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AYMAR EMBURY II, ARCHITECT.
There is no city in the United States which arouses so much enthusiasm and devotion among its citizens as does the city of Seattle. All the rapidly growing cities of the West arouse the same kind of pride and interest, but Seattle is more enthusiastic, because in the opinion of its citizens it has so much more to be enthusiastic about. It is proud of its phenomenally rapid growth of the varied sources, of its economic prosperity of its superb location, of its private and public works and of its very flattering prospects. Its enthusiasm partakes almost of the character of a religion. Several thousand of its leading citizens found nothing undignified or absurd in assembling in solemn conclave and burning an effigy of that most detestable of all traitors, the man who criticizes his own city. The “knocker” is anathematized as heartily in Seattle as was the heretic in Mediaeval Spain.

The citizens of Seattle undoubtedly have very real reasons for mutual congratulation. The growth of the city has been extraordinary and, for a place of its size, unprecedented. In 1890 it had 43,000 inhabitants. By 1900 they had increased to 80,000, a gain of only about 85 per cent. But by 1910 the 80,000 had become 237,000, a growth of almost 200 per cent. No wonder such extremely rapid expansion turned the heads of the citizens of Seattle. A city of over 200,000 people, which has added 20 per cent. to its population every year for ten years has, I imagine, never been known before in the history of the world. If it were maintained for another ten years, it would make Seattle at least the seventh largest city in the country. If it were maintained for twenty years, it would make Seattle the third largest city in the country. If it were maintained for thirty years, there would not be very much difference between Seattle and New York.

Of course such a phenomenal rate of growth cannot be continued, but even making all allowances for a substantial
diminution Seattle has every reason to look forward to an unusually rapid and substantial growth. Its prosperity is based on economic advantages which are not to be questioned and which will be permanent. It is situated on one of the most capacious and safest harbors in the world. It will share with San Francisco the advantages of the Oriental trade, the development of which will be one of the great economic achievements of the 20th century. It will benefit far more than any other single city from the exploration of the mineral resources of Alaska. It is the natural trading and commercial center for a great and growing agricultural hinterland. Its manufactures are already numerous and varied and are destined to become still more productive. Its population is homogeneous and thus far has been derived from the best American native stock. It has extraordinary opportunities and its business men are well equipped in every respect to turn them to the best account.

But the citizens of Seattle have other than merely economic reasons to be proud of their city. In planning for its development they have exhibited an unusual amount of intelligent public spirit. Eastern and middle western cities, when they were about the same size as Seattle and were growing almost as rapidly, usually showed a deplorable lack of interest in local public affairs; and it was explained on the ground that the rapid growth of population and business prevented men from fastening their attention on public as distinct from private interests. In the case of Seattle, however, an unprecedented expansion in population and business has been accompanied by an equally firm determination to make their city a pleasant and wholesome place in which to live. Public and private improvements have been running neck and neck, and its citizens have worked as hard and faithfully for their city as they have for themselves.

The location of Seattle is one of the finest enjoyed by any large city in the world. It consists of an area of hilly country, situated on Puget Sound and containing within its area several lakes, views of an impressive snow mountain, Mt. Rainier, and of the Olympic Range. Its location offers unusual opportunity both for architectural and landscape development, while at the same time the natural obstacles to the planning of a convenient city are numerous and serious. The hills, on which the city has been built, were steep and offered serious impediments to traffic. In the beginning the streets were run straight across them, just as they were across the corresponding hills in San Francisco; but Seattle with more public spirit than San Francisco soon decided that such a street system would constitute a permanent burden on the city's prosperity. Considering the size of Seattle, a gigantic scheme of re-grading was adopted and carried out, the result of which was the elimination of the worst hills and grades, and the radical transformation of the appearance of the city. Probably no urban community in the world ever imposed upon itself greater pecuniary sacrifices and expenditures for the sake of a desirable public improvement than did Seattle in this instance, and it had the courage, good sense and public spirit to make these sacrifices, while the city was still young, and while business was flexible and resilient enough to stand the expense and the disturbance.

The re-grading of the city belonged, of course, to that class of public improvements, which will be followed by permanent and substantial economic returns. To the same class belongs the extensive harbor improvements which when they are finished will bestow upon the city no less than one hundred and fifty miles of water-front capable of accommodating ocean-going steamships. But Seattle has been almost equally interested in planning a series of improvements, whose primary value is sanitary or aesthetic rather than economic. Parks and drives, which take advantage of the natural beauties of the site, have been laid out: and a general plan of additional street improvements, intending to provide both for the convenience of business and the increased architectural effectiveness of the city, is being considered. There is every intention on the part of the inhabitants of Seattle to make
THE BUILDING OF SEATTLE.
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their city renowned, not merely for its rapid growth and the unusual economic opportunities offered to its inhabitants, but its high standards of civic achievement. Their aim is to make a city in which men of all tastes and interests can live wholesomely and find abundant opportunities for the satisfaction of their legitimate personal demands. Of course it will be a long time before any such ideal can be realized. A metropolis cannot be made in a day or a generation. But if energy, public spirit and good will can convert Seattle into a metropolitan city, the result will be eventually attained. Its location, the varied character of its economic and commercial interests, its enormous advantages merely as a healthy and pleasant place in which to live, and the distinction, which it will obtain through its close association with Alaska and the Orient—all these underlying conditions tend to give sufficient plausibility to the enthusiastic and aspiring claims of the Seattlense.

At the present time, however, Seattle is no more of a metropolis than is any other city of its size in the country. Its architecture, in particular, does not differ much from that say of Portland or from that of the new San Francisco. Unlike the other two cities just named, it has had no architectural history. Practically all of its permanent buildings have been erected during the last fifteen years, and the majority of them within the past eight years. They are fairly representative of the better American standards of commercial architecture — standards which are coming to prevail all over the country. Of late years the American office building or warehouse of ten stories
or over in height has rapidly crystallized into a type. This type is determined for the most part by certain dominating practical conditions, and it cannot and will not vary—except within narrow limits—until some modification occurs in these underlying conditions. The variations in the type which appear in different communities are usually less due to differences in architectural standards or economic requirements, than to differences in local building regulations.
The most conspicuous group of business buildings in Seattle are not, however, as representative of the type of modern office building as are certain other individual structures. The Cobb, White and Henry Buildings are the first three members of a series of buildings that are being erected on contiguous property, which was acquired in a large parcel for this very purpose. The erection of the group of skyscrapers is to be spread over a good many years, and
there are to be, I believe, about ten of them before the enterprise is finished. The idea of erecting a group of office buildings is one which would scarcely have been advanced in any city which was not confident, not merely of its prosperity but also of the continuation thereof at a certain definite rate. It is the only case of the kind, so far as we know, in the country.

The architecture of this group of buildings was confided to one firm.
Messrs. Howells & Stokes of New York, and the three that have been erected up to-date are based upon a substantially uniform design. This design is more elaborately conceived than is the case with the typical modern American office-building. Two kinds of material have been used—white terra cotta for the two lower stores and brick above. The facade is divided horizontally not only by the difference of material at the level of the second floor, but by a cornice at the level of the 10th floor. The horizontal divisions are not very salient, however, and their effect is balanced by certain vertical divisions of the façade which also are not very salient. The corners of the buildings are rounded and the curve is emphasized by a flat projecting pilaster strip which bounds each end of it. The same flat vertical strip is repeated at a certain distance from the corner of the building on both façades. The effect of all this is fairly good, but hardly repays the apparent care which was spent upon its contrivance. This is particularly the case with the tedious little pedimental excrescences, which are supposed to adorn the terra cotta coping of the building. Nine times out of ten the attempts that are so frequently made to add an original note to the design of an office building are not worth what they cost. One usually turns with relief to a wholly unpretentious attempt to design buildings, consisting merely of the mechanical repetition of a certain unit.

Most of the business buildings of Seattle belong to this class—which all over the country is more popular than any other. It is the kind of business building which a business man wants to erect and which serves a strictly practical purpose better than any other. Take for instance, the Seary Building, which consists in the multiplication of a single...
unit. The unit in this instance contains two windows framed in by piers which are given a slight continuous projection from the face of the building. The building could be extended over double the area simply by tacking on as many more units. As a matter of fact it is stated that eleven stories are to be added to this particular structure, and such a vertical extension, assuming that the frame work is sufficiently strong, presents no more architectural difficulties than would its horizontal extension. The perfectly plain cornice can be raised eleven stories and the appearance of the building will be, if anything, improved. That type of façade looks better when it is twenty stories high than when it is nine stories high.

To the same class belongs the Alaska and the American Bank and Empire Buildings. In the case of the Alaska Building the vertical dimension is emphasized by the projection of the piers and the corners. Beyond that the façade has no design. In the case of the American Bank and Empire Building, there is not even any emphasis of the piers. Every once in a while the architect has varied the usual unit of two windows with a bay of only one window. But this device, whatever its purpose, cannot be said to have relieved the monotony of the façade; and the façade is none the worse for having its monotony relieved. Similarly monotonous but much pleasanter is the Crary Building. The moderate height of this edifice has enabled the architects to impart some scale of the design. The piers, have a pro-
THE ARCTIC CLUB, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON.
James H. Schack, Architect.

THE RAINIER CLUB, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON.
Cutter and Malmgren, Architects.
jection, which is really effective, while at the same time the strong simple cornice keeps the façade sufficiently low in effect. The design of this façade is admirable, and in its simplicity and unpretentious propriety has no equal in Seattle.

Typical, however, as Seattle is of the rapidly growing American city of the northwest, and important as are its business interests in the estimation of its citizens, its most interesting and in a sense its most conspicuous buildings are not devoted strictly to business. Take for instance the Arctic club-house. This façade is not precisely pleasing, and there is not very much about it to suggest that combination of semi-publicity and semi-privacy which an appropriate club-house ought to have. But it is unmistakably a strong and virile design which somehow suggests, if not the geniality of club life, at least the rigors of an arctic climate. The house of the Rainier club, on the other hand, is thoroughly a club-house and in addition a building of essential individuality of design. Less individual but thoroughly appropriate is the new station of the Oregon-Washington R. & N. Co. When one remembers the kind of railroad stations which were being built only a few years ago, one feels inclined to congratulate Seattle upon its escape from such terminals as that of the Southern Pacific R. R. Co. in San Francisco or as that of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe in Los Angeles. The newcomer to Seattle enters through gateways of which the city has no right to complain.

It is characteristic of such a public-
THE GREEN LAKE BRANCH, SEATTLE PUBLIC LIBRARY.
W. Marbury Sommervell, Architect.

...materials somewhat less sharp, but in the distribution of its masses the building is usually effective. The tower in particular is admirably situated in relation to the rest of the edifice and is both strongly conceived and strongly rendered. It adds to the building the needed sense that its function has associations with the church as well as with the medical profession. The Public Library is also an
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unusually large and imposing building for a city of that size. There are many larger cities in the middle west which are not as well equipped either with a central library or with branch libraries.

Probably on the whole the private residences of Seattle are more disappointing than any other one class of building. With a few exceptions they are rather commonplace and stereotyped buildings and have not demanded much expenditure from their owners or much interest from their architects. It is easy to understand why such should be the case. The business men of Seattle as a class have their capital tied up in rapidly expanding businesses, which could be expanded still more rapidly—in case more capital were available. Under such conditions, very few men even of considerable wealth wish to withdraw enough money from their business to permit them the luxury of really handsome houses. It is creditable to the city that its money has been lavishly expended rather for public than for private purposes; but eventually Seattle will contain a large number of costly and well-designed private dwellings. Both within the city limits and in the environs there are a large number of superb residential sites, which wealthy men will be tempted to crown with effective houses.

The dominant impression left by Seattle is that its citizens are planning in a bigger way for a bigger future than any other city in the country. They, more than their analogues, in the East and Middle West have begun by building not for the present but for the future.

They have identified their own fortunes with the fortunes of their city, and while not neglecting the former have placed quite as much emphasis on the latter. The consequence is that Seattle is unquestionably the city of most considerable promise in these United States. It will attract a superior set of men because it will offer them a superior set of opportunities. The process of building this better city is only just beginning, but it has gone far enough to explain and in some measure to justify the enthusiastic devotion of its inhabitants.
THE RESIDENCE OF C. J. SMITH, ESQ., SEATTLE, WASH. CUTTER & MALMGREN, ARCHITECTS.
IN CONTRAST TO THE MANY NEGLECTED EXAMPLES, SOME OF THE DUTCH FARMHOUSES SHOW THE UNFLAGGING CARE OF A CENTURY AND MORE.
The Last Dutch Farmhouses in New York City

By Mildred Staple
Photos by A. G. Byrne

Were the old Dutch towns on the southern end of Long Island merely suburbs of Brooklyn instead of part of New York City, one would still be amazed to find so many early farmhouses left amidst the brand new flats and cottages shooting up, so very much up, on the once broad acres of farm land. Considering that they are actually a part of the metropolis, and further considering our heedless tendency to exchange "old lamps for new," it is amazing that these ancient houses are allowed to continue their existence through a second century. The three old villages now encompassed by the wide spreading city are Flatbush, originally Medowwot; Gravesend, originally S'Gravesaande, and Flatlands, originally Amersfoort. Their homesteads are easily reached. The Flatbush Avenue car passes the very doorways of the Flatbush group and then on to Flatlands, and the Culver elevated line goes to Gravesend.

With their gracefully sweeping roofs, their broad eaves front and back, their big chimneys and very often a charming Colonial doorway to offset the general plainness of the house, they are a daily rebuke to the modern dwellings around them. Their emphatic preference for horizontal dimensions is a welcome change for city eyes that know only tall and narrow buildings. The fact that this type was the only one used in all the Dutch settlements of the New World proves it to have been the type of home commensurate with the needs and resources of its day and with the simple unostentatious character of its occupants. Such reasonableness is always an interesting lesson to an architect.

Those examples facing Flatbush Avenue are comparatively close together, for this broad highway was the old trail used by the Canarsie Indians across the southern end of Long Island. When the Dutch, bent on agriculture, bought this land from the Canarsie tribe, they built their homes, for neighborliness and protection, close together along the well beaten Indian path, and let their farms run far back of the house instead of each side of it. Then, as sons and daughters married and received a strip of the parental land, the same disposition was observed until by Revolutionary times there was an almost unbroken row of farmhouses within a stone's throw of each other along the once straggling trail that led from the ocean into Brooklyn. The Vanderveer, Stryker, Cortelyou, Ditmars, Lefferts, Gerretsen, Suydam and Hegeman families were prominent among the early settlers. Of these, the Lefferts are probably the only family still living in the homestead of their fathers. The rest have sold out and either moved away or built themselves unlively new houses. Indeed, so deaf is the American soul to the claims of tradition that the present head of the Vanderveer family last year sold their old place, the finest in Flatbush, to an automobile concern that promptly pulled it down, and the old barn too, and put up a garage. The automobile man offered more money than the Flatbush Historical Society who wanted to buy the place, refurnish it, and open it as a museum. Or else it was that the auto dealer got his cash together more promptly. At any rate the sturdy old house was razed to the ground. A week
after a New York man who would have bought it had he known of its impending demolition rushed over to secure its wrought iron hardware and its massive oak beams. The former had been sold for old iron to itinerant junk dealers; the latter, for easier removal, had been sawn into three-foot lengths. Along with the rest of the wreckage, it was found piled high in a vacant lot in the Italian quarter of Flatbush. Fine old Colonial sashes and trim selling at $2.00 a window were waiting to do service as coverings for early lettuce beds (and every pane of glass had that exquisite violet tinge that comes only of long exposure!). Two excellent staircases with mahogany handrails were waiting to be knocked to the outside of some squatter’s shanty. The timber itself would become fire wood. *Sic transit gloria.*

The Vanderveer case is one of the frequent instances of the louder appeal of dollars than of ancestors or of posterity to the American mind. The merits of Mr. Vanderveer’s act are likely to be questioned by his lineal descendants, as well as by everyone who admired the fine old landmark.

Its going leaves the Lefferts the oldest house on the avenue. The rest, though old, are not the first homes erected by the families mentioned but are, in most cases, later dwellings erected as wedding gifts for their children. None are older than the late eighteenth century. They were, therefore, erected at a time when Dutch rule had not only given way to English, but English to American; yet oddly enough in architecture, in local names and in their social and domestic life, these old Kings County villages were still very Dutch.

The very first family seats, it is said, were built of bricks imported from Holland, though good bricks were early made in Flatbush. Later on, shingles were the prevalent material. This change to wood is not surprising for the Medwout (Middle Woods) or Vlaachte Bosch (Flat Forest) was covered with hickory, white oak and black oak which they were constantly clearing to make room for the growing settlement. The Labadists (Dutch followers of the religious reformer de Labadie) looking for a favorable corner in the New World for their own sect, passed through Flat-
THE VANDERVEER HOUSE, TORN DOWN LAST AUTUMN, AFTER STANDING ON FLATBUSH AVENUE, FOR 125 YEARS.
bush in 1679, about thirty years after its founding and wrote in their famous journal: "We found a good fire half way up the chimney of clear oak and hickory which they make not the least scruple of burning profusely." No wonder, if oak was plentiful enough to burn, that the Dutch should soon have started building with it instead of bricks. Shingles next gave way to clapboards and it was probably about this same time that dormers began to pierce the expansive roofs. The first houses—the brick—made some effort to repeat those the settlers had left in Holland, but after a few generations a more local type was evolved. It was characterized by low ceilings—necessary where houses were heated only by two open fires; by cavernous cellars where the winter provisions were stored; by roomy garrets from which a heavy beam projected with a tackle for lifting bulky articles that were to be stored away; by preponderating roofs that sloped down into wide eaves, and by additions built out in any direction, for a Dutchman would not climb stairs. Windows had small panes and solid wooden shutters opening outward on iron strap hinges; large S-shaped irons held the shutters back. Gutters ran along the eaves and had tin spouts two feet beyond the house at each corner; in the front the water fell on to a flat stone below and at the rear into a large hogshead, for the Dutch ascribed great vir-

A RUINED FARMHOUSE IN FLATLANDS.

THE BACK OF THE VANDERVEER HOUSE, NOW DEMOLISHED.

tues to rain water. All houses were built, as mentioned, near the road and turned their long side to the south. Inside, tiles were much used for fireplaces and wainscots.

The charm of these villages was the charm of monotony and simplicity. When we compare all this simplicity with our own modern work we see how the Dutch came naturally by
THE UPSIDE-DOWN DOOR OF THE LEFFERTS HOUSE.
certain lines and proportions and breadth of treatment which we strive hard to reproduce. Of course one may argue that present day requirements are much more complex; but if one has good taste he builds simply in spite of modern requirements. For country-house architecture, for instance, a man might quite naturally think in this old Dutch vein. In spite of the differences of interior arrangement, he can see his outside walls, if he is familiar with the type of homestead we are describing, as simple and unpretentious, and yet not have his home a slavish copy, but an expression of, the same spirit of sincerity that actuated the Dutch builders.

About the only addition to the early pattern was the Colonial door instead of the laterally divided Dutch door. One of these older doors may still be seen on the back of the Ditmars house; while of the early nineteenth century Colonial variety seen on almost every other old house, the Lefferts and the Cortelyou are particularly fine examples.

The Lefferts homestead is the first which the Flatbush Avenue car passes on the left after entering Flatbush proper—a low brown structure with a gambrel roof on the main part and eaves wide enough to cover a piazza. No doubt it was originally painted white, and it is to be hoped it may again be if only for the sake of its doorway. The old barn and windmill were burned down by the British in the Battle of Long Island and the house partly destroyed as well; but it was soon rebuilt on its undamaged beams so that the present house, save for the late flat-roofed extension at the rear, dates partly from about 1780 and partly from a century earlier. The beautiful front door was added by the father of the present aged occupant, who all unwittingly placed the colonettes upside down and, classic traditions to the contrary, the effect is excellent. At any rate, they say he placed them upside down, but we have all seen the same sort of thing elsewhere, so maybe it was an accepted vagary of doorway designs in those days.

On the same side of the way, much farther along, is the old Erasmus Hall Academy, hidden now by the handsome new Erasmus High School. Erasmus Hall was built in 1786, being the third oldest academy in New York State. It is easily recognizable as a school house—it could not in fact, be mistaken for anything else; so that its early builders accomplished something in the way of expression that many a modern architect fails to do. Like most of the more pretentious edifices of its day its details simulate masonry. There is refined dentil moulding around the eaves and good simple work in door and windows. At first it had a substantial hooded porch at the front entrance, the present fragile looking piazza being a more recent feature. It is a pity that this characteristic old building had to be hidden even by such an admirable obstruction as the new high school.

Some years ago the Vanderveer and the Cortelyou were the only other houses left on this same side of the avenue with the Lefferts. The fate of the former has been mentioned. Th latter was saved by being moved north onto East 23d Street. It has recently been bought by an appreciative Western family, and so, in spite of encroaching flats, it may live another quarter of a century. A wide hall runs through it from front to back, and at each end of this hall are doors exactly alike, and as beautiful as ever were made in our best days. They are a distinct departure from Dutch traditions and savor more of New England and are probably contemporaneous with the handsome front entrances still to be seen across the river in old Greenwich village. The elliptical arch and elaborate cornice are very sophisticated for Flatbush, but there is a compromise in the heavy paneled mahogany door, which is divided laterally in the old Dutch fashion. For consistency's sake this same line was carried across the pilasters (which in the New England doorway would have extended to the base). The back door, twin to the one shown, has the kitchen of a new house or apartment so close upon it that no passer-by will ever again be able to admire its delicacy.
Returning to the car line, two sad but picturesque ruins are seen on the south side—the little gardener's cottage of the Ditmars estate and the Elsie Gerretsen house. Both are placed gable end to the street. Flower-bordered paths once led to the front and back doors of the Gerretsen house, and as the two entrances were equally visible they were both sheltered by nice little lean-to porches. Simple in form, these are built up of such good detail that they made a real embellishment to the house. One has a fine additions that make them less typical, though still very interesting in certain details.

Flatbush being the nearest of the Dutch villages to Brooklyn, was naturally the first to be swept away before the overflow of home seekers from the city. One cannot help being somewhat sentimental over the change. Even as recently as thirty years ago it was still a characteristic village with many farms and gardens and several windmills and the beautiful white Colonial church.

dentil moulding and was no doubt the front door; but so decrepit is it now that it seems cruel to photograph it. As these two places cannot last much longer, they suggest an excellent opportunity for some lover of old hand-split shingles, solid-paneled shutters, hand-wrought hardware, and nicely turned posts to acquire some of the débris if only he is there in time.

The rest of the Dutch houses left on the south side of Flatbush Avenue have been well kept up, but have, for the most part, a superfluity of dormers or other dominating all. The old Bergen house on the corner of Winthrop Street had been standing there since 1714, and many another, equally venerable, smiled upon the winding road that the Canarsie Indians had been treading for years ere "coming events cast their shadows before" in the shape of Hudson's little Half Moon. But Vlaachte Bosch was too near the metropolis to endure. An enterprising real estate concern publishes with pride a booklet showing "East Twenty-sixth Street in the winter of 1899" and on the opposite page "The
same in the autumn of 1900. The first records a picturesque Dutch farm house with low sweeping roofs and several happy little lean-to additions, and a fine group of barns; the second picture is a brand new street of cheap contractor-built cottages with turrets and curved glass windows and other foolish things, all for sale on the instalment plan. This is improvement. Flatbush is now a network of just such streets, all designated by unpoetic numerals. The only consolation to be seen in the many demolitions of this sort is that architects who witnessed them got a wonderful lesson in old framing; as, for instance, the Van derveer barn, where there were three huge 11x20-in. white oak timbers thirty feet long or more, supporting the hay loft; they were roughly hewn and mortised and tenoned into the vertical framing. For smaller beams pine was used, for the day had long since passed when Dutch families burned white oak on their hearths without scruple. Even these smaller joists were mortised and tenoned, but siding and laths were nailed with hand wrought copper nails; windows were excellent examples of the double hung heavy-muntined sort, and still worked easily without ever having been re-weighted. In barns and garrets, rafters fairly bristled with huge oak pegs for hanging up farm implements, etc. It was with justifiable malice that an onlooker noted how the house wreckers, finding the beams too long to remove intact, decided to cut them up on the site, and hacked their tools to pieces in the attempt.

A glance at a "Greater New York" map will show Flatlands and Gravesend to be, like Flatbush, intersected by hundreds of rectangular new streets; but the truth is many of these are yet to be "perpetrated"; there are still unbuilt stretches in the midst of which stands the dilapidated old homestead of some ancient country family whose present
representatives are callous to its fate. The architectural prowler who finds it too ruinous to be tenantable, or patched over just sufficiently to shelter the few Italian market gardeners who work its still rich acres, is naturally resentful and righteously tells himself how he would have cared for it had it come to him; but after all, irreverence for ancestral seats is an American failing that few escape. Where, in Europe, old families do not keep the home of their founders, it is because the family fortune has shrunken; here when the same thing happens it is because the family fortune has swollen. All the old Dutch families of southern Long Island have prospered. The Lotts house, still inhabited by one of the name, is a cheerful exception to the melancholy neglect that pervades Flatlands. There are a few others not far from the Lotts brothers, but we did not happen to make the acquaintance of their owners as in this case.

Flatlands, never wooded like Flatbush, but simply a vast meadow, must have reminded the first white comers of the level green pasture lands they had left behind them. They thought they had secured a tract better for the agriculture on which they were bent than had their brothers who were busy clearing away the oak and hickory forest at Medewout, but this proved later to be an error; the Flatbush farms were always the best. These meadow farmers named their settlement Amersfoort, after the birthplace of their national hero, John of Barneveldt; but after English rule prevailed the descriptive "Flatlands" seems to have been generally adopted. The tract had been bought in 1636 from the Canarsies, the chief purchaser being a Gerretsen (son of Gerret or Gerard), a Cowenhouwen (later evolved into Conover), a Loott (now Lott), a
THE MAHOGANY AND WHITE DOORWAY OF THE CORTELYOU HOUSE.
Stoothoof, a Wyckhoff, a Van Schenck and a Van Voorhees. It had its little history, of course—boundary disputes with Flatbush, a small scare when Indians attacked the English settlers at Gravesend, and, I believe, a scandal or farming into professions and politics and built new, comfortable, inartistic homes.

Gravesend, remotest of our three villages, is least spoiled; not that it would be recognizable by a returned inhabitant

two among the first families—somebody brought up somebody’s orphan children and then tried to get their land. Though its territory never yielded as rich crops as were gathered in Flatbush, it prospered until its enriched sons grew out of of a century ago, for a railroad and an electric line run through it on their way to Coney Island, and there are many new houses; but also there are many old ones, and the end of the Neck Road—a little cul-de-sac that leads immedi-
ately from the Culver Line's station—is as rural as anything within a hundred miles of New York. Thanks to an architect who, after long waiting and watching, was able to purchase the oldest house on this bit of road, the character of the spot has been saved. He has rehabilitated the house, and his wife has made the garden a paradise of bloom, from the earliest white and pink of the fruit trees to the last russet of the chrysanthemums.

This house is claimed as the one built by Lady Deborah Mody. Lady Mody was a refugee from the religious persecution of the Massachusetts Puritans, and had come, like the better known Anne Hutchinson, to seek a home in the territory of the more tolerant New Netherlanders. This was the first com-mingling of English with Dutch in the region we are speaking of. Lady Mody's name, along with that of Sir Henry, her son, Ensign Baxter and Sergeant Hubbard, appears on the patent given them by Governor Kieft in 1643. This governor is supposed to have named their seaside settlement S'Gravesaande; but another explanation is that the name was always what it now is, having been chosen by some of Lady Mody's followers who had migrated from Gravesend on the Thames. These new comers found one of their own race already established on the land granted them—a tobacco planter named Stillwell who became prominent in the new settlement. The able and courageous lady governed her little colony most excellently, and even had dreams of her making it a greater port than the promising one on Manhattan Island; in recognition of her leadership she was allotted the largest Bouwery in the assigning of plantation lots. But great
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seaports are not built in a lifetime, and when the ambitious woman was laid in the little cemetery opposite what is claimed to have been her home, Gravesend was still a very small though thriving village consisting of a few English families, who soon intermarried with the Dutch and became in every way identified with them.

An examination of the interior of the Moody house (the double o is probably a Dutch tinge, for their own names abound with it) would suggest that the main part at least is as old as the neighborhood claims—that is, in
certain structural features. Beams and window-framing are of ancient oak that might well have been cut and planed about 1650. The broad hearths extending far across the room are tiled with aged Dutch tiles. But when we come to
more decorative features, such as mantelpieces and balustrades, they are obviously of Colonial type. Outside, the house has a stucco front, which was not uncommon in Dutch farmhouses, although the one in question is new; but the new weathered shingles are an inharmonious note. To paint them white is all one could ask to complete a thoroughly sympathetic restoration.

Many curious old papers are preserved from Gravesend's early days. One of them, a builder's contract, is probably typical of many house contracts, and reads as follows:

"Ambrose London bargained and agreed with Micah Jure for his building him a house by the middle of June nexte and to pay said Micah forty gilders. Ye house to be twenty-two feet long, twelve feet wide, eight feet stooed with petition in ye middle and a chimney; to lay both rooms with joice, to cover ye roof and to make up both ends with clapboards and also to make two windowes and a door."

There is no telling whether this house of Micah Jure's is still standing; if it is, it probably expanded far beyond its original 22x12 feet, and its "petition in ye middle" is now one of several; but even under its added lean-tos and wings, the plan common to all these old farmhouses would be traceable—the simple oblong with four sturdy walls, a chimney, and a low-sweeping roof. These were always the assertive backbone. The house might be lengthened, widened, be-porched and be-dormered, patched and repatched by successive generations, but the simple central form would always dominate. This gives it a meaning more important to the student than its mere picturesqueness is to the average passerby. It is an object lesson in order and balance—two important qualities. It is a rebuke to the modern effort to be new and different at any cost.

LADY MOODY'S LIVING-ROOM WITH ORIGINAL LIME MORTAR WALLS MADE FROM GRAVESEND OYSTER SHELLS.
"Building a House of Moderate Cost"

A Bungalow Suggestion

By Robert C. Spencer Jr., FAIA

The man with but four or five thousand dollars to spend in the building of his house faces a difficult problem. He can buy easily enough, but in building he will have his troubles. The cost of construction has doubled in the last eighteen years in those cities which were once great lumber markets of the Middle West. And his wife, who graduated, I believe at "Siwash" five years ago, and who is really a very intelligent and cultured little lady, has a big scrap book pasted full of "ingle-nooks," pergolas, beautiful Colonial stairways, etc., etc., culled since the wedding day, from "Lovely Homes," "Cottage and Garden," and "The Home Builders' Monthly," and they all cost money.

And then, there are his friends with their ready advice. If a man wants a lot of free, disinterested advice, let him announce that he is going to build a little home in the suburbs, and say that he and his wife can't quite decide between a bungalow and a modest two-story cottage. If that little house could only embody one-tenth of the desirable features that his wife thinks she wants and his friends think she ought to have, it would be fit to rank next to the Seven Wonders of the world.

But seriously, how about a bungalow for the modest home builder? Does it cost less than a house? And by the way,—what is a bungalow? Several years ago that question was answered at length in this magazine by Arthur C. David in an article, charmingly illustrated with examples from California. The California bungalow as he defined and described it with its exaggerated eaves and Oriental or Japanese accent is out of place in the Northern and Eastern states, except when intended exclusively for summer residence. But his conclusion that the bungalow (so-called) would not become a popular type of dwelling in the North and East has proven quite incorrect. As a matter of fact, there is at the present time no close agreement among American architects as to just what peculiar characteristics differentiate a "bungalow" from the general run of houses of moderate cost, in expensive construction and simple furnishing.

In connection with the Clay Products Show held at the Coliseum in Chicago last winter a thirty-five hundred dollar brick bungalow prize competition was held, which brought forth over six hundred designs, the prize design being erected and furnished complete at that unique exhibition, where, in spite of some serious defects, it was the chief popular attraction. The program called for three bedrooms, at least one of them to be located on the first floor and one bath room. Owing to the elasticity of the program and the national scope of the competition, a wonderful variety of schemes was presented, a comparatively small percentage of which were well planned and designed in the true bungalow spirit. A large percentage of the designs were really for one story and a half cottages, with single ground floor bedrooms—a very common, small farmhouse arrangement, with bath rooms in the attic, or second story. The prize design was of this, rather than the true bungalow type. The program for the competition was prepared by a Chi-
A six room bungalow of the Southern or summer cottage type, with lower walls of rough concrete blocks and frame and stucco above.

cago architect, who has designed a number of charming little bungalows of the strictly one-story type.

In view of the wide variance of opinion as to what constitutes a bungalow (particularly in the Middle West where buildings of this type are becoming very popular for small suburban homes) it may be well to admit that a bungalow is an unpretentious house with liberal porch space having one or more bedrooms on the ground floor, and in which, whatever attic or second-story space the design provides, shall be utilized for sleeping purposes to a considerable less extent than in the average cottage or house. Many so-called bungalows are merely variations or modifications of the universal type of story and a half working-man's cottage, but the name has been a God-send to many who a few years ago would not have dared to build such cheap dwellings in good middle-class suburban neighborhoods.

A big porch across the street front and wide eaves and an open arrangement of living and dining room are really the only distinctive bungalow features of these little houses, but they help a lot when coupled with the magic title, "bungalow."

In some Middle Western cities whole districts are being largely built up with these so-called bungalows. Many of them provide two or three bedrooms on the ground floor, with additional provision for one or two more fair-sized attic rooms—the attic space, however, being left un-
A seven room, story and a half cottage of the bungalow type at Kenilworth, Ill., with similar open arrangement of living and dining room, and ground floor bed rooms properly planned in relation to bath. Two good rooms and bath in attic space would be improved by dormers on at least one side, giving cross ventilation. The terracing of the side helps to give the necessary elevation of the bed rooms for a level country.

WALTER BURLEY GRIFFIN, Architect.
finished in those which are built by real estate speculators. In a building of this type, with the rather low-pitched and spreading roof, which is an important characteristic, the attic rooms are seldom fit for use, except as servants' rooms during our hot northern summers, as they are in gable ends or in single dormers without cross draft. In the South, the bungalow roof space contains no rooms whatever.

The recently developed mania for bungalow building—which is so evident, for example, in the vicinity of Chicago, may be partly explained by the fact that an increasing majority of our metropolitan city dwellers live in "flats" until they are ready to build or buy homes for themselves, and are so accustomed to the conveniences as well as the drawbacks of a one-floor habitation that they are loth to change. Then, too, the wife, who does her own work with one or two small children to look after, greatly appreciates the convenience of this way of living on the level, particularly if she be not strong.

Offsetting the convenience of bungalow living as well as the undeniable charm and "homeness" of a low-roofed, spreading cottage as compared with the stilted, box-like proportions of the average little seven or eight-room cottage, is the excessive space occupied by the building in proportion to the accommodation it affords, crowding the ordinary suburban lot, or necessitating larger grounds and the common objections to sleeping on the ground floor, particularly in a flat country having a normal rainfall. Although in the arid or semi-arid regions of the West this latter objection disappears.

Much of the charm of the California bungalow is due to its very low proportions. In the Northern bungalow cottage this charm is lost to a degree, owing to the necessity for a well-lighted basement, and the desirability of elevating the bedrooms well above the ground.

The small bungalow, like the small flat, is seldom well planned from an architect's standpoint. As a rule, the relative proportions of bedrooms and bath room to the living room and dining room has all the informality found in a small seashore cottage. In a good plan, the bedrooms and bathroom are always arranged on a little private hall or corridor, which may be completely isolated from the rest of the house. The same is true in the planning of flats and apartments, but is neglected in most speculative buildings of these types, because flat dwellers have become accustomed to such really bad features as bedrooms and bathrooms opening off living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens, without other means of en-
An all the year round bungalow of the long, rambling type at Glencoe, Ill. The living room extends into the roof space, an effective possibility in the building of bungalows of the larger type. A bed room with private bath occupies the attic space over the kitchen and accommodates two servants. The dormers on two sides provide good light and cross draught, for all the year round use.

Interior of living room in same bungalow at Glencoe, enriched with broad mural painting above doors to dining porch. The furnishing, however, is hardly in keeping with the bungalow type of habitation.

SPENCER AND POWERS, Architects.
Showing an excellent arrangement of bed rooms on a private corridor in connection with bath. The wide opening between dining room and corridor screened by a long sideboard and china case is a practical and effective feature. The separation of the entrance and living porch, or out-door dining room, is also very good.
A SEVEN ROOM SUBURBAN BUNGALOW AT MAYWOOD, ILL. (SEE PLAN ON OPPOSITE PAGE). TALLMADGE AND WATSON, ARCHITECTS.
trance or exit, and real estate dealers insist that prospective purchasers overlook these trifling drawbacks in view of the space which is saved thereby and thrown into bedrooms, closets, etc.

In considering comparative cost as a factor in deciding between the erection of a bungalow and the two-story house, a question is raised, which is rather difficult to answer. The California, or summer cottage type of bungalow, is undoubtedly cheaper to build, but in the North, for all-the-year-round use the bungalow requires a good basement, which for a small building should include the entire ground plan to accommodate laundry, store and fuel rooms and heating apparatus. If the building is to be set low enough to look well in a stiff clay soil, the cost of excavating and building the foundation walls will be much more than for a two-story house, affording equal accommodations. Much more roof also will be required to cover the same number of rooms. On the other hand, less space need be devoted to the stairs, which may be placed out of sight and be more cheaply built than in a house, or omitted entirely except for access to the basement. Without any definite comparative data, however, it is doubtless safe to say that a thoroughly well-built bungalow of from six to eight rooms will cost more than an equally good roomy house. The former, however, lends itself more readily to a comparatively rough and inexpensive treatment, particularly as to exterior covering, which may be of rough unstained boards, shiplap or shingles, or perhaps a good, heavy asphalt roofing felt with fine crushed quartz or gravel embedded in the surface, divided into vertical panels by rough, undressed boards, giving a sort of half-timbered

STUDY FOR NORTHERN BUNGALOW ON A KNOLL OVERLOOKING A GOLF COURSE.
effect, the felt being afterwards painted with one of the flat paints, especially prepared for exterior stucco work.

In building a comparatively large rambling bungalow, it is unnecessary to excavate under the entire house; a basement under half the floor area being perhaps sufficient to accommodate laundry, heating apparatus, etc., provided that the latter shall be a steam or hot-water system. The underpinning of the unexcavated parts of the bungalow may consist of brick or concrete piers, between which heavy tarred planks are fitted, against which the earth is banked for warmth when the grounds are graded. The modern bungalow makes an ideal farm house, particularly for the rolling and hilly regions so common throughout our Northern states. On a well-drained hill or high knoll the objections to ground floor bedrooms disappear and no type of habitation can be more pleasing and harmonious in a rural landscape than the broad, low, home-like house of one story.

It is, therefore, to be hoped that the bungalow idea will in time appeal strongly to the farmers of our Northern and Eastern states.

Editor's Note.—Mr. Spencer's Series began in the June, 1912, issue of The Record. The third and succeeding articles will cover as comprehensively as possible the entire field of residence planning, design and decoration.
FURNITURE NEED NOT BE INANIMATE.
Rationalism in Art
By
W. Francklyn Paris

The mission of the architect, we are told, is to perpetuate in stone and other durable materials the history of his time. His art is the expression of the needs of the individual in society. It is in the study of ancient monuments that modern science finds the elements for the reconstruction of the history of vanished civilizations.

Until the end of the XVth. century this was the theory that prevailed. From the Renaissance, however, the artistic tradition of truth, reason and logic which had hitherto governed, disappeared and was replaced by the theory of assimilation, based upon the copy of motifs created by other peoples and periods.

Undoubtedly the exhumation at the time of the first vestiges of Greek and Roman art in antique temples and forum had a great deal to do with this reversal of taste and method.

However that may be, the chief concern from then on changed from the following of a logical art tradition based upon social needs and purposes, to the warping and distorting of these needs to make them fit into fixed proportions of Greek and Roman orders and porticoes.

The formulae of Vitruvius were revived, the column was codified and from everywhere there arose monuments and edifices which, although conceived for diametrically different purposes, were clothed and ornamented with the same elements of decoration.

Previous to the XVth. century the general outline of a building gave indications of its raison d’etre and of its purpose. Both in ensemble and in detail, the real function, the uses to which it was to be affected, stood revealed.

To-day, however, the exterior means nothing. We no longer build houses, we put up façades. This reproach, which the disciples of rationalism lay at the door of the architecture of the present day, applies with equal force to modern furniture and the art of interior decoration. What is true of one side of the wall is true of the other side. Indeed, too little stress has been laid upon the fact that as much skill and science and understanding of art is needed in the adornment of the inside of a palace, as is required in the designing and embellishment of the outside. The same problems of form and dimensions and styles which confront the architect in the planning of a cornice or the placing of a colonnade must be solved by the decorator who has a credence or a carved chest to fashion or a tapestry panel to install, with the added consideration that whereas the architect need only concern himself with difficulties of line, the decorator must weigh both line and color.

As for the relative importance of the inside and outside, either of a dwelling or public building, it all depends on whether or not the object is to impress and please those within, or those without. The Moors who builded the Alhambra considered solely the pleasure of those who were to inhabit it. The interior is of regal magnificence; the exterior is one of flat, unornamented mud walls.

Although this would appear to be an extreme view, it is infinitely more log-
ical than the opposite one of embellishing the outside only. Yet examples are not wanting, particularly in this country, of millions spent on façades and farthings only on interiors. Many a costly gown of silk or satin hides a tattered cotton petticoat. However, there is not the chief crime. It is when the petticoat is also costly and of silk, for it to be too long or too full, or too green.

We have made tremendous progress in art since the day of the brown-stone stoop dwelling, built by the mile, and the Eastlake sideboard, built by the gross, but our petticoat is still occasionally too green.

This comes, as in the case of modern buildings, copied after the Parthenon, from a disregard of object and purpose and a consideration of the table or chair or petticoat “per se,” and not as a component part of an ensemble with which it must harmonize.

The decorator who takes his art seriously should subordinate everything to the attainment of harmony. He should consider carpets, hangings, furniture, wainscoting, rafters, door knobs, lighting fixtures, wall paper, carved mouldings and every detail of floor, walls, and ceilings, as so many elements entering into the fashioning of one complete “picture,” as so many shades to be blended into one “tone.”

It is just as fatal for a console or divan to have too many legs, as for it to be out of proportion with the remainder of the ameublement, or else out of “spirit” with the room itself.

First of all the decorator, if he be an artist, must get his inspiration from Nature. The role of art is to awaken in the mind the sense of Nature. What Nature has made is always artistic. Take the most prosaic, the most unspectacular of its manifestations, a lichen-cover ed stone by the roadside. Look at it closely. Observe how the colors are grouped, how fine the tracery, how the edge of green velvet moss figures a spreading sea in which are little islands, some brown and spotted like chestnuts, others like rusted links in a coat of mail touched with verdigris. Here is a small tuft, the color of orange-peel, and a cluster of infinitesimal blue flowers, like tourquoises. See how instinctively the greens are grouped with the browns and the orange with the blues. How harmonious the ensemble is, how preponderance of one color gives to the apparently heterogeneous shades a unity of tone. What a lesson in coloring!

As for form, observe the skeleton of the rhinoceros and of the camel. It is in the skeleton that architecture finds all its formulae demonstrated. In the rhinoceros, the frame work is heavy and thick-set in accordance with its purpose, which is to support a massive and slow-moving bulk.

In the camel, built for rapid movement over the sands, the fundamental carpentry is light and slender. The form of each, down to the last detail, is in accord with the functions to be performed.

So it is with everything in Nature. Always “there’s a reason.”

Similarly in art there should always be a reason. It should be as easy for the architect to reconstruct Solomon’s temple from a wheelbarrow full of excavated debris, as it is for the naturalist to reconstruct an antediluvian pachyderm from a fossil rib or jawbone. The same theory of proportion should apply. Unfortunately it does not. When there was nothing but Doric or Corinthian or Gothic, perhaps such a reconstruction from a fragment of column or a carved oak stanchion could have been attempted. Since then, however, we have so “adapted” and “assimilated” that almost any kind of salad is permitted, with two, three and sometimes more styles brought in.

As seriously as the architects have erred in this respect, their sins have been but trivial compared with the crimes against Art and Good Taste committed by the decorators.

In this generation alone, we have Eastlake and the so-called “Modern Gothic” to live down, to say nothing of “Art Nouveau” and Mission.

While even a journeyman carpenter would to-day abjure the geometrical atrocities of the late, but not lamented, C. L. Eastlake, there are many examples
of his shapeless scaffolding still to be found. The abominations of the "Modern Gothic" have died a harder death even. Less than twenty years ago the neurasthenic furniture of this "period" pervaded the homes of our best people and only yesterday the bourgeoisie went into spasms over the Marchigras styles which, if they were nouveaux, were nothing else.

The decorator of to-day may find food for thought in the contemplation of these freaks of artistic aberration and learn from the study of these esthetic "dons'" how not to do things. He will see that a chair may be doleful or festive, formal or familiar, dainty or robust, masculine or feminine. Furniture need not be inanimate. It may have character and soul and convey delicate subtleties of feeling, a sense of soft sumptuousness, or of rigid austerity. It may possess Louis Quatorzian grace and court manners or be stiff-kneed and un-

restaurateurs would hesitate to equip their Rathskellers with upholstered bergères of the Louis XV period. "If one has anything to say, one might as well put it into a chair," Mr. Le Gallienne tells us. True, but some chairs have a roistering spirit and consequently talk wildly and in loud tones. They must not be put in company of priggish straight-laced furniture built with scrupulous precision and speaking in modulated terms and in the most unimpeach-

BEAUTY AND RAISON D'ETRE SHOULD BE CONSIDERED TOGETHER.
ably correct manner. In such a company a chair may mumble or say nothing, but it must not shout.

Consider a man's chair. A chair that would suitably frame Edward Everett Hale, let us say, or Lord Kitchener. It cannot be flippant, nor dainty, nor pink. It must in a way be explicative of the personage it supports. Without being unnaturally solemn, it must have poise and dignity. Logically it will be an Elizabethan fauteuil, or something Gothic and in carved oak. Or else something be studied, so the spirit and complexion of a room must be absorbed.

A room intended for music and dancing and the harboring of female loveliness and flounces will lend itself to crystal chandeliers and red and gold trappings. Even here there are graduations and there are ballrooms without these glittering gauds that nevertheless suggest the spirit of festivity. Think of the varieties of dining rooms! Some need as a fitting accessory an ancestor, real or apocryphal, painted in leather or tapestry. On the other hand if the chair is to shelter a woman, let the decorator bring out the full explicitness of that fact with carved motifs and soft tints. Even empty, let such a chair evoke beauty, grace, tenderness. Dead wood and faded fabrics contain an inspiration. There is more than is seen by the corporeal eye in the tabouret of Marie Antoinette or the cradle of the Roi de Rome.

Just as the "sex" of a chair and the uses to which it is to be dedicated must by Velasquez. Why do we have breakfast rooms? For the simple reason that soft-boiled eggs do not harmonize with tapestries and old masters, but rather with chintz and caned chairs. Again, is your dining room to harbor men only—as for instance in clubs. Here, then, is another problem. Are these men' wholesale butter-and-egg merchants, or fish-market folk; or are they lawyers, doctors, and men from the professions and colleges?

Not very long ago one of our most
exclusive clubs, an organization famed for the culture and wealth and social prominence of its members, rejoiced in a dining room finished in red-striped burialps and white and gold woodwork. Who shall say that under certain conditions this combination might not be altogether fitting, say in the dining room of a "Votes-for-Women" organization? Here, however, it offended and was promptly replaced by carved oak paneling, Elizabethan strap-work ceiling—and carved oak furniture. Since then the food tastes better and the speeches have more wit.

What is true of dining rooms is true of sleeping rooms, only more so. The more intimate the apartment, the more individual should be its furnishings. Here the personal tastes of the occupant may be given expression. His—or her—preference for a color, may be studied, but always let the bed be a bed and not a ship or a sleigh or a monument, and let the chairs be sleeping-room chairs and not garden-seats or library fauteuils. And because Marie de Medici slept under a baldaquin and behind curtains, let it be remembered that it was not because such trappings appealed to her and to her times on the score of decorativeness or beauty, but because in those days, fresh air was an heresy and the fear of draughts widespread.

Beauty and raison d'etre should be considered together, never separately. Instinctively we all feel beauty. There is no such thing as the sin of original ignorance. We are all of us born learned. Each of us comes into this world with a set of personal faculties and inherits at birth the accumulated intelligence and knowledge of his ancestors. The man that has in him the appreciation of a sunset has it also in him to appreciate the same sunset when put on canvas. To know beauty is to know art. And yet how few are able to create beauty. How few can piece together the squares that go to make up the mosaic, or aptly juxtapose the tints and colors that constitute a chromatic ensemble. They know a well set stage when they see it set, but are hopelessly incapable to set it.
Landscape Architecture in and about Chicago

By Anthony Hunt

The practice of landscape architecture on the prairie encounters some different conditions from those of the Atlantic Coast cities. The prevalence of roads following section lines produces a chessboard monotony in the country, relieved somewhat, however, by those that follow the course of rivers or the shores of lakes. The usual small town or suburb of the West follows these same lines and consists of square blocks all of the same size. Riverside, one of Chicago's suburbs, stands alone as a properly laid out village for country residence. It was designed by Frederick Law Olmsted in the '70s with curved radial avenues. The city of Chicago itself is in need of some radial avenues with their interesting rond points to break the monotony of its square blocks. In the country winding roads through woods are much needed. Where the land is open roadside trees for beauty and shade should be planted, and especially the lombardy poplar, to break the flat sky line.

There is, however, one movement new in the history of landscape architecture in which Chicago has taken the lead. Playgrounds for children are scattered through the poorer districts of the city. Of these, Sherman Park is the largest. The well-planned planting of trees and shrubs about the borders will before long effectually shut out the surrounding city. Olmsted Brothers drew the plans.

The South Park system is also being developed under the care of the same landscape architects. Jackson Park was created on the site of the World's Fair and is full of pleasing landscape. The view from the granite bridge looking north gives the effect of the rivers of Illinois, with wooded islands in the stream.

The West Side parks have been much benefited by the public-spirited service of Jens Jensen. His bog and water gardens are characteristic of his work.

On the North Side, Lincoln Park and its extension up the lake shore is under
the care of O. C. Simonds. Older and better examples of his work, however, can be found in the new part of Graceland Cemetery. His heavy massing of shrubs, and avenues on long, slow curves are typical. In fact, he is an active exponent of the natural as opposed to the formal school of landscape gardening and produces many beautiful effects in his own manner. The entrance to the estate of Mr. J. Hobart Moore at Lake Geneva shows his method of approaching a country place from the highway.

In formal work, L. V. LeMoyne was the first Chicago landscape architect to design gardens of any aesthetic quality. His terraces at the country place of Mr. L. M. Williams, on the Green Bay Road in Highland Park, make an interesting gradation west of the house to a tennis court.

North of Chicago, out for thirty miles,
on a bluff rising from the lake are many handsome country houses. In nearly all cases it has been necessary to plant the bank to keep it from sliding as well as to improve its appearance. Sometimes retaining walls have been found necessary where the waves wash the bottom. A good example of this treatment is the bluff at Mr. James F. Porter's place in Hubbard Woods, planted with locusts and colored willows. There are, how-

ever, great possibilities for terracing which have not yet been taken advantage of. A number of large, well-proportioned houses have been built, which would gain in dignity by a base of two or three terraces, with handsome balustrades and stairs down to the water. The house of Mr. C. A. Stonehill, in the French chateau style, the best large country house about Chicago (designed by David Adler), would lend itself well to such treatment. So far nothing has been done to the bluff, as the house itself of the house terrace, are surrounded by flowers, and at the end of the garden is an artificial lake. A pleached alley of maple leads from the casino to the tennis court and then on to the kitchen gardens. As yet no photographs have been taken, as the gardens are not sufficiently developed. As an example of a good formal entrance, Howard Shaw's approach to his own house is well known. Frost & Granger have produced a dignified English effect with a straight drive to the deep stone entrance of the home of Mr.
TERRACED GARDENS OF MR. L. M. WILLIAMS, HIGHLAND PARK, ILL.

L. V. Le Moyne, Landscape Architect.

HUMBOLDT PARK, WATER GARDENS.

Jens Jensen, Landscape Architect.
HOUSE OF MR. JAMES F. PORTER, HUBBARD WOODS, ILL., SHOWING NATURAL BLUFF TREATMENT.

HOUSE OF MR. C. S. STONEHILL, GLENCOE, ILL., VIEW TAKEN FROM LAKE MICHIGAN, SHOWING NEED OF TERRACING BLUFF.
C. I. Dangler. Gates, however, are needed here, as in many other places, to give it a finished air. Posts alone are not sufficient.

There has been a feeling among people, even of the cultivated, traveled class, that the formality of the European estates was out of place in the Middle West. The first country places were all open, with neither fence, hedge nor shrubbery border about them. Then came the large plantations of shrubbery fostered by Mr. Simonds. But the formal treatment of the grounds immediately about the house is as suitable for a handsome piece of architecture in Illinois as it is in Italy. The whole countryside will become more and more cultivated, more and more civilized. People will seek good use of the land. On the inside of the place, to the south, French windows open on to a terrace. Flower gardens have not been closed in sufficiently, not made sufficiently intimate. Sculpture brought from Italy has been frequently put in an unsympathetic setting. There is, however, a series of gardens in Winnetka, one opening up into another,
APPROACH TO HOUSE OF MR. C. A. STONEHILL, GLENCOE, ILL.  DAVID ADLER, ARCHITECT.
COUNTRY PLACE OF MR. C. I. Dangler, Lake Forest, Ill.

Frost & Granger, Architects.
which have grown up simply and in
good taste. They are at the foot of a
hill on which the four residences to
which they belong were built. The gar-
den of Mr. H. P. Crowell illustrates the
general style—perennial borders against
good shrubbery backgrounds—the whole
garden well shut off from the nearby
road by thick planting. Another Win-
etka place of interest is the farm of Mr.
George Higginson, Jr. The grass steps
which lead from the terrace to the swim-
ning pool are noteworthy.

In the last few years a number of out-
of-door swimming pools have been cre-
ated in private places. As an architec-
tural feature the best use of them has
not been made, however. An attempt has
been made to naturalize them, in the
shape of lima beans, in the lawn in plain
view of the house. Obviously, some se-
closure by hedges or otherwise is neces-
sary, unless the pool be placed at a suf-
ficient distance.

An interesting problem presented it-
self to me recently in pool place-
ment—an estate of several hun-
dred acres, a large house in the
Louis XVI. style. The house site, al-
ready determined by the owner, had an
old apple orchard between it and the
highway, and a heavy woods on the other
side, to the west. The land was open
and fell away slightly to the south. A
straight entrance avenue was the nat-
ural thing, and I suggested extending
the principal axis by a long cut through
the woods to the west. This would open
up a view of several miles across coun-
try. In this avenue I would put a large
rectangular basin, making an interesting
water effect in the French manner as
well as a place in which to swim. On
the tapis vert should be the tennis court,
shortly east of the basin. South of the
house I would keep in lawn and pas-
ture—the cattle, for picturesque life in
the landscape, allowed near the house,
with ha-ha (sunken fence) intervening.
The garage under the service wing made
an eight-foot difference in grade between
the service court and the fore-court.
Both courts should be well enclosed by
high walls, thus giving seclusion to the
sunken flower garden on the south. This
garden, to give it the charm of privacy,
should, moreover, be enclosed by high
hedges on the east and south, opening
only toward the terrace and house. Kitchens gardens north of the service
wing would complete the arrangement.

However, the feeling for well shut-off
parts of one’s place is not yet very
strong. Typical of the state of middle
western civilization is the number of well
designed, expensive country houses, with
the family wash fluttering conspicuously
off one end. But the desire for civic bet-
terment is also typical. Before long will
be carried out the plans for the embellish-
ment of Chicago and for the creation
about it of a wide belt of park land.
The New Washington Hotel, Colon, Panama

Cram, Goodhue &d Ferguson, Architects

A new hotel at Colon was needed primarily to save our national face. It has also, evidently enough, a clear commercial justification. Curiosity hunters, "prospectors," looking for chances of investment or speculation in the canal zone, all these classes of "paying guests" require a better hotel at the Atlantic extremity of the canal than is now available, and not only better in respect to its accommodation, but more seemly and dignified as a visual object. There is a constant demand for quarters for permanent or transient officials of the canal. As the opening of the canal comes nearer, it may be expected that tourists of a superior pretension to that of any of the above-named classes will visit the isthmus, who will require to be entertained in an official or semi-official manner. It is important that there should be, in advance of their arrival, some preparation for entertaining them more suitable than has hitherto existed. Moreover, all experience shows that in the matter of luring tourists to a place intrinsically interesting by what is to be seen there, either in the way of striking works of nature, or, as on the isthmus at present, of a wonderful work of art, supply must precede the demand to which it appeals. There can hardly be a question that a new hotel at the entrance to the Panama Canal, even on the scale of the Washington, will pay from the day that it is opened. It is of a piece with the entire administration of the work, since it was committed to the Engineer Corps of the Army, an administration which is in so many respects a just source of national pride, that the project of the new hotel should have been put into good architectural hands.

In the tropics, and within ten degrees of the line, the greatest enemy of man is the sun, and his best friend the shade. And not only are such devices as the outlying and protruding verandahs which sufficiently meet the need of shade in the summer residences of the temperate zone still more essential in the tropics, but also that "boundless contiguity of shade" which is secured by enclosing the verandahs as loggias, with more effective protection from the solar fierceness than inch-plank and shingles can furnish. The thicker the walls, the more complete the enclosure of the sheltered spaces, the better. Doubtless that is one of the considerations which, as it has led to thick walls of adobe or other sunproof material in other and more primitive styles of tropical building, has called, in the case of an hotel at Colon, for the latest construction "in the present state of the art," a construction of reinforced concrete, or as the natives of the isthmian region would call it of "cimento armado," with the additional precaution against the enemy of the other modern construction, double walls of hollow tile. With the additional provision of as many currents of air as can be induced to circulate through its apartments and communicating corridors, such a construction promises to be as comfortable as any could be in nine degrees or thereabouts North latitude.

The architecture quite naturally follows the construction. The Spanish Colonial architecture, of which the most elaborate and interesting specimens are
in Mexico, not only lends itself to the exigencies of a concrete construction, but, in its most characteristic manifestations, simulates such a construction by disguising the actual brickwork, if that happens to be the structural mate-
rial, under a coating of plaster, the gradual discoloration and peeling of which adds delightful touches of apparent antiquity and of factitious picturesqueness to quite modern erections. It is not by structural logic that the Spanish Ren-

Third Floor—Bedroom Plan.

First Floor Plan.

WASHINGTON HOTEL, COLON, R. P.
Cram, Goodhue and Ferguson, Architects.
Renaissance, either in the "metropole" or in colonies, is distinguished. Least of all the phase of it known as the Churriguereque, from the name of Don Josef Churriquerra of Salamanca and his two sons, who operated in it during the closing years of the seventeenth century and the opening years of the eighteenth. Structural logic was the last thing they or their disciples troubled themselves about. What they did aim at, and what they attained, was the production of decorative features which are impressive, one may almost say, in proportion to their unscrupulousness. But their manner of design, which can hardly be called a manner of building, is especially eligible for the purposes of an architect having a characteristic building to do in Latin America, for the reason that in the opin-

DETAIL OF CENTRAL PORTION, SOUTH FACADE, WASHINGTON HOTEL, COLON, R. P. CRAM, GOODHUE & FERGUSON, ARCHITECTS.
NEW WASHINGTON HOTEL, COLON.

DETAIL OF CENTRAL PORTION, NORTH FACADE, WASHINGTON HOTEL, COLON, R. P.

CRAM, GOODHUE & FERGUSON, ARCHITECTS.
ion of some good judges, the style was practised to more effective results in New than in Old Spain. One note of it, in the best Mexican examples is the concentration of all the ornament of a front upon a monumental and fantastic central feature, while the walls on either hand are left entirely bare and bald, with a studied or unstudied plainness which does undoubtedly enhance the effect of the single “architecturesque” feature. The adapter, in the case of the Washington Hotel, is “not a bigoted one” to the extent of omitting all architecture from his curtain walls. Contrariwise, he has emphasized by orders the division of the wall into bays, and has similarly set an order, very effectively framed and relieved, at the centre of each of his terminal pavilions. But, nevertheless, the central feature, the sculptured and possibly colored frontispiece, is “the thing.” It promises to be a very effective feature, signalized as it will be, by the projected vestibule at the base, and flanked by the dark voids of opening in the ground floor, and the colonnade bays above. The building has an “official” air, and suggests a municipal palace quite as strongly as an hotel; but it is none the worse, nor indeed any the less expressive on that account. It certainly looks tropical, and will look still more so when it comes to be surrounded with the “massifs” of palms which are to contribute to its final decoration. It certainly looks “Latin American,” and decidedly that, rather than “Norte Americano,” is how it ought to look. When it is completed, it does not seem likely that we shall have left any cause for complaint that there does not exist at the entrance to the Panama canal, proper and suitable accommodation for those who visit the great work, on occasions either of business or of pleasure, or that there is any want of facilities for the exercise of official hospitality, if such hospitality should seem to be called for.

M. S.
TWO HOUSES AT CRANFORD, NEW JERSEY.
Hollingsworth and Bragdon, Architects.
THE NEW BUILDING FOR H. W. JOHNS-MANVILLE CO.,
NEW YORK CITY. AUGUSTUS N. ALLEN, ARCHITECT.
SHOW ROOM LOOKING TOWARD MADISON AVE., H. W. JOHNS-MANVILLE CO.,
NEW YORK CITY.

AUGUSTUS N. ALLEN, ARCHITECT.
Private Office.

Directors' Room.

THE H. W. JOHNS-MANVILLE COMPANY BUILDING.
FARM BUILDINGS OF "BURRWOOD" FOR WALTER JENNINGS ESQ.,
COLD SPRING HARBOR L. I.
CLINTON MAC KENZIE, ARCHITECT.
ENTRANCE DETAIL—FARM BUILDINGS OF "BURRWOOD" FOR WALTER JENNINGS, ESQ., COLD SPRING HARBOR, L. I. CLINTON MAC KENZIE, ARCHITECT.
EXTERIOR, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH.
EDENTON, NORTH CAROLINA.
Early American Churches
Part VII
St. Paul's, Edenton, N.C.—First Baptist, Providence, R.I.—Congregational, East Avon, Conn.—Christ Church, Philadelphia:
By Aymer Embury, II

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH
Edenton, N. C.

St. Paul’s, Edenton, is the only old church, with the exception of that at Winston-Salem, remaining in the State, and should be regarded rather as one of the Virginia group than as representative of a different type. These Virginia churches were at the beginning very much alike, but their appearance has been in many cases modified by the construction of towers, side aisles, transepts, etc. The building was begun in 1736, was substantially built of brick, and the main construction has been unchanged since its erection; it is still in good repair. The construction, however, dragged along for a number of years and the building was not finally occupied until 1760. The floor was originally of tile, and burials were permitted in vaults below the floor. These are no longer permitted and the present floor is of wood. The building is sixty feet long by forty feet wide within the walls, the side walls twenty feet high, but as to its architect or designer there is no evidence. Its construction was opposed by many of the members of the parish, of which the earliest edifice, built in 1701, was the oldest church structure in North Carolina. The construction of the present church was retarded by the fact that six chapels had been built in various parts of the parish in 1701, and the congregation, thus decentralized, had no particular inclination to support either morally or financially the mother edifice. As bearing on the methods of construction of the time, the following minutes of the vestry, which constitute a specification for the six chapels, may be of interest: “The dimensions as here mentioned, viz: Thirty-five foot long and Twenty-two foot and a half wide, Eleven foot in the pitch between Sill and Plate, and a roof; workmanlike, near a square, and to be good frame Gott out of Good Timbers and covered with Good Sipress shingles and good Sleepers and flowers of good plank and seated with Good plank; with three Windows suitable, with a pulpit and all things suitable.” Can one wonder that when the design and construction of church buildings were thus limited by orders of a vestry totally unacquainted with the art of construction the names of the architects have been forgotten? And is it not remarkable that with such fixed limitations, which in every case where the records of early construction have been preserved we find to have been imposed upon the unhappy designer, Colonial architecture obtained such a tremendous quality?
THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.
THE FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.
FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH
Providence, R. I.

Most of us will remember in our American history that one Roger Williams, a Baptist fleeing from persecution in Massachusetts, founded Rhode Island as a sort of place of refuge to the persecuted for religion's sake. It has often been a source of amusement to historians that the stolid old Puritans who founded New England fled from England not only that they might worship in accordance with the dictates of their own consciences, but also that they might make everybody else worship in the same way. In the State of Rhode Island was found the first genuine religious tolerance in the world. The congregation of the First Baptist Church is the oldest Baptist congregation in this country, as the church edifice is the oldest Baptist church still extant. The building was designed by Joseph Brown, of Providence, in 1775. He was a merchant, with a taste for the arts and sciences, a member of the American Academy of the Arts and Sciences and a trustee of Brown University. An interesting side light on the methods of design in those days is thrown by the information that Joseph Brown, together with a Mr. Hammond, was sent by the First Baptist congregation to Boston "in order to view the different churches and make a memoranda of their several dimensions and forms of architecture." As a result of this visit to Boston the First Baptist Church was designed in its present style and bears in a general way testimony to the effect which the Boston churches had on its architect, without specifically resembling any one of them. While the tower is rather interesting, the balance of the exterior is not so attractive, the high basement, with a door under the tower, placed at the basement level, injuring its effect. On the other hand, the interior is very agreeable, and the magnificent chandelier is one of the most beautiful examples of Colonial lighting fixtures still extant. The contrast between this beautiful piece of cut glass and the wretchedly tasteless gaslights along the gallery is very strong, and the change in artistic quality indicated by comparison of the two is pathetic. The history of the church is very closely connected with that of Brown University, whose commencements were held in it until very recent years.

EAST AVON CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH

While its fondest admirers can hardly claim for this little building any very great amount of architectural design, it is so typical of the many New England meeting houses built either at about the same date or in the few years previous that I am including it in this series to illustrate a series which, were all of them included, would become monotonous through repetition. There are probably twenty or twenty-five small churches or meeting houses built in the Connecticut and Massachusetts towns of design very similar to this. Architects, so called, they had none, but with Asher Benjamin's hand books, which gave both the Vignola orders, and Benjamin's own adaptation to them for edifices of various kinds, the designers struggled along as best they could; and because of native good taste, of many good examples around them, and of a total absence of church buildings of downright hideousness, the results were always pleasing, well adapted to their locations, and, while perhaps without any very definite merit, at least sufficiently good to arrest attention. This East Avon meeting house is, as before said, typical of a whole group; the body of the building is a short oblong (sometimes they were square), with a vestibule in the front containing three entrances and three windows above, with pilasters (generally Ionic) between them. Partially on the pediment above these pilasters and partially on the roof itself was carried the tower, a square or round above that gradually diminishing to either a small domical termination or a spire of more or less length. The interior had galleries on both sides whose face was decorated
EAST AVON CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH.
with paneling and ornament copied out of Asher Benjamin's works. Oftentimes the ornament used was not that which we would expect to be employed, but it was always scaled with unerring accuracy to fit its position and to produce an agreeable and proportionate broken shadow. The reredos, if the Congregational Church will pardon the use of the word, was the only decoration on the blank walls, except the window treat-

ment, and as a rule the builders found themselves somewhat at a loss as to what to do there. Asher Benjamin is strangely silent on wall treatment back of the pulpit, although he gives several very excellent pulpit designs in his valuable little books. This East Avon church was built in 1819 and, being in a little backwater of civilization in the Connecticut Valley, has remained practically untouched ever since.

CHRIST CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Christ Church, Philadelphia, on North Second Street, near Market, is certainly one of the half-dozen most famous churches in America. It was designed by Dr. John Kearsley in 1727 and completed about 1737. Dr. John Kearsley was an amateur architect, a physician by profession, who was certainly the designer of St. Bartholomew's as well as St. John's Church, Philadelphia, and to him has sometimes been attributed the design of Independence Hall, although I believe it is generally recognized that Andrew Hamilton was probably the designer, and that Dr. Kearsley merely served on a committee with him.

The building is in a general way like St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London, and was built of bricks imported from England in 1754; a chime and bells were purchased also in England with the proceeds of a lottery conducted by Benjamin Franklin. At the time of the Declaration of Independence the bust of King George III. was removed from the niche which it had occupied up to that date, and when a few months later the crown on the spire of the church was destroyed by lightning the members of the congregation felt that they had heavenly approval for their struggle for liberty. During the progress of the War of the Revolution Christ Church occupied a very prominent part in the affairs of both church and state. On July 20, 1775, Congress attended service officially in Christ Church, and shortly after the Revolution the Episcopal Church of the United States was organized as a separate body from the Church of England by a convention held in this structure in 1788. I have found occasion before to refer to General Washington's inveterate church-going, and I believe that in the churches hitherto published there is only one erected before his death at which he was not a constant and regular attendant for at least one Sunday. In Christ Church he was really a regular member of the parish during his presidency, from 1790 to 1797, and the pew he then occupied is preserved, as well as that of Betsy Ross, who, as the political speakers say, "needs no introduction." Architecturally the church is of much interest; the photograph of the facade here given showing an interesting Palladian motive flanked by brick pilasters indicative of the nave within, while the two-story portion of the building on either side denotes very clearly the presence of galleries on the interior. The interior contains one curious feature of design which could only have happened in a building erected from the plans of an amateur architect. The ceiling is carried by false arches springing from the tops of the columns and at the end of the church the spacing failed to work out equally, and a half arch butt directly into the wall. Nevertheless we can forgive a good many such anachronisms to an interior as well proportioned and agreeably detailed as is this one, although the manner in which the galleries just miss the columns leads one to feel that under a heavy weight they might slide down. It was one of the peculiar characteristics of colonial work that the architects of that period seemed to forget what are to us almost the first principles of design, and still produced buildings which we, with our infinitely greater knowledge both of construction and of work of the past, do not seem to be able to greatly better.
The Fourth National Conference on City Planning was held in Boston May 27th-29th. With an actual registration exceeding two hundred, and representative to remarkable degree of the whole country, there was evidenced the movement's continued growth and vigor. Each convention thus far has had a larger attendance than its predecessors.

In the program of this year's conference attempt was made to emphasize discussion, and at the same time to add to the value of the formal papers, by cutting down the number of the latter and extending their length. This was sufficiently successful to encourage, it may be hoped, the repetition of the experiment. At the opening session, on the evening of the 27th, the subject was "The Meaning and Progress of City Planning." An architect, a landscape architect, and a civil engineer, significantly, presented the three papers. The speakers were Arnold W. Brunner, Frederick Law Olmsted and George F. Swain. This was the popular meeting of the conference. Next morning the more technical discussions, of most interest to the city planners themselves, began. The subject of the morning was "Paying the Bills for City Improvements," and the papers were by Nelson P. Lewis of New York, and Street Commissioner Gallivon of Boston. The presiding officer was Lawson Purdy, President of the Department of Taxes and Assessments in New York—an appropriate selection. A roundtable luncheon that day, attended by about a hundred delegates, developed into an experience meeting. At the third session, "City Planning Studies" were discussed by an architect, J. Randolph Coolidge, Jr., and a landscape architect, Arthur A. Shurtleff, both of Boston. The first took as his theme "Blighted Districts"; and Mr. Shurtleff discussed street systems of the Boston Metropolitan district. Nelson P. Lewis presided. The fourth session of the conference, under the chairmanship of Hon. Frederick C. Howe, New York, was devoted to an informal discussion from the floor of a selected list of topics; and at the fifth session, an application to the United States of the zoning principle of German city development was considered in a single paper by B. A. Haldeman, of the Bureau of Surveys of Philadelphia. The final meeting was reserved for the business of the conference. It is interesting in going over the program, to observe the careful relation which was preserved between the several especially concerned professions—architecture, landscape architecture, engineering, and economics. Sociology, however, had no recognition, perhaps because of the especial emphasis which it had received in each of the previous conferences. Even in the discussion of "Blighted Districts," Mr. Coolidge took care to explain that his reference was only to districts that suffered the economic blight of impaired land values, without regard to their social condition.

The three most important contributions to the conference were generally judged to be the papers by Messrs. Lewis, Haldeman and Coolidge—two engineers and an archi-
tect, the architect discussion a non-architectural theme. Throughout the whole conference, the "civic center" was ignored—striking evidence of the change which city planning in America is undergoing, and change which is the more to be approved, since the pendulum is sure to swing back again when some of the civic centers that are now under construction, though planned years ago, are completed, to become the envy of rival communities.

At the final session, a committee, of which Charles Mulford Robinson was chairman, brought in a series of resolutions, which were adopted, embodying the conclusions of the conference. These included approval of five important principles of improvement assessment enunciated in the paper by Mr. Lewis; recommended the prompt and inexpensive publication in separate form of the more important conference papers, so that they might have a wider circulation than can be given to the proceedings; and suggested steps to secure, by co-operation with other bodies, a municipal exhibit at the Panama-Pacific Exposition. An executive committee of sixteen, of whom five are architects, was elected; and a general committee of about fifty was appointed for consultation on matters of general policy. The entertainment of the conference consisted of a luncheon, given by the Mayor, of an automobile ride to see developments in and about Boston; and of a largely attended dinner at the City Club.

Some six or eight months ago the Mayor of Boston retained Frank A. Bourne, an architect, to make studies for the improvement of Copley Square. The problem is one which has been studied for many years. Almost twenty years ago, the Boston Society of Architects arranged a competition on the subject, and year after year it has been one of the projects submitted to the lads in the landscape architecture department at Harvard. But because the present study was officially authorized, and is, therefore, to be seriously taken, it invites special attention. Also, the conditions of the problem have changed in recent years. On the one hand, the Museum of Fine Arts has moved from the Square, and a big new hotel which will have a large amount of continuous vehicle traffic is taking its place; on the other, a Huntington avenue subway, greatly reducing the number of surface cars that must make use of the present diagonal, is no longer regarded as a matter of the distant future. Finally, Boylston street is rapidly becoming a business thoroughfare even opposite Copley Square. Nevertheless, the new plan's abandonment of the diagonal, though such action is artistically necessary, is likely to provoke the old time opposition. The plan contemplates a diversion of Huntington avenue street cars, so that they shall pass in front of the library, turning two corners to get into Boylston street. This will straighten the sides of the central Square, putting them parallel, respectively, with the library, Boylston street, Trinity Church, and the new hotel. To the north of the church, in the space gained by the elimination of that part of diagonal Huntington avenue, a small subsidiary square, with evergreen planting, is proposed. West from this, across Trinity place, and thus along the south side of Boylston street, there is planned a promenade, lined with small trees. South of the promenade, will be a parallelogram, sodded, adorned with shrubs, and having in its center a column or obelisk. This would be on the axis of the library and would be surrounded with appropriate architectural and sculptural treatment. A walk is to traverse the space from east to west and from north to south and there is a suggestion of fountains, and broad flights of steps to a lower level, and of pattern paving such as used in Germany. Mr. Bourne makes the excellent proposal that the ninety-foot building height limit be extended to include the east side of Clarendon street, where the Brunswick Hotel now is, so that no future skyscraper shall frown down upon Trinity Church and overbalance the library beyond; and he adds the obvious comment that the top of Westminster Chambers could be easily made satisfactory if the roof garden were developed on architectural lines, with a suitable colonnade and cornice treatment.

On engagement by the City Commissioners and the Park Board who were enthusiastically supported in the venture by the City Plan and Development League of the Chamber of Commerce, George E. Kessler was retained a couple of years ago to make a city plan for Dallas, Texas. This plan, with various illustrations, maps and diagrams, has just been published. Dallas, Mr. Kessler points out at the beginning "to-day presents the difficulties at..."
tendant upon the expansion into a great city of a village at a temporary railroad terminus, no apparent thought having been given in the interim to the needs of the increasing population." The plan, therefore, becomes, he remarks, "a plan not for the building of the city, but one formulating recommendations for rebuilding along broader lines." He finds that "unconsciously and along natural lines" the city has begun "to segregate its lands for their varying uses." The railroads are at the lower level, the business districts are slightly above them, and the residence sections are on the surrounding higher ground. But the residence expansion has been directed by the land speculator, and there is the usual absence of direct lines of comfortable communication between the different residence districts and between them and the business city. To correct these and other shortcomings, the Plan proposes: The building of levees and the straightening of the river, to provide flood protection; to give a wide basin that will be the city harbor, and to furnish additional room for railroad terminals and switching properties; the construction of a belt railroad, of a union station and of a freight terminal; the development just east of the proposed union station of a civic center—this would be at the western end of the present business district; the elimination of a number of grade crossings; the correction and extension of streets in the downtown district; the establishment of additional playgrounds, and the building of a comprehensive system of parks, parkways and connections.

For the civic center no diagram or drawing is presented, and the text, which is brief throughout, makes only this reference to it. "Upon the borders of this park (to be located in front of the union station) there could be grouped public or semi-public buildings, such as a post office, a traction terminal building, and others, that may be suitably placed in that locality." The report adds, however: "Doubtless Dallas will not confine herself to a single so-called civic center. There are in the eastern section of the city a number of places where several streets converge to make a commercial traffic center, and some of these will doubtless naturally develop into sites for the grouping of public buildings. In all cases where such intersections occur, the municipality should take sufficient ground to open traffic ways, holding some of the resultant triangular spots as open parks, and about these encourage the grouping of fine buildings. In this report no definite selections and recommendations for such sites have been made." In the discussion of the business streets there is the following comment, which is of some interest to architects: "The mistaken idea of the need of glaring advertising has produced the most positive injury to the appearance of our American cities. The outrageous excess of billboard advertising and the entirely unnecessary signs on the sides and roofs of buildings has made this one of the most difficult factors to deal with in city improvement. Rarely does the average citizen derive sufficient advantage from such signs to compensate him for being constantly confronted with them but probably the only means of checking the abuse will be to establish the practice of licensing billboards."

An interesting episode, of which the significance should not be lost, may be chronicled of Harvard Square, in Cambridge. With the completion of the new subway from Boston, great numbers of people who formerly transferred from cars there, are now making their transfers under ground, and the businessmen of the Square are feeling the difference keenly. So serious did the matter become, and so plain did it seem that the handicap could be overcome only by enhancing the attraction of the Square, that the mayor appealed to President Lowell of Harvard for the advice and assistance of the university. Accordingly, President Lowell has appointed four professors from the Graduate School of Architecture to cooperate with committees from the city government and business men in working out a plan of improvement for the Square. Among the chosen professors, is Duquesne, who as former director of the Ecole des Beaux Arts in Paris, has had considerable experience in this kind of planning.

DENVER'S ART COMMISSION.

The Art Commission of the City and County of Denver has recently issued two small pamphlets. One contains a short history of the Denver Civic Center; the other, under the caption of "General Report," a short history of the Commission itself. Of the splendid Civic Center, which is now about to be realized, so much has been written that nothing more need here be said—except that
the bonds to pay for its creation were successfully sold early in April. As to the Art Commission the report contains those extracts from the City Charter under which it operates, and a brief account of what it has brought to pass. The commission was appointed in 1904, and it early adopted a constructive policy, believing that a merely critical attitude would not be productive of maximum results. Its first actual work was to secure the adoption by the council of the present city seal. Besides deserving nearly all the credit for the civic center, the commission is responsible for the ornamental light standards which have made Denver widely known, for the Welcome Arch at the Union Station, for a general study by an outside authority of the city's improvement possibilities, for a handsome Isle of Safety carrying a bronze electrifier, for designs for fire and police alarm standards, and for bubbling cup fountains. It was consulted with regard to the beautiful Pioneer Monument and to the Cheesman Memorial Pavilion in one of the parks, with reference also to the interior decorations of the Public Library, and of the Auditorium, and of various park improvements. It also took a vigorous part in opposing a campaign which was designed to secure the removal of the ordinance placing a limit upon building height. Thus the record of the Denver Art Commission is long and honorable—a fact due in large part to the tireless enthusiasm of Henry Read, its chairman, and to the constantly sympathetic attitude of Mayor Speer.

Mount Vernon, New York, which is about to build a new city hall and police station, proposes to make the most of its opportunity to secure a civic center. The site is the five corners, where North Fifth avenue, Stevens avenue and Valentine street intersect. The city hall will take one corner, extending back the whole block; the police station, another; and efforts are going forward to induce the government to erect a new postoffice on a third. On a fourth corner, a large theatre is to be constructed, with due appreciation it is said of the site's civic significance. All this is not simply a vision and only a hope. The land has been actually bought and the whole project is well advanced. The result well illustrates what a small city can do by taking thought. Millions of dollars and costly municipal plans rendered in water colors are not always the essential preliminaries to a civic center.

Springfield, Mass., owes many of its good things, including an enviable reputation among cities of its size, to unusual displays of civic spirit. The latest case in point has arisen in regard to its new city buildings. For these, it will be remembered, are to constitute a group in themselves—office building, auditorium, and campanile—an unusual and striking arrangement. In the tower carrying out the campanile idea, it is proposed to place a set of chimes. This is a possession which is believed to be had by no other American city and yet one which can often be put to good use, notably, for example, on Springfield's safe and sane Fourth of July celebrations. During the spring, the people have been raising the money for these chimes. Funds have been raised by the Board of Trade and by the school children, and some individuals have given single bells. Now, is not all this fine and heartening, calculated to give one faith not in democracy only but in even American municipal government? While citizens buy back, with voluntary contributions, their river bank from the railroads, and in the same way pay the cost of a part of their city building, there surely is hope for the municipal governments they create.

The third annual convention of the American Federation of Arts was held in the auditorium of the National Museum at Washington, D. C., on May 9th, 10th and 11th. The attendance was larger than usual and the territory represented somewhat broader. An increased interest in the work of the Federation as a National body and closer cooperation between the several chapters were shown.

Mr. Robert W de Forest presided at the sessions on the first day; Mr. E. H. Blashfield on the second day, and Dr. Mitchell Carroll on the third day. Both sessions on the 9th were given over to reports of the standing committees, which evoked both interest and discussion, especially those on Craftmanship and Industrial Art.

According to the report presented by the
Assistant Secretary the American Federation of Arts now has 130 chapters with an aggregate membership of 50,000 scattered throughout the United States. During the year thirteen exhibitions of oil paintings, water color, original works by American illustrators, Arts and Crafts objects, engravings, etc., have been sent out. These have gone to 43 different cities in the south, middle west, and north. The attendance at these exhibitions has been large, and nearly $6,000 worth of sales have been made. Not only do these exhibitions awaken interest in art, help to establish a standard, but they have helped in the formation of art societies and permanent collections. Five illustrated typewritten lectures have been sent to 40 cities and towns remote from art centres where authoritative lecturers could only with difficulty be secured. Art and Progress, the official publication of the American Federation of Arts, has been issued regularly and gained largely in circulation and public estimate. It has become a strong factor in the Federation's educational work. The Federation has also been doing practical service, acting as a bureau of information on the Fine Arts and a general clearing house for art organizations throughout the country. The treasurer reported a balance of over $800 in the bank.

There were two illustrated addresses, one on the work of the Federation by the Assistant Secretary, and the other on American Sculpture by Mr. Augustus Lukeman, representing the National Sculpture Society. The afternoon session on the 10th was devoted to the consideration of Civic Art, Mr. Cass Gilbert speaking on the subject of City Planning, Mr. Richard B. Waitrous on Civic Art in the Country and Mr. Edward T. Hartman on the Housing Problem. On the same afternoon a conference on Art Museum methods and improved public service was held in a room adjoining the auditorium under the leadership of Mr. Arthur Fairbanks. Attending this conference were representatives of Museums in Worcester, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, St. Louis, Indianapolis, Buffalo, San Francisco and elsewhere.

On the recommendation of the Board of Directors and with the complete concurrence of the delegates it was determined by the convention to request each chapter, to increase its annual dues at the rate of ten cents per member, the minimum fee remaining as established by the constitution at $10 a year. It was further determined to make a nominal charge hereafter for exhibitions and lectures to organizations which were not chapters of the Federation; and to raise the price of Art and Progress to $2.00 a year. The following directors were elected: Mr. Charles L. Hutchinson, the retiring president, Mr. J. W. Alexander, Mr. H. W. Kent and Mr. C. Powell Minnegerode.

A memorial meeting was held by the American Federation of Arts at Washington, D. C., on the evening of May 10th in the auditorium of the National Museum. Mr. Cass Gilbert presided and beautiful tributes to Mr. Millet's ability and character were paid by Senator Root, Senator Lodge, the Hon. Charles Francis Adams and Secretary Charles D. Walcott. Senator Root laid stress upon Mr. Millet's many-sidedness and his public spirit; Senator Lodge emphasized the vital quality in all his work; Mr. Adams spoke of him as the lifelong friend and associate; Mr. Walcott told of his interest and help in the establishment of the National Gallery of Art. Resolutions from numerous societies of which Mr. Millet was a member were read by Mr. Glenn Brown as well as a letter from Mr. William Dean Howells which told of his sense of personal loss and referred to Mr. Millet's ability as a writer in fiction and his special gift for friendship.

Among the social features of this convention were receptions at the White House, Mr. Taft graciously inviting the delegates to the Garden Party given on the afternoon of the 10th, a reception by Mr. and Mrs. Bush-Brown, visits to the National Gallery, the Freer collection, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, and an excursion to Mt. Vernon. On the morning of the 11th, Dr. Berthold Laufer, of the Field Museum, Chicago, read a very interesting and instructive paper on the Freer collection.

In a recent issue of The International Studio we find an interesting little chat between the Art Critic, The Architect and the Man with the Red Tie. We are very much indebted to "The Lay Figure" for a report of this discussion.

"I want to plead for a closer association between the different forms of artistic effort," said the Art Critic. "I mean that I want to see the arts of architecture, sculpture, and painting brought into such intimate relation that each will take its full share in building up a complete decorative result."

"But surely that association already exists," objected the Architect. "You cannot complain of any neglect of either sculp-
ture or painting in modern architectural work. Both play parts of real importance in every architectural scheme that has any pretensions to completeness.

"I am not so sure about that," returned the Critic. "I am quite prepared to admit that sculpture has during recent years regained much of its earlier status as a valued ally of architecture, but I cannot see that painting has been admitted to anything like the same degree of intimacy."

"Now you mention it, I hardly think I can recall many examples of important mural decoration in modern buildings," commented the Man with the Red Tie; "and I do not fancy that architects nowadays have any particular liking for painting as a means of completing an architectural effect."

"Precisely; that is what I would imply," agreed the Critic. "Sculpture is given a fair chance, painting is not; and therefore the alliance I am asking for has not been brought within the range of practical art policies. I want to see things more equitably arranged."

"You are forgetting, I fancy, that modern buildings are usually decorated and that architects do reckon on the use of color to give a proper finish to their designs," said the Architect. "Is not that evidence that they recognize the value of the painter's collaboration and that they are quite ready to give him his proper chances?"

"As far as it goes it is evident that the collaboration of the painter is necessary," replied the Critic; "but I contend that it does not go far enough. The color decoration of a building is as a rule a sort of after-thought, not a matter contemplated and provided for in the original design."

"And it is a matter about which the architect concerns himself so little that as often as not he leaves it entirely in the hands of the local builder and decorator, who takes a contract for the job at so much a square yard," put in the Man with the Red Tie.

"Well, even if it were true that the painter does not play as important a part in architectural decoration as you think he should, does that matter so much?" inquired the Architect. "There is such a range of colored building materials—marbles, different kinds of wood, and so on—now available that painting seems to me to be really superfluous."

"Ah, now we are getting at the point of the argument," cried the Critic. "Painting is superfluous! That is the attitude which many people are taking up to-day and it is an attitude to which I very strongly object. I say there can be no perfect decorative achievement unless architecture, sculpture, and painting contribute to it in something like equal shares."

"Do you suggest that the architect in making his designs for a building should invent opportunities for the painter, and should contemplate intervention on the part of the painter as a matter of course?" asked the Architect.

"Most certainly I do," returned the Critic. "In a public building, or, indeed, in any large building, he should recognize that significant mural paintings, placed in spaces suitably planned and so treated that they form an essential part of the architectural scheme, have a vital and emphatic interest; and in elaborating that scheme he should take into account the part which the painter may be called upon to play. The painter would be in this case subordinate to the architect, but that would be a very different thing to ignoring him altogether. But in a domestic building the architect should remember that the easel picture is needed to give the note of artistic completeness to the rooms and to provide the proper surroundings for men of taste. Here he must subordinate himself to the painter and frankly accept certain limitations which will affect his freedom of action. He must plan with consideration for the paintings that are permanently or temporarily, as the case may be, to be brought into association with the architecture for which he is responsible."

"Then you think that the architect and the painter should work in collaboration, and that the painter should have a say in the planning of the building, because he has to fill spaces which the architect must leave for him," said the Architect.

"Collaboration, alliance, call it what you like," laughed the Critic. "I do think they ought to work together for the good of art, and that they should help one another."