

business, and yet we tell him he must not make good in the very fundamental of all business transactions, namely, responsibility; that since he is only an adviser he must never be responsible for results; that since he is a professional man in a calling which requires a great deal of business management, he must not stand behind any of his statements financially, must not guarantee anything; that his motto to his clients can be only "caveat emptor." Again we impress it upon the young man that his profession is a creative one, that his work over the drawing board is purely objective, that the building is the thing and not the drawing, and yet we absolutely prohibit him from taking any part in the actual building. Architects often refer to the structures they have built. This is an unconscious derogation of a part of the code of ethics. Architects do that really far more than the profession sometimes admits, but theoretically the young man may have no affiliation or connection of any sort with the building, and may take no contracts from anyone to do anything.

Again, and this is a point which is held most tenaciously by most of the older architects who have arrived, the young man starting out must not enter any competition unless it has received an official sanction from a body of men who may have had absolutely no connection with that particular problem. He must make no attempt to show on paper what he is good for unless such an attempt is so surrounded by restrictions that he has slight chance to show his ideas, and he must, perforce, if he is to be professional, stand back and see men of less ability, fewer scruples, but far more freedom of action, sail right by him and take the job out from under his nose.

So, therefore, it is, or has been at least, unprofessional to solicit work, to advertise, to guarantee a contract, to accept a contract for carrying out work or to enter an unauthorized competition, and the last item has been construed to mean that if a certain client wants the combined advice of two or more architects they cannot furnish it to him under any conditions, except it be that of a recognized competition approved by the institute, even though the client is perfectly ready to pay full professional fees for all the advice that is given him. We say our whole trade, our whole occupation is giving advice, and yet we prohibit ourselves from offering that advice freely even when paid for.

Now, these provisos are not the result of an attempt to suppress individuality or to deny access to the field on the part of the younger men, but they are rather the results of the code of ethics being a backward look instead of a forward prospect, and they represent the reaction-

ary element of the profession rather than the alert, striving, active element which looks at results first rather than theories. The American Institute of Architects at its last meeting dodged the matter of advertisement and simply struck out the clause relating to it in the code of ethics. That body did not quite dare to accept the developing facts, and it was quite right in doing so, for we shall always have two codes of ethics, one the written code which will invariably lag behind actual practice, will invariably be archaic and harmful in many cases; and the other will be the unwritten code, the real constitution of the profession and the voicing of custom which has sprung up as result of real, practical experience.

Looked at in the light of what is done, and being really honest with ourselves, we can write a very distinct negative code of ethics.

1. It is not unprofessional to solicit work.

By no possible explanation, except on the ground of pure selfishness, can we deny to another the perfect right to go and ask for a job. It may be inexpedient at times to do so, the method of asking may defeat its own ends, and it may be far wiser to adopt the indirect method and have our friends do the asking for us, but no matter how it is done it is asking just the same, and there is absolutely no wrong to anyone or to the profession in presenting one's case, one's experience and one's ability in the most judicious light so long as the Golden Rule is observed and the presentation is made in absolute fairness and truth.

2. It is not unprofessional to advertise.

This again is a matter of expediency and method. The profession has hid its light under a bushel for so long that it has come to feel a comfortable glow under the suppressed light of the candle and think that means moral victory. It is really nothing of the sort. We are simply sticking our heads in the sand like an ostrich and refusing to let other people even dream we are on earth. With a natural result they take us at our own estimate and pass us by. There is a right and a wrong way to advertise, and no code can say which is which, but that an architect should condemn himself to voluntary oblivion is at least a needless limitation.

3. It is not unprofessional to guarantee results.

If an architect has not the courage of his own convictions and can prove it, he has no place in this busy, practical world. If he is a mere dreamer, changing his mind as easily as he changes his drawings and cannot maintain his promises to his clients, he is a bad and faithless business man, and I would that every architect were held to the same degree of accountability which exists in France, where for ten years after the completion of a building the architect