f12 Correspondence, Post-Columbia, 1911, 1914.

Milton, January 16, 1911.

My dear Mr. Lowell,

You were so good as to send me your New York address, and it seems no more than mere good manners for me now to send you the paragraphs I put into the Graduates Magazine last month. I did not see my way to offer any very definite suggestions, but it seemed to me that my point was worth making.

Meanwhile, though my Latin book got much praise from many quarters, every body said that no School would think of trying so novel an experiment. So that is laid on the shelf. But it still seems to me to point the way to study not only Latin but any language.

I need not add that I am rejoiced to hear of the successful negotiations with M. Duquesne. This will give the School better teaching than any, while its

Post Graduate character secures it an equally superior class of Students, This ought to bring better results than any where else in the world. No college graduates of any sense would think of going elsewhere. For nowhere else will their own culture be such a real help, and the ignorance of fellow students so slight a drawback.

L.R.W.

Columbia University
in the City of New York
SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

March 14th, 1911.

Professor W. R. Ware,

Milton, Mass.

My dear Mr. Ware:-

I am much obliged for your note, and very grateful for your kind offer to supply any missing numbers of the R.I. B.A. Journal. I will put the matter at once into the hands of Mr. Bach, who looks after such things for me, to prepare the list of missing numbers, if such there be. The volumes of L'Architecture we shall also gladly receive and thank you heartily for them.

Of course we feel greatly elated over the gift of the "munificent patron of the Fine Arts" who has so often figured in the programs of the problems in design, but has never yet manifested himself in practical and tangible fashion. I have my suspicions as to his identity. The plans promise us ~~a~~ fairly commodious and sufficient accommodations for the next few years, at least; as long, no doubt, as I shall remain in my present post. "Après moi, le déluge."

I hear you have been to Cambridge, and I suspected you would soon be seeing C. W. S. I am glad you had the outing.

Please give my best regards to your sister,

And believe me,

Faithfully yours,

A. D. F. Hamlin

(Copy)

Milton, April 6, 1911.

Dear Mr. Wheeler;

I write supposing you are still Dean of the Faculty of Fine Arts, though this letter is a personal communication only.

I have received the impression, which may be a mistaken or exaggerated one, that the Society of our Graduate Architects have become possessed with the idea of making themselves useful to the School. All I want to say is that, though this display of interest may be welcomed, I think any such advances should be responded to rather cautiously. Most of our best men have spent as much time at the Paris School as previously at our own and been rather dazzled by its brilliant achievements. They do not see that the two Schools have little in common, not even a common aim, and that the situation in France is so unlike the situation here that what suits there is here, presumably, unsuitable.

The Paris School is organized so as to furnish the French Government every year one or two Government Architects, men capable of building and caring for Public Buildings. These include Palaces, Theatres, Churches, Custom Houses, Mairies, Museums and Government Offices. This important but somewhat restricted function it performs to the entire acceptance of the Authorities. But this training does not aim at furnishing a thorough professional education, and does not entirely meet the needs of the general practitioner. Moreover, naturally enough under the circumstances, the School gives more attention to drawing buildings than to erecting them. Nothing could be further from the requirements of our own country.

The work of the Ecole being thus somewhat removed from practical affairs has naturally ever since its foundation fostered somewhat fantastic and capricious styles of design which have not always done it much credit. Good taste and good sense have not always prevailed, and Beaux-

Arts fashions after disfiguring French towns have done much to disfigure our own. It has been rather an accepted maxim that "whatever looks French, goes." The Atelier system, based largely upon competitive draughtsmanship, is well calculated to bring about this result, especially when the students are, as are most of the French students, only half educated. Taine complained of them as ignorant troops rather boors.

It is for our own Schools not to copy the French system but to devise methods better suited to our own ways of education, and to improve the profession by establishing for it as high a standard of personal culture as our conditions permit. Here private schools and other irresponsible institutions may do as they please, but it becomes the Colleges and Universities that take up this problem to attempt its solution by seriously studying the application to it of Acedemic methods. This is a path from which our own School, certainly, should not be diverted.

I notice that the Educational Committee of the American Institute of Architects is also manifesting an uneasy disposition, proposing in some way to control the professional schools and even to "standardize" their methods. But I do not think any interference is to be apprehended from this quarter.

If your position as Dean fairly exposes you to the receipt of these remarks, perhaps my own Emeritus functions excuse my making them.

W. P. W.
?

What you said about the classes at 116th street was very interesting. But it reminded me of the Report which the Committee on Education lately presented to the Institute of Architects, recommending that all the Schools should be taken in hand and standardized. But this would imply in the first place that we know what the best form of professional training would be, and in the second place that it would be a good thing to have all our Schools pursue the same course. But we are far from ready to establish any model scheme. The only example in sight is the French one, and the conditions in Paris are so entirely unlike our own that we should probably be more hindered than helped by try ing to copy that precedent in its details. Moreover, the problem of framing a course of study for the general practitioner has not been solved, nor even seriously undertaken, until now in this country. The only hope of a satisfactory solution is to be found in a variety of entirely independent experiments such as are now going on in different places under very different conditions. It is to be expected that the results shall vary with the local requirements and local advantages, and especially with the character and culture of the students. There is place for Academic, Scientific, or Artistic, preponderance in different places, as these circumstances may determine. What seems to be most desirable is that the American Schools should chiefly resemble one another in not being alike. This is a free country, after all, and had better be kept so.

I hope our reformers will hasten slowly, and bear these things in mind. Nothing but mischief can come from a domineering spirit.

Yours

Dwill.

Columbia University
in the City of New York
SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

April 7th., 1911.

Professor W. R. Ware,

Milton, Mass.

My dear Mr. Ware:-

I am much obliged for the two letters which you enclosed to me and your note penciled on the back of one of them.

I think your letter to Professor Wheeler is inspired by a groundless anxiety. I have never detected the slightest tendency on the part of the Society of Columbia University Architects to urge Beaux-Arts methods upon the authorities of the School. The Beaux-Arts element is very far from being in the majority in the membership of the Society, and some of the most conservative among the members are Beaux-Arts men. We have in our so-called atelier system succeeded, I think, quite effectually in avoiding the dangers and pitfalls of the French system. I think so far as draughtsmanship is concerned the Columbia men are known for their restraint and quietness of style; and from personal association with the juries in the judgment of the problems I can testify that the fundamentals of sound planning and design -- good composition, refined proportion, quiet and dignified treatment, and refinement and charm of general character have always been given precedence over tricks of draughtsmanship or mere cleverness. There has been no invasion of the Frenchiness that I have been able to discover in the work of our School. Some

of our Beaux-Arts graduates, like Nelson and Beadel, for example, have been readiest to recognize the deficiencies of the French system applied to American practice.

I have been wondering whether your fears were not perhaps inspired by the letter from Mr. Morgan which you enclosed. The mention in that letter of the "Atelier Ware" may have awakened the dreadful suspicion that we had established at Columbia an atelier under your name. Of course we have done nothing of the sort, and the atelier to which reference is made is that conducted by Arthur Ware for the Beaux-Arts Society. Evidently Mr. Morgan associated it with yourself and jumped to the conclusion that it was a Columbia University Atelier. I have written to him to correct his error.

I hope the spring weather is bringing you new life and vigor and that you and your sister find yourselves in the best of conditions.

As ever,

Faithfully yours,

A. D. F. Hamlin

Columbia University
in the City of New York
SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

April 12th., 1911.

Professor W. R. Ware,

Milton, Mass.

Dear Mr. Ware:-

I thank you for your note and the memorandum you sent with it. I agree absolutely with your feeling regarding the notion of standardizing the Schools of Architecture. This is an old proposition that keeps cropping up every now and then, but I do not think you need to worry over it so far as we are concerned.

We had a very good dinner of the Architectural Society last night, about sixty being present, and I had the opportunity to explain and to show the architect's plans for the new building, which of course elicited much enthusiasm. Hornbostel told me ~~after~~ of his recent meeting with you, and after saying that he knew that he was regarded as a Beaux-Arts enthusiast, he begged to express his thorough and entire sympathy with the conception upon which you based the organization of the School, namely, that of broad, liberal culture, and he hoped that that ideal would never be surrendered. He is a somewhat irresponsible and reckless fellow in his talk, and I do not attach much importance to his views either way, as such; but, as I said in my recent letter, neither as an organization nor through its Committees has the Society, of which he is now President, so much as hinted at the desirability of making the School conform more closely to the Paris methods. It may interest you

to know that the drift of our students to Paris has almost wholly ceased, and that hardly anyone now attempts to enter the Ecole. On the other hand, we now have from two to four graduates working in Rome, more or less under the wing of the Academy.

Faithfully yours,

A D F Hamlin

Harvard in

1911

1

Columbia University
in the City of New York
SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE

May 3rd., 1911.

Professor W. R. Ware,

Milton, Mass.

My dear Mr. Ware:-

I was very glad to get your letter a little over a fortnight ago. I have now learned what was the real basis of your suspicion regarding the Beaux-Arts Society. It seems that a few members of our Graduate Society who are active in the B-A. organization had secured the ears of the President and some of the Trustees for representations of help and co-operation, the true inwardness of which was not at first apparent. At a subsequent conference in the President's office, to which Sherman and I were called, I asked some pretty pointed questions which finally elicited the disclosure of that constantly recurring old bogie to which you referred; that of gathering all the Schools into one lump and turning out all their work into one hopper. I think the President was rather surprised at this outcome, and I am taking steps to meet the situation with such strong representations, so emphatically supported by F. W. Chandler, H. L. Warren, and men of other schools, that the spectre will be effectively laid, for a time at least. I do not think the Graduate Society, as such, ever authorized these propositions for a practical subjection of the School to the Beaux-Arts Society, or would support such a scheme for a moment.

I am glad to learn what you say of engravings and photo-

graphs, as I did not know how to draw the line between your own property and that of the School. We really must send away your box, which has been nearly packed for a long time; but the Bow Church engraving will have to come separately. I do not know the book you refer to on Open Timber Roofing, but will make a search for it. The rendered drawings and photographs will certainly be welcome additions to the School collections, and I will see that due credit is given you for them. I accept them on behalf of the School with very sincere thanks.

I remain, with best wishes,

Yours faithfully,

A. D. F. Hamlin

290 Adams Street, Milton, Massachusetts.

May 29, 1911.

My dear Mr. Comstock,

I am very glad to receive your Prospectus of new books, and to know that you have brought both Mr. Nolan and Mr. Killam into your service. The two together may perhaps find a satisfactory solution of the very difficult problem of Architectural Engineering.

My own endeavors along these lines, when I was in New York, were not very successful, the only result being a conviction that I had better begin again, and this I was preparing to do, with Nolan's help, when I came away. A year or two later, when Killam went to Cambridge, I had some talk with him, and found him more inclined towards the position I had taken up. This was that, with all the things an Architect needs to understand about, the only thing he can undertake to do himself is what nobody else can do for him, and that it is no more his business to be a better engineer than a Civil Engineer, or a better Electrician than a professional Electrician, than to be an expert Carpenter or Mason. A sound theoretical understanding of all these auxiliary Arts and Sciences is all he can attain to. This enables him to ask intelligent questions, understand the answers, make sagacious suggestions, and choose from his own point of view, between possible alternatives. But it is no more his business to work out problems of Engineering, than to mix paints. He can do both, after a fashion, and in a way very creditable to him as an amateur. But that is not the sort of work his clients need, and that he ought to be content to furnish.

Here the distinction the Chemists make between Qualitative and Quantitative studies seemed exactly to meet the case, and to offer a solution of the practical question of schooling. For in designing a building an architect needs to be acquainted with all the constructive

devices that are at all available for his purpose,so that he can choose intelligently the kind of thing best suited to the result he has in view, light or heavy,open or close, low or high,composed of many small parts or a few large ones. But what then are precisely the best dimensions,large or small, to econimise cost or material,he had better not try to determine. That demands the experience and judgment proper to men who give all their time to such calculations.

Architectural Schools are apt to devote the little time they can give to such subjects to a thorough examination of one or two cases,figuring out the sizes of the timbers and bolts,and then leaving the student to apply the same principles to all other cases. This an Engineer can do.It is his specialty. But an Architect needs to be equally well acquainted with all cases,so that he can choose intelligently among them . If, perchance, he is shown how to solve one of them, it is only for his information. It is an example of what he, is not to do himself, for it is the sort of work in which most practioners can be only amateurs.

All this I am moved to say,seeing a prospect of this difficult question reaching,in your hands, the only solution which seems to me possible, theoretically or practically. It is just as well,probably, that the independent solution should be attempted. But I cannot but wish that you may finally see your way to combine the results,if they prove harmonious,in a single volume. Two heads are better than one,but one body is better than two.

1914

Aug. Nov 20.

My dear Hamlin,

I had a very nice visit two three days ago from Ludlow, who came round this way to see me, in going from Montreal to New York. But I forgot to ask him for his Montreal address, which you can, perhaps, give me, and can perhaps also tell me whether Stoughton is in New York or in Canada. I have had a little correspondence both with him & with

Goldsmith. They both seem very well contented with their new life.

I keep pretty well, and am told that I seem much better than I seemed in the Spring. But I do nothing, being very lazy and idle, not walking abroad at all, but taking a drive of an hour or two when the weather is pleasant, and cherishing a faint hope that you or Sherman may turn up in the course of the winter.

I do a little miscellaneous reading, and am read to from various books about this horrible and wicked war, which however, I do not expect to understand until it is all over.

Yours always faithfully,
William R. Ware.
(by H.W.)

Dublin, Nov. 15, 1914.

1914