway through the Wednesday session.

The Illinois State Council (the Council conducting the Regional election) has notified the National Executive Board that William E. Baldwin, ARA; of Oak Brook, Illinois, was elected Regent for Region 6 in the recently conducted election.

Saturday night in Houston, at the Annual Installation and Awards Banquet, the newly elected officers of the Society were formally installed in office. The ARA Officers for 1978 are:

President: Jerome Salzman (Illinois)
President-Elect: Richard Shields (Pennsylvania)
Vice President: G. Robert Johnson (Illinois)
Treasurer: Wayne Bryan (Illinois)
Recorder: Bertrand Johnson (New Jersey)
Directors: Donald Geitz (Ohio)
John Pankovich (Pennsylvania)
Sidney Epstein (Illinois)
Regent-at-Large: Donald Mckerchar (Florida)
Archivist: Chester Stark (Illinois)

GRASSROOTS

In the first issue we published in this section extracts from some of the letters received from members following the Atlanta Convention. Unfortunately, this usage did not explain the reason for this permanent magazine component.

In establishing Grassroots the National Executive Board agreed that it was important that there be an opportunity for the public discussion by the membership of matters relating to the philosophy, operations, and welfare of the Society. So this particular section will be reserved for the publication of comments received from individual ARA members.

Letters received are subject to final selection by the Editorial Board, guided primarily by considerations of aptness to the general membership, good taste, and space availability. Therefore when you have some concern about ARA, wish to offer a personal perspective on our operations, or respond to another member’s ideas send it to Grassroots.

On the subject of submitting things, we should call members’ attention to our interest in publishing feature articles on subjects of building technology or office practice methods prepared by the members. Submit articles for publication consideration in accordance with the directions on the back cover of this issue.

---

The photograph shows members of the National Board at a meeting.
COUNCIL UPDATE

The following are reports of the current activities of ARA State Councils, which have been received as of the time that we went to press.

Illinois—This year we have separated the awards program from the Annual Meeting so that participants have more time in preparing their award entries which previously conflicted with the timing of the National Awards Program.

The Illinois Council will hold its Annual Meeting on Friday evening, January 13, 1978. The meeting has been scheduled to take place in the Oliver Harvey Room at McCormick Place in Chicago, where we will start at 5:30 PM. A cocktail hour and dinner will be followed by a brief meeting and attendance at a play. The play will be performed at Drury Lane East in McCormick Place and stars Mickey Rooney in "Hide and Seek".

Details of the 1977 Awards Program will be announced in the next issue of the Illinois Council Bulletin and by separate mailer early in December. Entries must be post-marked no later than February 24, 1978. Awards will be made at the regular bi-monthly meeting to be held in March 1978. The exact time and place to be announced.

New York—We are pleased to furnish the following report on the activities of the New York Council during September and October.

The first fall meeting after the summer recess took place on September 7. Ballots for the election of officers through 1978 were tabulated and the following results recorded:

President: Ralph M. Meyer, FARA
Vice Pres.: Rudolf Herzberg, FARA
Second Vice Pres.: Burton Roslyn, ARA
Secretary: Stanley Kasindorf, FARA
Treasurer: George Sharon, FARA

Aside from the formal conduct of business, our meetings become interesting forums for the discussion and exchange of information on various architectural concerns such as errors and omission policies and premiums, the running of a small office, a statute of limitations, continuing education, etc., hopefully our "architect helping architect" goal is, in a small way, being realized.

The main items of activity involve: (a) support of Barry Milowicz as Acting Regent for Region 2, (b) stimulating interest in the design competition to be judged at the National Convention in Houston, (c) recommending of individuals to fill the "public member" position on the New York State Board of Architecture (appointment mandated for January 1978), (d) the establishing of a ten person Board of Directors, to be responsible for handling the various assignments to help the Council be of service to its membership and to the profession, (e) the continuing endeavor of stimulating interest in membership in ARA.

In addition we are determining methods for exposing architectural students in New York based schools of architecture to the existence and goals of ARA, via: (a) the establishing of an award for a competition, (b) the furnishing of guest lecturers, (c) the offering of a "counseling" service for those students interested in the workings of an architectural office. A committee has been appointed to formulate a practical program.

Ohio—Our newly elected officers are as follows:
President: Donald L. Geitz
Vice Pres.: Randall B. Lawrence
Treasurer: Herbert E. Robezniak
Secretary: Edward H. Amos

The Ohio Council, which is the only state with a Blue Cross program for architects, is working with our local Blue Cross offices for the purpose of contacting other cities to develop Blue Cross programs in their areas.

In an endeavor to make architects in our area aware of our Society and its benefits, we have sent out approximately 2000 questionnaires.

Pennsylvania—The Pennsylvania Council meets in regular session usually on the first Wednesday of each month at a location designated at the previous meeting. Locations include Morgantown, Allentown and Reading, and occasionally in Philadelphia, Valley Forge or other areas convenient to members of the Council in various parts of the State. A customary highlight each year is an overnight meeting hosted by Edmund G. Good, Jr., at his retreat in Perry County where we can relax and still get a lot of Council business done.

We have achieved approximately 100% increase in paid membership so far this year, and are processing Council records to verify the exact tally. The following are some of the highlights of the Pennsylvania Council activities.

Resurgence of the Philadelphia Chapter in conjunction with the Council and National membership drive is a high priority of this year’s activity. There is a considerable reservoir of potential members in the Philadelphia metropolitan vicinity, and we have had very favorable response to our efforts.

A Philadelphia Chapter picnic/swim party was sponsored by the Council as an all-day Sunday affair at the residence of Mitchel Abramowitz in Roslyn, Pa. on September 18th.

A major activity on the current Council agenda is the formation of the Host Council Committee for liaison and assistance in planning the 1978 Convention in Philadelphia. We anticipate an exceptional convention for 1978, at which time Richard E. Shields of our Council will be inaugurated as the National President.

Our newly elected officers for 1978 are:
President: John G. Pankovich
Vice Pres.: Ted Monzulewski, Jr.
Treasurer: Ralph Caldwell
Recorder: Wayne Bridgens
Directors: Edmund G. Good, Jr.
Robert S. Martin
Paul W. Getz

Chapter Coordinator:
Mitchel Abramowitz
SUPPORT OUR SPONSORS—
1977 CONVENTION

Recognizing the continuing discussion of product manufacturers’ lack of commitment to providing quality service to the architectural profession generally, the Executive Board directs the attention of the membership to those companies who made an appearance as exhibitors at the Houston Convention. In doing so, these companies acknowledged that you, as an architect, are an important buying influence for their business and in addition have recognized your professional organization as a representative of your interests.

It is strongly recommended that when you are selecting or specifying products, you give first consideration to those manufactured by these companies. This constitutes a part of what the Board calls, perhaps inaccurately but with proper intent, the Support Our Sponsors program. In the coming months it is intended that this program will begin identifying those companies and organizations who by their activities evidence a recognition of the position of the architect within the construction industry, as well as those who do not. With this identification, member firms can begin to respond in kind, by exerting their product selection influence on behalf of those companies that are supportive of the architect and minimizing the usage of products whose manufacturers’ marketing and sales activities work to downgrade the profession.

STEELCRAFT MANUFACTURING COMPANY
9017 Blue Ash Road
Cincinnati, Ohio 45242

LUDOWICI-CELADON
Div. of CSC, Inc.
201 N. Talman Ave.
Chicago, Illinois 60612

VICTOR SYSTEMS & EQUIPMENT
P.O. Box 500
Blue Bell, Pennsylvania 19422

CRESCENT METAL PRODUCTS/CROWN X
12711 Taft Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44108

UNITED STATES GYPSUM COMPANY
101 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606

BARRA BANRESE BEALL STUDIO
23727 Hawthorne Boulevard
Torrance, California 90505

TOM BLACKBURN & ASSOCIATES
P.O. Box 56624
Dallas, Texas 75207

MILWAUKEE VALVE COMPANY, INC.
2375 South Burrell St.
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53207

KOPPERS COMPANY, INC.
P.O. Box 16220
Houston, Texas 77022

MASONITE CORPORATION
29 N. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606

LCN CLOSERS
P.O. Box 100
Princeton, Illinois 61356

GLOBE AMERADA GLASS COMPANY
2001 Greenleaf Ave.
Elk Grove Village, Illinois 60007

LANIER BUSINESS PRODUCTS
1700 Chantilly Drive, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30324

JOHNSON CONSTRUCTION SPECIALTIES
P.O. Box 1360
Houston, Texas 77001

CUSHING & COMPANY
173 W. Madison St.
Chicago, Illinois 60602

FEATHERLITE CORPORATION
3445 Executive Center Drive
Austin, Texas 78731

For easy reference to the 387 published Underwriters Laboratories standards, the newly amended “Catalog of Standards for Safety” is now available. For a free copy write to: Underwriters Laboratories, Stock Department, 333 Pfingsten Road, Northbrook, IL 60062.
DAY BY DAY
AT THE 1977 CONVENTION

In order to try and present some of the true flavor of the 1977 Convention, we asked various members to report in their own words on the scheduled activities. Following are their reactions to what they saw, heard and did.

Thursday Morning. The Dale Carnegie Program, a three part seminar. We were addressed by Mr. W. Bayne Gibson, V.P. and General Manager of Bonar & Associates of Denver, on the Dale Carnegie method of “Selling Yourself and Your Firm.”

He gave a dynamic presentation that displayed where, why, and most importantly, how to get positive sales results. No visual aids were used to detract from direct one-on-one communication.

He worked to make us aware and realize our own role and mission. Stressed was the importance of knowing yourself. Who we are individually or as a firm. What direction we must take and the best method to achieve our goals. Discussed were management style and philosophy, services, markets, profit and growth orientation, and external causes and forces to be reckoned with.

As this was a several part seminar we set about augmenting these goals by participation, in groups, to formulate priorities and methods to achieve these various goals. In essence, we established a creativity group session to examine problems and facts, and to evaluate solutions. We discussed a marketing plan for an organization and how to implement it, so we could become known and respected within the sphere of our specialty. It became apparent to most, that we were being shown how these sessions would be desirable within our own offices. Success requires recognition available by exposure through civic, political, or social outlets, or by articles or positions in newspapers or trade periodicals. The key word is communication.

The final session addressed itself to retention and continuation of our client relationship that directly affects our “performance”. Mr. Gibson stressed and proved the need for very defined and published company standards for ethics, business dealings, rules, limitations, communications, trust, respect, confidence, and above all else, responsibility by all personnel in any client dealings. He enumerated firms whose success was traced to such credo and business codes. These standards improve employee relationships and achievement.

Most, if not all, were impressed with Mr. Gibson’s forthright delivery and presentation. He spoke directly to us; not at us. He involved us in cooperative effort at a solution, which we felt was ours by contribution and involvement. He knew his subject. The valuable and informative question period proved it.

Thursday Luncheon. The ARA was officially welcomed to the city of Houston by Mr. Jerry King, Special Assistant to Mayor Hofheinz. Member awards were presented. (See page 8 for report.)

Thursday Afternoon and Evening. In partly cloudy weather, seventy ARA members and wives rode in two buses to romantic and historic Galveston City.

Many buildings on the mainland and in Galveston were observed to be on “stilts” because of the high water during severe storms. Numerous cotton warehouses and pressing plants attested to Galveston’s position as the “cotton capital.”

In Galveston many historic homes were seen, including the Ashton Villa, now used as a museum and having a fine auditorium occupying what had been the stables.

Highlight of the tour was the visit to the Bishop’s Palace, formerly the home of Col. and Mrs. Walter Gresham. Victorian in style, it was built starting in 1888 and completed several years later. Nicholas Clayton was the architect. Notable were various Victorian features: 14 elaborate fireplaces, exquisite wood paneling and hand carvings, stained glass, a fifty-five foot high central rotunda, and numerous sculptured items and paintings.

Three years were required to do the hand carving of the central wood stairway and railing. The construction cost when built was $250,000 and today’s valuation of the building is $5,000,000.

The tour continued along the Strand, originally the waterfront street. This is an historic area where many buildings are being restored or reconstructed. We also had a chance to observe the sea wall of Galveston: three feet wide at the top, sixteen feet thick at the base, seventeen feet high and twenty miles long.

Dinner was in the Balinese Room where a sumptuous buffet of roast beef, red snapper, and many other fine foods were consumed in large quantities. The Balinese Room was once one of the largest gambling casinos on this continent; when raided trap doors in the floor opened and the gambling equipment dropped into the Gulf below. Members and wives gambled on this tour being interesting and exciting and they won.

Friday Morning. Mr. Julian W. Goodrich, NCARB Director, stated that the NCARB program has been adopted in 55 states and territories of the United States, and is administered through six regions.

The Board membership is made up of members from the various registration boards and the Board operates with various committees: Design Committee, Examination Evaluation, Professional Examination, Qualifying Examination, Professional Conduct, Procedures and Documents, Intern Development Program.

The Intern Development Program has been in operation in several states for three years, and seems worthwhile, even though there are still areas that need to be refined.
Treasure Epstein reported on the financial status of the Society. The 1977 budget totaled an income and expenditure of $69,000 and was balanced with a reduction in reserve funds. It was estimated that the final Convention accounting would show a $3,000 to $4,000 deficit.

Chairman Berger, reporting on the 1977 Convention, stated that both exhibitors and membership participation are not as high as last year—an increase in both must be achieved next year.

John Pankovich reported that the Student Design Awards Program included nine participating Colleges of Architecture and twenty-five offices participated in the Professional Program.

It was reported by Richard Shields that a unit of 100 millimeters has been adopted as the basic unit by the Metric Council and a target date of April 1978 has been set for the approval of all units. He also reported that the NCIC had approved a stand on procuring A/E services by the Federal Government as outlined in the Brooks Bill and representatives appeared before Congress to make recommendations.

Chairman Bryan reported that over ten percent of the membership questionnaires have been returned. It was also reported that the Legal, Accounting, and Public Relations Programs were well received by the members last year based upon the frequency of their use.

The 1978 Convention will be held in Philadelphia from November 1 through November 5. Chairman Schaffner asked that all members be ready and willing to help in this endeavor.

Regents and other Special Committee Chairmen also reviewed key elements of their Board reports.

Member Bernard Frishman moved that the Society approve the use of advertising by architects, subject to its being done in good taste and in a professional manner. Considerable discussion ensued indicating strong membership concurrence with this idea. The question was eventually put to the membership and approved.

Member Frishman then moved that the Society officially affirm that it recognizes the architect's position as "Master Builder" and approves and encourages their involvement in the areas of design/build, construction management, project development, and ownership. Following a minimum of discussion the motion was passed.

A motion was introduced stating that the Society reaffirm its belief that ethical conduct by the members be guided by the "Golden Rule" and by professionalism. The motion was passed.

President Salzman closed the meeting noting that membership will again be the major concern for 1978 and asking for all members' help.

The climax of the 1977 National Convention was the Annual Installation and Awards Banquet, held in the Grand Ballroom on Saturday evening. Seated at the head table were Mr. & Mrs. Wilfred Gregson, Founder; Mr. Jerome Salzman, 1977-78 National President; Ms. Judith B. Maxinov, Mr. Salzman's niece who was attending the National Women's Conference; Mr. Richard Shields, President-Elect, and Mrs. Shields; Mr. Herbert Berger, 1977 Convention Chairman, and Mrs. Berger; Mr. Arnold Schaffner, 1978 Convention Chairman, and Mrs. Schaffner; and Mrs. Jean Boulanger.

The Student and Professional Design Awards were presented by Mr. John Pankovich, the 1977 Design Awards Program Chairman. (See awards listing on page 8)

The Jean Boulanger Award was presented to Herb Berger by Gladys Boulanger. President Salzman awarded the ARA Gold Medal to Mr. Fred Prather and Mr. John Pankovich. (See membership awards on page 8)

Founder Awards, the famous "Gregson ties", were presented to G. Robert Johnson and Jerome Salzman by Wilfred Gregson. In a "first time ever" turnabout Mr. Gregson was given a clan plaid cummerbund and bow tie (the Members' Founders Award?), the presentation being made by Bernie Frishman. Also, somewhere in these ceremonies a rubber chicken became involved.

Honored guests recognized

Continued on page 13
MEMBERSHIP AWARDS PRESENTED
AT THE 1977 CONVENTION

On Friday afternoon in Houston President Jerome Salzman presided over the presentation of membership awards at the Annual President's Award Luncheon. Seven members received recognition for their singular contributions to the Society on the Council and National level.

President Salzman stated that it was his policy not to repeat the presentation of individual awards to members who had received them in previous years. Therefore he also made a

general acknowledgement of the efforts of a number of past recipients who continue to make significant contributions to the advancement of the Society.

The 1977 award recipients are as follows:

Special Service Awards: The Society award for work done on the Council level.

George Sharon—As President of the New York Council and for his assistance on the national membership program.

Weldon Fulton—As President of the Southern California Chapter; in recognition of the success of their programs, awards competition, and seminars.

Len Glasser—As President of the Florida Council.

Wayne Bryan—For work done in the Illinois Council as Chairman of the Awards Program; also recognizing efforts on behalf of the national questionnaire program.

Presidential Awards

Don Geitz—For work as Chairman of the Student Program and as Regent for Region 4.

Bernard Frishman—Service as our representative at hearings, meetings, and representing the Society in Washington.

Donald Uding—For work as President of the Illini Council and Editor of the Illinois Council Bulletin, which became a model for all Council publications; and on the national level as a leader of the "Now" Team and Editor of "Practicing Architect".

Commemorative pins were awarded to Gladys Boulanger and Vida Chennault for their personal input, involvement, and support of ARA.

A commemorative pin was also awarded to Ted Wolfe, of Chuck Faroni's office, for his continuing help in setting up and operating the conventions.

Gold Medal

Fred Prather—Given for the work he did through the Illinois Council on the national membership program, his interest in national affairs as evidenced by his attendance at all meetings, and for the job he did and is doing as President of the Illinois Council. (Photo-top)

John Pankovich—in recognition of his work at the national level on the awards program for the 1977 Convention and his leadership in the Pennsylvania Council on the national membership program. (Photo-center)

Jean Boulanger Award

Herb Berger—for his work on the 1977 Convention, as well as his service as National President. (Photo-bottom)
A QUESTION OF IMAGE
Donald N. Uding, AIA, ARA
Editor

We Americans appear to mentally perceive certain groupings of people uniformly as defined by the characteristics which we desire to see them exhibit. Thus all doctors are viewed as noble and dedicated, all soldiers courageous and indomitable, all journalists truthful and concerned, and, of particular interest to us, architects as altruistic and artistic.

"All have sinned and fall short of the glory...,", runs the biblical adage that succinctly expresses the reality of our human condition. So, in emotionally refusing to acknowledge this reality we are constantly being traumatized by evidence of its conflict with our perception. Not in relation to ourselves, but to these idealized groupings. We are scandalized to learn that there are doctors who want to become affluent and spend three months a year in the Virgin Islands: overlooking this dream in ourselves. We are outraged by the journalist discovered to have slanted the facts of his reporting to reflect the viewpoint that editors were buying: even as we "put the best light" on our own operations to gain acceptance and remuneration.

At its core perhaps this categorical perception is a fine thing. Perhaps representing an enduring natural instinct toward the ennoblement of our species, expressed through a desire for absolute trust in the actions and motivations of our fellows.

In human affairs, however, it is very often corrupted to an ignoble end, operating to project onto the shoulders of others the responsibility for acting with nobility while we are free to make those compromises which we can justify as necessary to meet our realities. On this premise we must be disturbed when one of these "others" violates this trust. He has failed to shelter us under "his" integrity. Our outrage is personal and viable because his failure reveals ours, whatever the quantitative proportion between our transgressions may be.

In viewing the resurgent question of the validity of codified ethics for architects, these psychological responses should be recognized as part of the subjective environment within which ethical determinations are made. It is possible that they may be revealed as the determinative factor in the established attitudes.

Advertising activities have come to be accepted, particularly within the last thirty years, as a virtual necessity on the part of every business enterprise from General Motors to the local craft boutique; as well as by trade and political groupings, charities, and departments of government. Everywhere except in the major professions.

Why this contradiction? Are we facing here the action of the concept of the "nobility of others"? Throughout most of the history of architecture in this country there probably was no realistic value to advertising, as the requisite for significant commissions was primarily social standing. The architect rising from a lower middle class family and social background could have advertised his brains out without making any impact in the marketplace. But this is not the America of Grover Cleveland but Space Age, future-shocked, production line, technological America. The role of the University Club Renaissance Man, backed by an office of minimum wage drudges and immigrant craftsmen, if it has not vanished, is at least enclaved. Today's office which effectively responds to client and societal needs comprises a team of skilled, educated professionals with information and production resources, both hardware and software, which were unheard of thirty-five years ago.

This adds up to one thing—overhead. And, as the same economic rules apply to all businesses, be they product or service, the response to overhead is volume. (There seems little realism in considering the theoretical alternative of increasing prices.) But volume is not increased by adhering to the methods which produced current volume (except on the presumption of inefficient present operations); so the traditionally endorsed methods of seeking clients, which come perilously close to sitting and waiting for them to find you, are not going to make it. Again, these have more to do with "image" than reality.

If we disregard the "image", these traditional restraints may even be seen to be irresponsible. In addition to our professional activity responsibilities don't we also owe our clients some responsibility as businessmen? Isn't there some obligation to provide the maximum value for dollar spent? It seems a straining of moral principle to justify client subsidy of inefficient service delivery on the grounds that the service is "professional".

To date advertising is the only business methodology perceived as applicable to increasing office volume. If it functions conventionally, a lowering of unit (time) costs through the spreading of overhead costs over more units, it should produce a corresponding increase in the size of the market as these lower unit costs meet with value acceptance. Freed of any image of nobility, the danger seems to lie in creating a larger, more fluid market for our professional services. Danger to whom?

In the editorial comment for the next issue we will attempt to review some of the specific objections which are frequently raised to professional advertising and perhaps attempt to project some of the impact on the practice environment if advertising activities found acceptance. Members who have formed a strong opinion pro or con on this matter are invited to express them in writing and send them to the Editor before February 15th, in the hope that we could present in the Spring (March) issue a broad based review of the present status of this question.

Erratum: The first issue of Practicing Architect was designated the "Summer" issue although actually the "Fall" issue. We regret any confusion that this may have caused.
CAN PUBLIC RELATIONS HELP YOU—
THE ARCHITECT?

by Stanley D. Banash

Public relations services available to architectural firms are seldom understood, infrequently used, and sorely needed. Part of the problem is a lack of understanding of exactly what services a public relations counsel can provide, cost for the service, and the extent of benefits derived from a public relations program.

Before examining these three points more closely, let’s define public relations. Over the years many definitions have been presented, but perhaps one of the best describes public relations as “the management function which evaluates public attitudes, identifies policies and procedures of an individual, firm or organization with the public interest, and executes a program of action to earn public understanding, acceptance, and recognition.”

A public relations counsel can be very helpful to an architect in areas such as government relations, media exposure and contact, and professional image building.

In the government area where many complexities exist, a public relations counsel can be most helpful in serving as a liaison with agencies at all levels on government-supported projects, or in maintaining relations with various local, state, and federal departments. With the media, a public relations counsel can prepare press releases and feature stories for local newspapers and trade publications, as well as arrange for radio and television interviews.

In professional image building, he can arrange for still and motion pictures of your project, assist in presenting your case and credentials to building commission and community organizations, prepare speeches and talks for members of your firm to deliver before professional and service groups, publicize building additions, rehabilitation work, in-house promotions, and outside appointments, and prepare brochures and newsletters.

Since most architects are creative and imaginative, they may want to complete some or all of these public relations functions themselves. And perhaps they can. But an architect should carefully consider whether he is more productive and efficient by practicing architecture rather than devoting his time to a professional field in which he has little expertise. The choice is his.

The degree to which a public relations counsel becomes involved with an architectural firm is dependent upon the goals and objectives of the firm itself. Similarly, the fee is based on the amount of work required, size of the firm, type of project, and specific problem.

A fee structure can be established in two ways: 1) on a per project basis; and 2) on a monthly retainer.

In the former, a firm contracts for a specific project at gross cost or at cost plus fee. The project, for example, may include design and preparation of a brochure, or publicity of a special building. In any event, the relationship between the architectural firm and public relations counsel is of limited duration and would conclude when the project is completed.

A monthly retainer fee is established for a long-range public relations program, usually of one year or more. This is a desirable arrangement because it gives the public relations counsel the latitude to move in several directions with his client, and also enables the client to benefit from a variety of image-building efforts.

Fees may range from as low as $200 per month to $1,000 per month or more, plus expenses. In public relations as in architecture, you pay for what you get. Oftentimes, the bulk of the hard work is seldom seen. Just as an architect spends hours on a drafting board before his design is completed, a public relations counsel does likewise in making media contacts and preparing editorial copy before a project is published in a local or national trade magazine. This result usually is the climax of months of work and effort on the client’s behalf.

There are no shortcuts in building a public image. A public relations counsel can offer expertise and time, two ingredients that seldom can alter situations overnight. For that reason, many public relations firms require a minimum contract of one year. This gives both parties a fair chance to measure a program’s success.

If your firm is considering hiring a public relations counsel, it should be committed to three points: 1) examine the architectural practice and select those areas where public relations guidance can be most helpful; 2) contract with a public relations firm that is familiar and knowledgeable about your particular field and 3) listen to the advice of your public relations counsel.

Public relations can be a very useful and beneficial tool for the architect in building a public image, but it is a team effort that requires the full cooperation and commitment of both parties.

Mr. Stanley D. Banash is the principal in the firm of Stanley D. Banash and Associates in Chicago and the public relations advisor for the member service program.

METRIC STANDARDS AVAILABLE

A newly issued publication provides the technical basis for a comprehensive and authoritative standard for metric units (SI) to be used in building design, product manufacture and construction applications. The publication describes the nature of SI and gives rules and regulations for the presentation of SI units as well as the symbols and numerical values associated with SI.

For example, it recommends using only millimeters and meters, not centimeters, on drawings to save time and space. This publication is titled “Recommended Practice for the Use of Metric (SI) Units in Building and Construction” and is published by the National Bureau of Standards.

To order copies at $1.60 each, list publication title, plus NBS Technical Note 938, and SD Stock No. 003-003-01761-2, and request from: Supt. of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402.
1978 CONSTRUCTION FORECAST

Total construction contract volume for 1978 is predicted to increase 8% over this year according to the recently released McGraw-Hill Information Systems Company (Dodge/Sweet's) Construction Outlook. Prepared by Chief Economist George A. Christie, this annual report has been for many years one of the most respected evaluations of construction industry trends. While this report deals in its specifics with construction contract dollar volume, which our service market must anticipate by anywhere from a minimum of four months to a period of years, its view of the trends of movement in construction can be of value to architects in evaluating which segments of the market will be expanding or declining.

In general 1978 is seen as a period of slower growth than 1976-77, as residential demand begins to decline and nonresidential building cautiously increases to somewhat more than fill the gap. Overall volume will increase with commercial and industrial construction taking over as the more dynamic segment of the industry. The cyclical trends discussed in the report would appear to indicate that this pattern of a gradually declining residential market and a countering, gradually increasing nonresidential market would extend into 1979.

Two general influences continue to aggravate the conditions in the building market. The first is the diminishing rate of growth of the general economic recovery, which does not seem to want to firmly take hold. The second is the intractability of our inflation rate. An improvement in either of these conditions during 1978 could considerably improve the long-term construction picture, while a worsening of either could have a serious dampening effect on the predicted market growth.

Excerpts of this Christie Construction Outlook, which deal with the principal construction areas, are presented here.

Residential building

“From a rate of housing starts still above 2.0 million units in 1978’s first quarter, we anticipate a gradual decline over the year to a rate of 1.8 million in the final quarter. This would leave next year’s total, at 1.9 million units, virtually unchanged from the estimated 1977 volume except in two important ways: the direction in 1978 will be downward, and the composition of the next year’s total will shift, consisting of about 100,000 fewer one-family homes and that many more apartment units. Regionally, next year’s trade-off of some 100,000 dwelling units from one-family homes to apartments should benefit the Northeast and Midwest, partly because Federal housing policy will be directing more community development funds to these heavily urbanized areas under a revised formula which gives greater weight to the age of the housing stock and to lagging growth: problems plaguing the cities of these regions.”

During the predominantly single-family building boom of 1976 and 1977, the West and South outpaced the two older regions. In 1978, as multi-family building expands and single-family demand wanes, it is expected that the Northeast and Midwest will show modest gains, while volume holds steady in the South and declines in the West.”

Nonresidential Building

“In 1978 commercial and industrial building will be providing the thrust that has been lacking in nonresidential building up to now. With the long-awaited expansion of business capital spending finally taking hold, contracting for commercial and industrial building could jump as much as 20 percent in 1978, provided that he economy itself remains buoyant.” (Retail facilities and offices are considered to be expansionary throughout 1978 and beyond.) “The bonus of a modest reversal of the long decline of institutional building can also be hoped for, but shouldn’t be depended upon.”

The only positive influences coming from Federal programs, principally Revenue Sharing and the second phase of the Public Works Employment Act.

The particular short-term vulnerabilities of 1978 are pinpointed as: (a) “if credit restraint becomes excessive, disintermediation could precipitate a collapse of the housing market in 1978 instead of the orderly decline that is anticipated”; and (b) “businessmen are prepared to stretch out, or even cancel, their 1978 commercial and industrial building plans if signs of a serious economic slowdown appear.” It is emphasized that these are foreseeable risks and not probabilities. If government and industry remain alert to them and take positive action, if required, to restrain their development they should remain as no more than background to a positive 1978.

LAB OF THE YEAR AWARD PROGRAM

Industrial Research

Magazine now is accepting entries for its 12th Lab of the Year Competition. Research laboratories that reached occupancy between August 31, 1976 and December 31, 1977 are eligible. The annual award competition honors the most outstanding research laboratory designs in the world.

Winning labs each year are featured on the cover of Industrial Research, a magazine that goes to 95,000 scientists in research institutions around the world.

The annual competition recognizes the following achievements: (1) research and development laboratory design that exists in harmony with its surroundings, balances design with function to improve performance of personnel for the client, and increases return on investment; and (2) deals efficiently and safely with hazardous research, in terms of huge bulk or with projects of constantly varying nature.

Building designs for small firms employing only a few people, as well as designs for buildings that house thousands of scientists can compete in this awards program. Entries are judged on how well they meet the needs and objectives of the prospective users and designers. Size is of little importance.

Inquiries should be directed to: Laboratory of the Year, Industrial Research Magazine, 222 S. Riverside Plaza, Chicago, IL 60606, or call (312) 648-5820. An entry form for the competition, along with rules governing the contest will be forwarded.
TAX REFORM ACT OF 1976—ITS IMPACT ON REAL ESTATE

by Paul M. Lurie

We were unable to obtain publication of an article on the Tax Reform Act of 1976 for the ARA members last year, however we have noted that its provisions still do not appear to have been fully absorbed and it continues to have the predicted major impact upon the ability of the real estate industry to attract capital for the structure of real estate deals and syndications.

The following is a summary of the major aspects of the Act as they affect the real estate industry.

Recapture of Depreciation on Real Property

Under prior law accelerated depreciation claimed as a deduction after 1969 (i.e. depreciation in excess of straight line depreciation) must be recaptured as ordinary income upon sale of the real estate. Different rules apply depending upon the classification of the real estate.

These rules have been tightened in several regards. In case of government subsidized low income housing there is full recapture for all accelerated depreciation claimed after 1975 if the property is disposed of within 100 months after acquisition. For the next 100 months there is a phase out of the recapture of one percent per month so that there is no more recapture after the end of 162% years. Government subsidized housing means housing financed pursuant to Section 221(d)(3) or 236 of the National Housing Act and under Section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 or those loans made under Title V of the Housing Act of 1949. With the exception of government subsidized housing the new law applies the same recapture rules to residential housing as previously had been applied by the 1969 Reform Act to non-residential real estate.

Capitalization and Amortization of Real Property Construction Period Interest and Taxes

Under prior law, construction period interest and taxes were usually deductible by a cash basis taxpayer. Under the new law, with various phasing rules according to category, construction period interest and taxes are to be capitalized and amortized over a ten year period.

For non-residential real estate the new law applies only to property where the construction period begins after December 31, 1975. However, for 1976 only, 50% of the construction period interest and taxes can be deducted and 50% capitalized by a cash basis taxpayer.

For residential real estate (other than subsidized housing) the capitalization requirement is applicable only to construction interest and taxes paid or incurred after December 31, 1977. In the case of subsidized housing the capitalization requirement only pertains to interest and taxes paid or incurred after December 31, 1981.

When the new capitalization rule is applied there is a transition rule so that the full application of the 10 year rule will not be in effect for a 7 year period. During the first year to which the new rule is applied the amortization period is 4 years. The amortization period increases by 1 year for each succeeding year until the amortization period comes to 10 years. The first year in which a full 10 year amortization would be required would be 1982 for non-residential real estate, 1984 for residential real estate and 1988 for government subsidized housing.

Five Year Amortization for Low Income Housing

There is currently in effect a special 5 year amortization rule for expenditure to rehabilitate low income rental housing. This provision has been extended until January 1, 1978 and certain liberalizations have been made to its provisions.

Limitation on Dedication to Amount at Risk

The significance of this change is that it eliminates the tax shelter aspect of all so-called tax shelter investments other than real estate and to cattle deals where a partnership is not involved. The investments affected by these provisions include farming (except farming operations involving trees, other than fruit or nut trees); exploring for or exploiting oil and gas resources; holding, producing or distributing of motion picture films or video tapes; and equipment leasing. Real estate is not subject to this limitation. The limitation provides both for individuals and partnerships that the amount of any loss which may be deducted in connection with the limited partnership interest may not exceed the aggregate amount with respect to which the taxpayer is at risk in each such activity at the close of taxable year. "At risk" means cash invested plus obligations for which the taxpayer has personal liability either individually or through the pledge of the fair market value of personal assets.

Under the doctrine Crane vs. Commissioner, which this new provision effectively overrules as to all activities other than real estate, the taxpayer was allowed to depreciate as a basis not only the amount of his cash investment but also the amount of his pro rata share of any non-recourse loan for which he was not personally liable. As to the no-favored activities, there are certain phase in rules.

Prepaid Interest

The new law requires a cash method taxpayer to deduct prepaid interest over the period of the loan. "Prepaid" are now required to be deducted ratably over the term of the loan and may not be deducted as a current expense by a cash method taxpayer. However, this limitation is not applicable to points paid in connection with the purchase or improvement of a principal residence by a taxpayer. There are phase in rules which provide that the prepaid interest rule applies to prepayments of interest on or after January 1, 1976, and does not apply to prepayments made before January 1, 1977 pursuant to a binding contract prior to written loan commitment in effect on September 16, 1975.

Limitation on Deduction of Non-Business Interest

Interest deductions on investment indebtedness is now limited to $10,000 plus the taxpayer's net investment income. No offset of investment interest is permitted against capital gain income. There are certain exceptions and transition rules.

Dollar Limitation on Additional First Year Depreciation Allowance

Under prior law there was no limitation placed upon the amount of additional bonus depreciation that a partnership could pass through to its partners. The new law imposes a limitation of $2,000 of the amount of bonus depreciation which can pass through to partners. The existing law remains in effect. A partner filing an individual return cannot in the aggregate take more than $2,000 additional bonus depreciation allowances from all partnerships ($4,000 in the case of a joint return).

Partnership Syndication and Organization Fee

All fees paid in connection with the syndication of a partnership must be capitalized and not be deducted. Organization fees of the partnership may be amortized over a 5 year period, beginning January 1, 1977.

Retroactive Allocations of Partnership Income or Loss.

Income or losses of a partnership will be allocable to a partner only for the portion of the year that he is a member of a partnership and may not be made retroactive to periods prior to entry. This means that if the partnership was formed on January 1,
1976 and a partner became a member on December 1, 1976 that partner can only take 1 month's of losses. Under prior law 11 months and 30 days of loss could have been allocated to a partner. Under prior law the partnership agreement could allocate income gain, loss, deduction or credit among the partners in a manner that is disproportionate to the capital contributions of such partners. These special allocations may be made by amendment at any time up to the due date of the partnership tax return for that year. Prior law recognized such special allocations if the principal purpose was not to avoid or evade any income tax. However, practitioners had contended that this restriction upon retroactive allocations applied only to allocation of items of income, gain, loss, or deduction themselves. The new law specifically provides that the allocation will be recognized only if it can be demonstrated that it has substantial economic effect. Among the factors to be taken into consideration are the interests of the respective partners in profits and losses, (if different from that of taxable income or loss), cash flow, and rights of distribution of capital upon liquidation.

Minimum Tax.

Under prior law there is a minimum tax equal to 10% of the sum of an individual's or corporation's tax preferences reduced by a $30,000 exemption plus the taxpayer's regular income taxes (after credits). Tax preference items include accelerated depreciation in excess of straight line depreciation, qualified or restricted stock options, capital gains (for individuals) excluded one-half of net long term capital gains; for corporations 18/48 capital gains; and certain other more esoteric types of amortizations and deprecations. The new law increases the minimum tax from 10% to 15% and the exemption is reduced. This has the effect of increasing the capital gains tax for persons subjected to the minimum tax since only one-half of the capital gain tax paid will be an offset against the minimum tax. Under previous law, the full tax paid was offset.

Maximum Tax.

Under prior law the maximum marginal tax rate on earned income is limited to 50%. Under prior law deferred compensation, lump sum distributions from pension plans and distributions from annuity plans did not qualify for the maximum tax. Further, the earned income eligible for the 50% limitation was reduced by current year's tax preferences in excess of $30,000. Under the old law taxpayers were required to use the maximum tax if they used income averaging. The new law eliminates the $30,000 exemption to the preference offset and certain averaging provisions that were associated with it. The maximum tax is extended to pension and annuity income.

Deductions for Expense Attributable to the Business Use of Homes.

An overall limitation is imposed which limits the amount of deductions to the income generated by the business activity of the taxpayer in his home. Further, a taxpayer is not permitted to deduct any expenses attributable to the use of his home for business purposes except to the extent attributable to the portion of the home that is used exclusively on a regular basis: (1) as the taxpayer's principal place of business; (2) as a place of business which is used by the taxpayer's clients or customers in meeting or dealing with the taxpayer in the normal course of his trade or business; or (3) in the case of a separate structure which is not attached to his dwelling unit, in connection with his business. Further, in the case of an employee, the business use of the home must be for the convenience of his employer. Any mixed use of a portion of a dwelling for both personal and business purposes does not meet the exclusive use test.

Deductions for Expenses Attributable to the Rental of Vacation Homes.

The law provides a limitation on deductions for expenses attributable to the rental of a vacation home if the taxpayer's personal use of the vacation home during the year exceeds the greater of 14 days or 10% of the number of days during the year the vacation home is actually rented. If a taxpayer exceeds the personal use limitation, the attributable rent to the rental of the home cannot exceed the gross income derived from the rental activity less the deductions allowed at any event. There are other restrictions of a more technical nature upon such deductions.

Deductions for Attending Foreign Conventions.

Deductions will be allowed for expenses incurred in attending not more than two conventions, education seminars or similar meetings outside the United States and its Possessions and the Trust Territory of the Pacific. The amount of the deduction for transportation expenses to and from these foreign conventions cannot exceed the cost of air fare based upon coach or economy class charge. There are certain other restrictions and limitations provided upon these deductions.

Non-Business Guarantees of Bad Debts.

Where a taxpayer has a loss arising from guaranty of a loan he is to receive the same treatment as where he has a loss from a loan which he made directly. Thus, if the guaranty agreement arose out of the guarantor's trade or business the guarantor would still be permitted to treat the loss as ordinary loss. If the transaction was entered into for profit, but not as a part of his trade or business, the loss is treated as a short term capital loss. This rule also applies in the case of a guarantor of a corporate obligation. If the guaranty is made not as a part of a guarantor's trade or business and not as a transaction for profit no deduction is available.

Increases in Holding Period for Long Term Capital Gains and Losses.

Under prior law gains or losses on capital assets held for more than 6 months are considered long term capital losses. The new law increases the holding period for long term capital gains and losses from 6 months to 9 months in 1977 and to 12 months in 1978 and subsequent years. This increase in the holding period does not apply to agricultural commodity futures contracts.

Increases in the Amount of Ordinary Income Against which Capital Loss May Be Offset.

Under the prior law, capital losses of individuals are deductible in full against capital gains and excess of capital losses over capital gains can be offset against up to $1000 of ordinary income each year. The new law increases the amount of ordinary income against which capital losses may be deducted from $1000 to $2,000 in 1977 and to $3,000 in 1978 and subsequent years. As under prior law, only 50% of net long term capital losses in excess of net short term capital gains may be deducted from ordinary income.

Mr. Paul M. Lurie is a partner in the law firm of Fohrmann, Lurie, Holstein, Sklar & Cottle, Ltd., in Chicago and legal advisor for the member service program.

Convention...cont'd from page 7

on this evening were: Mr. & Mrs. Julian Goodrich, Mr. Goodrich is the Director of NCARB; and Mr. & Mrs. Earl Thomas of the United States Gypsum Company.

The formal proceedings concluded with the installation of officers for the coming year. (See page 8)

We are indebted to Wayne Bryan, Sidney Epstein, Bertrand Johnson, Robert Johnson, John Pankovich, Fred Prather, Arnold Schaffner, Richard Shields, and Chester Stark for their assistance in preparing this report.

Joseph Molitor is a respected member of the upper echelon of fine architectural photographers—anyone who does not recognize his name will, upon opening this book, quickly recognize his work if he or she has any familiarity with the architectural press. He has created here a profusely illustrated, chatty book—which while including a minimal amount of text material, contains many insights into the real everyday world of the architectural photography specialist.

For the architect who desires to collect examples of fine architectural photography or wishes to improve his own photographic efforts by seeing what the work properly performed should look like, Architectural Photography would make an excellent addition to his or her library. The range of examples contained is extremely complete—including interiors and exteriors of many building types, and ranging from overall site shots to details. But a word of caution is required. If you only use professional photography for special purpose presentations and are approaching this book looking for technical assistance because you are tired of butchering your do-it-yourself efforts on normal project recording, this is probably not the book for you. Mr. Molitor early on sets the premise of the book, "I am assuming that you have a basic knowledge of photography; you know how to use a view camera, how to make a correct exposure, and how to develop a negative", and he is consistent in adhering to this assumption. So the reader who does not meet these criteria of technical knowledge will find little here to help raise him to that level.

The book is about the business of architectural photography and the text is primarily oriented toward the photographer who is considering this specialized branch of the field. If your present photographer is not a full-time professional in this field, it would probably be a sound idea to give him a copy of this book (after reading it yourself) as it contains valuable insights into what should be expected in architectural photography and some of the unglamorous practical necessities for obtaining it.


If it is truly possible to designate a book as invaluable to the architect, then in this reviewer's opinion the subject volume must fall within that category.

This response is elicited not only by the quality of the material forming its content, but also because of the intelligence and usability of its presentation. Whether there was some collaborative effort between the author and the resources of Shepard's (which is also the publisher of Shepard's Citations, a primary case law resource for attorneys nationwide) or the publishers merely recognized this book as consistent with their philosophy of researched legal services, the result is a book compiling the latest resolved decisions relating to architect liability drawn from the full scope of the U.S. judicial system.

A key structural feature is the fact that the book does its own cross-referencing. Cases bearing on more than one aspect of liability are recited in each section with particular emphasis on the point in question. This is a considerable improvement on the method of describing a decision once and then merely citing the reference should it be applicable to a future point. In this book the text is therefore continuously readable and the development of the points of law easier to follow. The book treats with each major topic of liability in a chapter format and subdivides to specific points therein, making reference very efficient.

The fact that the author is not a scholar or researcher, but a practicing trial attorney as a partner in the firm of Acret & Perrochet in Los Angeles, appears to lend a valuable sense of perspective to the case selection and commentary. The reviewer particularly found enjoyable and instructive the author's summary commentaries, which not only effectively correlated existing decisions but lucidly expressed his opinions on the proper director for the law to move in future decisions.

The content does not deal with business law per se, but concentrates specifically on the actions arising out of professional service performance in the construction field. The concept of negligence and the question of the application of tort or contract law to particular actions are given careful and extended consideration.

In a strict sense, this book is not written for the layman who has never been involved in the evaluation of contract language or litigation arising from practice; although where one would find an architect or engineer who had not is open to question. The reader must bring to this book some basic knowledge of the precepts and terminology of the law, however there is probably little required precedent to basic understanding for the average professional that could not be provided through half an hour's discussion with his attorney. In this reviewer's opinion, even a considerably greater effort would be justified if it permitted the reader to obtain the benefits inherent in this book.

This reviewer's summary evaluation of his experience with Architects and Engineers would be that if the reader were depending upon existing contract language and office practices without having reviewed the contents of this book, the reader is missing a potentially valuable component within his loss control program; if he finds that his attorney does not possess a copy, it might be wise to begin searching for a new attorney who does.
THREE NEW CONCEPTS ON THE HOUSTON AGENDA

In Houston three items were put on the agenda of the annual meeting for consideration by the general membership. These were concepts relating to (1) professional advertising, (2) professional participation in contracting and project equity, (3) ethical conduct.

The concepts, as presented, will promote an entire new direction for the practicing architect of today. For too long we, as a profession, have been guided by our predecessors in keeping with the old traditional ways. Predecessors who all too often fail to realize or will not admit to fact that the practice of architecture today is changing.

Membership in ARA is comprised generally of the small firm variety of practicing architect, whose problems of survival are different than those of the large firms. His projects are much smaller in fee remuneration and in turn is being continually challenged by design-build firms, the "one percenters", and contracting companies, all of which take a sizeable cut of his marketing arena. Therefore, the small firm must commission many projects at low scale fees and in turn sometimes lose money or barely break even if the job is done properly. Many clients look hard at the first dollar project costs by choosing an architect on fee alone, not ability; deleting from the architect's contract the supervision responsibility, but not the liability; and taking away most, if not all, control from the coordination of efforts on the project.

For years we have received information on architectural seminars and conventions which discussed the plight and survival of the architect. Attendance at these meetings has revealed a lot of rhetoric about the dilemma we are in and how our profession is dying. A lot of nothing, in terms of grass-roots solutions to the problems has been derived from most, if not all, of these meetings.

For years we have been guided by weak professional organizations who have done little if anything at all to really promote and help today's practicing architect. We've all admired on occasion other professional organizations such as the AMA or the Bar for their ability to maintain guidelines and standards which gained the respect and support for the profession represented. To the general public, doctors and lawyers are all overpaid. Yet clientele do not question their fee structure—but question ours. The current real estate sales commission on the sale of a residence is seven percent. That's seven thousand dollars on a hundred thousand dollar house; and for how many total hours of work to complete? The public does not question them—they pay them—while not accepting the validity of the same dollar figure for the hours necessary to create this house.

Mr. Predecessor, business is forcing us to fight for our survival as a profession. We are in a hell of a mess: weak as a profession—losing the respect of the peers of our industry—searching for a true, positive direction in which to move. This can be changed. This must be changed. Today's architect cannot afford to practice in the romance of yesteryear's traditions. Today we must face a hard fiscal reality in which to plan a course for the practice of architecture as a viable profession. Yes, Mr. Predecessor, the profession has changed and must change more.

Our National Board of Directors is recognizing this need for change. The proposed practice concepts presented in Houston are a first step; a positive step. It is time that we, as architects, stood up and took hold of our own operations and destiny. Each and every one of us must support a determinative role on these questions, by giving them our earnest and thoughtful evaluation, by expressing our concerns in discussions with our fellow professionals and industry associates, and actively working to see that the changes we need become the rule and not the exception.

William E. Baldwin, ARA
Oak Brook, Illinois
Editor of the Illinois Council Bulletin

above left—The "Chicken Dinner" Award is received by Arnold

above center—Bernard Frishman accepts a Presidential Citation from Jerome Salzman.

above right—A surprised Wilfred Gregson receives the "turnabout" plaid.
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