

USITT NEWSLETTER

United States Institute for Theatre Technology, Inc.

Vol. I, No. 1



MAY, 1961

THE USITT

The United States Institute for Theatre Technology (USITT) is established to promote the circulation of useful information and ideas between the various groups of technicians serving the theatrical arts as well as between these groups and the playwrights, actors and directors who achieve the final result upon the stage. The Institute's members are convinced that no other society exists precisely for this purpose and that it should accordingly perform a valuable function.

Existing organizations, of course, contribute much to this end but do so almost left-handedly, so much more are they devoted to the aesthetic problems of acting, playwriting and directing, to the selection and evaluation of plays, the improvement of standards of production and the participation of an appreciative audience in its direct experience of the theatre. Wide-spread official recognition exists that our country should acquire wider recognition for our drama, opera and dancing throughout the world. The Institute applauds all these enterprises and recognizes the institutions, publications and societies devoted in these terms to theatrical progress as senior partners in quest of the ultimate goal of all — better plays, better production, and a larger and more appreciative theatrical public.

Nevertheless theatrical thinking often aspires hastily to build a roof without a foundation, creating a structure of many compartments and wings separated by bulkheads through which transit becomes increasingly difficult. The ultimate spiritual and aesthetic problems are rightly subjects of zealous study and speculation. Contrary to a common misconception regarding Americans, we are by no means an exceptionally materialistic people. On the one hand we attempt to assault the goal of artistic perfection by direct action, on the other we industriously amass material contrivances without knowing clearly how they can serve ends for which they are supposedly created. We stumble over the mass of our materials quite as often because we are looking at the stars (very literally in the theatre) as because we are staring at the ground. Uncertainty exists as to what contrivances are to be used, as to when they are helpful and when cumbersome. Theatrical workers hasten in different directions, moving with almost disturbing speed but unclear of their direction. This is not through any particular fault of the theatrical directors themselves but because at all points the theatrical system lacks sound coordination. Accelerated activity ends in a breakdown of communications. The USITT aims to aid both in better equipment and ideas and in better communication.

A century ago our present condition had not arisen. Any presentational art, to be sure, demands to some extent a division of labor and of technical skills other than the work of the performers themselves. Someone must make a costume, a puppet or a violin, prepare a dancing place or design and build a theatre. But modern technology vastly increases the complexity of all that lies behind the scene itself — not to mention the scene as well. The actor remains but not his environment. We have also a more complex society and hence more

complicated problems for the public relations of the theatre. We are building many theatres and endowing them with far more equipment than theatres have ever enjoyed before. The stage, for example, has undergone in the twentieth century a technological revolution far greater than that of the orchestra in the nineteenth century. The equipment of the lesser world of the theatre can easily become not its blessing but its bane, somewhat as the superior military equipment in the greater world may, if uncontrolled, become its destruction. No Americans wish regimentation in the bleaker sense of that word but rational organization we do require.

In the most specific terms our problem is only too clear. It is a matter of common concern that owners of theatres have too often had little fruitful communication with architects, architects with producers, engineers with theatre administrators, and technicians in general with playwrights and actors. Each group has advanced without adequate acquaintance with its neighbors, often creating a technical language difficult for the outsider to understand. The result has been a widespread malformation in the body and limbs of the theatre. Many theatres are badly equipped for the functions which they perform. Operas are given where they should not be and not given where they should be heard to advantage. The complex problems of the multi-purpose stage are still inadequately studied and there remain serious problems under certain conditions as to the efficacy of such theatres. Technical progress in almost all mechanical fields has been so rapid that in many instances theatres have fallen far behind their best potential. Playwrights, working in a vacuum, have too seldom known for what stages they may be expected to write or actors on what stages they may be expected to perform. The travelling theatre today faces radically different problems from those of a generation ago, problems that it is often unprepared to meet. New types of drama, opera and dance are created without remotely adequate facilities for their performance. Our shortcomings in all these cases are essentially defects in communication. We have lacked a roundtable about which leaders with vision in various fields may meet and exchange their views.

The Institute aims to provide such a table. The trite image of the roundtable has some apology here in that success in the theatre is overwhelmingly a question of cooperation where if any hierarchy has a right to exist it is only on a basis of mutual generosity, cordiality and respect. The greatest actor obviously depends on supporters of many kinds, by no means alone those of his own cast. There can be in the historic sense of the word no caste system in the modern theatre. Only by a clasping of hands is the ring maintained. It is even important that the theatre itself be a pleasant place, well located in the town, good to see, approachable to its visitors, sociable in spirit, with facilities for audience as well as for actors, an attractive lobby, good cloak and rest rooms, as well as store rooms, work rooms and the proper equipment for the stage. Lighting may be as much a factor as any actor. Problems of acoustics and

visibility have always presented technical difficulties; it is only to be hoped that modern science can resolve these as successfully as technical wisdom and sagacity solved them in ancient Greece and medieval India. No theatrical problem can be resolved in isolation. The theatre today and at all times relies on the association of its technicians.

Of all technicians aiding creative artists in the theatre the architect is possibly the chief, if only because his high position within the creative arts themselves has traditionally been secure. The Institute includes within its membership a large number of architects, though they comprise but one of its many groupings. They are keenly aware of the desirability, or it may even be said, the responsibility of an over-all grasp of technical problems. Yet today all technical fields tend, of course, to ever-increasing segmentation and much that a century ago was accomplished by the architect himself is now achieved by the engineer, the specialist in acoustics, in sight-lines, in color design, and the many other departments engaged in theatrical construction and equipment. Any art is a synthesis or, even more, an organism. More than in the design of most buildings, the architect for a theatre must be in active collaboration with his associates and they with one another. Here is his supreme problem in synthesis, the creation of a free world for the imagination. Since the material foundation of the theatre supports its spiritual being, technicians must further be expected to seek the company and conversation of the actors, dancers, singers, and directors and conductors in our presentational arts.

The Institute provides a meeting-place for all. It is based equally on the view that each department demands a specialized knowledge and that all require a constant exchange between one another. By definition the Institute is a society of specialists and by principle an association of liberal-minded thinkers aiming to bring technical skills into focus with the greatest of the arts which man knows to project his ideals, his emotions and his very soul. It is believed that members will find the Institute's activities stimulating to themselves and that the American theatre will find the Institute stimulating to itself. The first initials of the Institute must not mislead us. We even hope that its influence may in some measure be felt across the seas, much in the proportion to which it proves able to bring to itself the theatrical wisdom and skills of the world. In short, it aims to promote within the theatre both precision and vision.

FIRST ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE USITT

The USITT held its first annual Conference at the Juilliard School of Music, New York, on Saturday, February fourth, and Sunday, February fifth, in the midst of one of the worst snowstorms in the history of the city. Many persons earnestly wishing to attend were prevented by the impossibility of transportation. Nevertheless attendance was highly gratifying, totally 150 persons. Hospitality within the Juilliard School was at all times warming, despite the hostile weather. At the opening session pro-tem President of the USITT, Thomas DeGaetani, spoke briefly in introducing the Conference. Reports were heard from the chairmen of standing committees and a special report from the chairman of the By-laws Committee, Joel Rubin. The general business of the Conference fell under two heads: five panels on leading topics in theatre technology and a series of

meetings by the various committees. This summary of the Conference offers accounts of its five panels.

The objectives of the committees as recorded in the Program are as follows:

Theatrical Presentation: Chairman: Peter Cott. "to stimulate and reflect the creative and interpretive elements that will enable us to use the theatres of today and build the theatres of tomorrow."

Theatre Architecture, Engineering, and Construction Chairman: Helge Westerman, A.I.A. "to provide collective experience and exchange of ideas and authoritative data relating to the workable, effective design, equipment, and construction of theatres."

Sub-committee on Theatre Architecture: Chairman: Eric Pawley, A.I.A. "to provide collective experience and exchange of ideas on effective theatre architecture based upon evaluation of the theatre program as it relates to techniques, material, and economics."

Sub-committee on Theatre Engineering: Chairman: Hans Sondheimer. "to encourage, develop, and communicate effective techniques for optimum coordination of all elements and forms of equipment, old and new, necessary for theatrical presentation and theatre operation."

Sub-committee on Theatre Construction: Chairman: Arthur Benline. "to review traditional, contemporary, and legal requirements for theatre construction, and to make and implement recommendations for the encouragement and facilitation of theatre construction."

Theatre Administration: Chairman: Joseph London. "to exchange and reflect collective experience on efficient operation and management of existing theatres; the successful coordination of form and function in projected theatre programming; the successful equation of original theatre program and ultimate use."

Publication and Research Material: Chairman: Henry Wells. "to edit and publish the Institute's magazine *The Theatre Technology Review*, and collect and make available to the Institute's members graphic and literary material relating to theatrical presentation, administration, architecture, engineering, and construction."

Committees on Membership and Ways and Means, with their usual functions, were established, John Cornell being chairman of each. Norman Redmon served as chairman of a Committee on Public Relations.

Panel One; the Theatre of the Future; the Play; the Opera; The Dance

The first panel of the Conference met with Peter Cott as chairman, who described the three chief functions of theatres as accommodation for drama, opera and dancing. That theatre technicians are first of all servants of playwrights was indicated by the presence of Barrie Stavis as first speaker, who discussed relations between the physical theatre and the playwright's conceptions.

Stavis pointed out that each historical period and each culture has achieved at least some harmony between drama and the theatre, the most fruitful times achieving this the most fully. Even classics springing from earlier cultures are later accommodated to the spirit of the times of their performance. Naturalism and social realism characterized much of the best theatre of the primarily bourgeois nineteenth century. The neatly framed box stage served these ends best. In most of its typical productions the imagination of the twentieth century has moved away from this outlook, often found constricted and inadequate to confront problems of modern living. Today horizons widen, as though seen from an ascending plane. Our psychology grows in

depth, our sense for history in discursiveness. We are increasingly sensitive to motion and hence to time. So media expressing time and space must be suppler than in the last century. The modern stage requires an increasingly symbolic treatment, coming closer to all imaginative stages, as the Elizabethan or the Oriental, our new dynamics making those of the preceding generation appear uncomfortably static. Boundaries are disregarded, even those between actor and audience. Magic of lighting creates new illusions. The stage shares something with the freedom of the film. Ibsen's **Brandt** stands closer to us than his **Doll's House**. Playwrights unmistakably call for new stage architecture and presentation. Mention was made of such plays as **Our Town**, **Death of a Salesman**, **Lamp at Midnight**, **Mother Courage**, **Yellow Jack**, **The Adding Machine**, and **The Emperor Jones**. The speaker praised theatres in Milan, Paris, London, East Berlin, and Stratford, Ontario, noting that old theatres, as in Paris, are occasionally redesigned in keeping with modern needs. In particular he signaled out the Stratford Canadian Shakespeare Festival Theatre for superlative achievement in the modern spirit, noting the irony that here it was not modern plays but Shakespeare's plays which architects and technicians had served so well.

Speaking of the theatre for the dance, **Valerie Bettis** pointed out that contemporary dancing has received little attention from contemporary architects. Dancers are accustomed to performing in theatres still far from their desire. She stressed the preference for a resilient floor over a hard one, for wood over cement. The dancer, she felt, is the loser when surrounded by the audience. There should be a fair space between performer and spectator. Martha Graham's use of props as sculpture in stage-space was praised as superior to romantic scenery now appearing old-fashioned. Modern dance as distinguished from folk-dance and concert dance has its own requirements. The value of the dance as an integral and major item in carrying the play's plot by pantomimic procedure was emphasized.

Robert Lewis advocated a drastic reorganization in American life whereby all workers in behalf of the art — playwrights, directors, actors, technicians — should operate in the close cooperation which only established theatres provide. Our present theatre was depicted as sick, strangled by "show business." A healthy condition he found indicated by the Group Theatre, which he described as having ultimately been strangled for want of a home. Within this ensemble were developed dramatists, directors, actors, designers. The groups working within the Federal Theatre were also cited favorably. Advances, the speaker thought, had in recent years been made chiefly in the established academic theatres. He declared the need in each professional ensemble for a studio, a school, and facilities for experiment and accordingly even for failure. Commercialism without guidance or imagination was described as at the root of our present discontent.

Gunther Schuller, representing the requirements of the lyric theatre, pointed out a general lack of communication between architects and musicians and illustrated his principles with much specific reference to problems of the orchestra pit. The french horn-player, he noted, is often forced to sit against a wall which necessarily curbs his instrument's effectiveness. Each musician, he remarked, should hear every other. Although horn and 'cello, he observed, often play together, at the Metropolitan they are situated at opposite ends of the

pit. The pit itself is frequently ill-designed and scant comfort provided for musicians on, under, or behind the stage. The importance of acoustics he found evidenced by the high reputation of certain ensembles, notably a Hi Fi orchestra, which through enjoying superior conditions for performance wins acclaim perhaps equally deserved by orchestras playing with less success under less favorable physical conditions. Above all, opera was described as performed under anachronistic circumstances. Improved conditions, he believed, would even stimulate better composing. The musical stage was seen as needing radical reinvestigation, not only in terms of such contemporary problems as raised by electronic devices, but from top to bottom in its equipment and design.

Theatre problems for the lyric stage were the subjects of a talk by **Robert Ackart**, who made a plea for buildings of radically different kinds for the different types of opera. An open stage he thought effective for works by Berg, Poulenc and Schonberg but not for those of Wagner and the classical Italians. He pointed with approval to cities having both a small and a large house, as Vienna, Milan, Berlin, and London. The disposition of the orchestra largely beneath the stage, as at Bayreuth, met his approval. He recommended in general the comparatively small house with a proscenium and a capacity of about 1,500 seats. As a company he warmly commended the Royal Opera, in London, with which he had worked, but deplored its theatre, which he described as an instance of all an opera house should not be. In his opinion the new Vienna Opera is almost ideal. He specified certain of its features: a 46 foot proscenium, an ample stage 90 feet square, with a comprehensive equipment of stage elevators.

The panel concluded with an address by **Eldon Elder**, who expressed deep distrust for the multi-purpose theatre. As his ideal he specified the leadership of a director knowing what plays and what standards of production he favored and capable of molding the physical plant to contain such art. He spoke with some affection for the conservative type of stage, though acknowledging legitimate grounds for experiments, which, he observed, are especially feasible in academic theatres. The new theatre at Harvard, however, he described as an unwieldy mechanism imposed on an institution unprepared to operate it to advantage. He stressed the value for the theatre of the man capable of mastering a wide variety of techniques, thus admitting that he found the ideal of the Renaissance man by no means antiquated. Hope he found chiefly in vigorous leaders working in comparatively small houses.

Panel Two: Building Theatres in America: the Function and Needs of the Theatre Administrator

The second panel was chaired by **Paul Preus**, Assistant Dean of the Juilliard School. The first speaker, **Julian Beck**, of the Living Theatre, gave a succinct, factual account of his experiences in leading this avant-garde company in New York, which in eight years has presented a remarkable number of outstanding plays. His talk presented a case history. At first the group played before invited audiences. Their small theatre was in a loft on the corner of Broadway and one-hundredth street, constructed for \$135, equipped with seats gathered from here and there. It opened with W. H. Auden's **Age of Anxiety**. After its formative years the group constructed a larger theatre on the corner of Sixth Avenue and Fourteenth Street. This occupies the second floor of a building 80 feet by 65 feet; the company owns the two floors

immediately above, used for storage and other theatrical purposes. In constructing this theatre six persons of the company were aided by nearly a hundred volunteers and by only two kinds of paid workers, electricians and plumbers, whose services were required by law. The theatre is fireproof and solidly built, by no means the makeshift job of that on one-hundredth street. Mr. Beck described the enterprise as personal. The material investment is small but the spiritual investment acknowledged to be great. The public receives its work warmly, recognizing its sophisticated pioneering.

Robert Chapman, laboring under some of the most different conditions imaginable as director of the elaborate new academic theatre at Harvard, gleaned from his experiences other lessons for the American stage. He commented on the difficulties at present perplexing the relations between architects and persons engaged in production. He concurred with Mr. Elder, the severe critic of the Harvard theatre, that successful work in this field requires above all else strong leadership. History, he maintained, also proves that in most cases thriving theatres have enjoyed subsidies. Regarding the theatre at Harvard, he spoke of the complete divorce between its own program and that of the University and of the difficulty of achieving good results without time for adequate organization and an effort accumulated through a matter of years.

Mr. **T. Edward Hambleton**, also of the second panel, has kindly supplied the **Newsletter** with a written statement summarizing his views on the subject. He speaks here in his own words:

"The economic path to building and operating the new theatre is the audience. It is also the basis for operating the old theatre or renovated theatre as well, but it is the new theatre which concerns us here, because old theatres capable of renovation are in short supply. If there is in any city an audience which has some conception of what a theatre can provide to the community in terms of pleasure and fulfillment it will not be impossible to raise the necessary money, confident that this audience will be available to underwrite its operation. Sadly, this is not the case in America. Historically, we have built such white elephants as The New Theatre in 1911, only to have the dream of repertory die in the second year. Today we are concerned with that same essential factor, theatre audience, and we find that it's not as vital and responsive as thirty years ago, twenty years ago, or even ten years ago. It seems to me that the theatre is reaping the results of bad practices that have been going on for years.

"Having said this, I believe we are at the point of making a change that will begin building this essential back to where it was. There is an interest in theatre largely potential in the schools. There is a concern for the cultural benefits on the part of government and industry. These are not very well formed and may provide more the opportunity for the future than any fulfillment. There is no tradition in America of the repertory theatre and its resident company devoted mainly to the classics. With the disappearance of the stock company and the economic failure of the revival, the commercial theatre is left with the production of new plays which has enabled the commercial theatre to maintain the questionable honor to be able to operate as a profit-making enterprise. Many have attempted to develop a theatre that was more than a successful real-estate operation, but until recently, they have not been able to resist the competition of the commercial theatre and the inertia

of finding an audience. Only now, as the commercial theatre is facing a crisis of its own and the need is becoming more apparent that the theatre must be something more than a producer of new plays at a cost beyond the range of the average American's pocket-book, does there seem to be a chance for the roots of such an institution to get down deep enough to achieve permanence. This permanence brings with it no guarantee, unless the quality is the best we can afford and it better be good. But once such permanence and the means of keeping it replenished are established, it will provide a flourishing theatre with an audience able to attend within their budget on a basis satisfactory to the artists who present it. This will not only be duplicated elsewhere, but it will make possible the further development of commercial projects."

Panel Three: Building Programs for Theatres

The third panel met under the chairmanship of **Arthur Benline**, who mentioned that he had worked on over fifty theatres and described his friend, Ben Schlanger, as having worked on still more.

Joseph Lovelace spoke primarily of theatres for cultural centers, treating his topic with the rare conjunction of a hard realism and a dignified inquiry for the ideal. Several times he referred to his own work in the civic center at Montreal. The basic problem he described as one of marketing. A theatre implies an audience. The design of the building and all else depend on what the users can persuade the audience to accept. There must be compromise between what the public will support and the goal set by the artist as his ideal. As a planner, Mr. Lovelace discussed this problem with complete directness. He admitted that many centers had failed. The different factions press in opposite directions. Producers as a rule wish large-sized buildings, performers, smaller ones, where their art can be experienced with greater immediacy. Politicians prefer monumental proportions to support civic ceremonies with civic pride. Everyone, said the speaker gravely, has an ax to grind. Some are concerned only with sight-lines, others solely with acoustics. And someone is bound to be obsessed with the bar! The over-all problems must be faced with a broad vision and admission of the hard truth that most city governments will not support the arts. The healthy approach is to ask who will come, and, if so-and-so comes with a car, where he will put it?

In his introduction to **Jean Rosenthal** the chairman paid her his compliment for her remarkable versatility. She spoke on the role of the creator in the interpretive arts and especially on the creative function of the theatre consultant. She stressed the need on all sides for imagination. Two opposing demands are hard to reconcile, that of the purely aesthetic creator whose ingenuity rises, perhaps, to inspiration, and that of the collaborator. The successful theatre consultant must perform both functions. He must, for example, see not so much what functions the building will perform when it opens as what these will be in a dozen years. He must learn to bring order out of conflicting demands and harmony out of difference. Everyone somehow suffers disappointment and yet, said Miss Rosenthal, we learn by experience. Her talk was in a grave, minor key, heard on the strings.

Next came **Joseph Papp**, sounding an inspiring major upon the trumpets though also speaking gravely and with much restraint, the irresistible enthusiasm notwithstanding. His talk was an exhortation to new frontiers with new audiences and to a basic faith in the performers

themselves as potential masters, come what may in respect to the building or to the weather overhead, if the production is in a public park. "A theatre is not a building," he said. "A theatre should have an idea. Poverty is no virtue, but you can have too much preoccupation with a building." If the company and its manager are alive, the plant may grow almost unconsciously, as he presumed had been the case with The Living Theatre, represented at the Conference by Julian Beck. The market that interested Mr. Papp is "one that has not as yet been touched." He gave a vivid account of playing to high-school children most of whom had never seen a play before and who had no idea how the story of Romeo and Juliet would turn out. He declared that in his opinion the general public does not want theatre. It would presumably vote "no" against a government subsidy, should a referendum be presented. But in some way we must get a subsidy, if only to overcome the inertia. If the art itself is good enough, the public will respond.

In ringing words he said: "the stream of life must keep a theatre building open and alive and vital." Mr. Papp gave the impression of carrying a theatre on his shoulders, which, indeed, he does.

The next speaker, **Eric Pawley**, turned to a more philosophical mood. Much of his advice hinged on a warning against "hardening of the categories." He observed that categories had been excellently arranged for the USITT Conference and yet that the best wisdom lies in caution against the tyranny of categories that separate rather than unite. He pointed out the long training required of the American architect, his need to negotiate with the contractor and a host of others, to educate his client and to keep him from getting excited about what he cannot afford. He pleaded for love of the profession, for awareness that it is "elusive, complex, subtle, fascinating." Though architects face enormous difficulties, he said, the good ones "keep out of the doggerel house," which summarized his view that they avoid categorical clichés and analyze their hard problems with the passable success that can attend only on exercise of the imagination.

Joseph Prendegast being unable to attend the Conference, as he had desired, his paper was read in a condensed form. It was focused on an optimistic view of the audience rapidly being developed in this country. It alluded to the increase of leisure time, the asset of school and college training, and various auguries of a theatrical golden age.

A vigorous discussion, with questions and answers, followed the prepared addresses. Mr. DeGaetani complimented the American Educational Theatre Association for notable contributions to the cause of better theatre architecture. He spoke of the desire of USITT to collaborate with all its affiliated organizations, urging those at the Conference belonging to such associations to present their ideas for part of the business of the special committees of USITT.

Mr. DeGaetani urged the need of a two-way street for theatre architects and the theatre personnel.

Mr. Beck, speaking as a theatre administrator, declared the duty of the theatre to be first of all to assist the playwright, who alone can introduce something really new. The playwright, he observed, must have the possibility to write and something to say. The small subsidized theatres, he believed, are the most hopeful instruments of progress. Classical plays should pay the way for experimental plays and no one should attempt

to predict what the creative imagination alone can project.

Mr. Pawley and others looked askance at the larger theatre, foreseeing in the schools the decline of the 1,500 seat auditorium and an increasing number of small halls; segmentation has already occurred in some of the largest schools themselves.

Panel Four: the Total Environment of the Theatre

A General Session Panel held on Sunday morning was devoted to "the total environment of the theatre," **Harold Burris-Meyer** serving as chairman. His own comments created the total environment for such a discussion, stressing the genial spirit which, he maintained, should animate an ideal theatre. He explained that whereas the ideal gauge for our churches is divinity, or infinity, and their spirit may well be awesome or sublime, the proper measure for the theatre as we know it is man, both as seen on the stage and present in the audience.

Donald Oenslager, the first speaker, dealt with general principles. He emphasized the objective view of the stage as the world projected by the actors, not the private world of the playwright. Hence the spirit of the stage-design should not be expected to follow the more personal expression of the easel painter, which still dominates what we commonly regard as modern art in painting. Instead, it should accompany the spirit of the play. The right background, he declared, is dictated by the play's own emotional character. Its proportions should be carefully adjusted to the scale of a scene including on an average about six characters. He discussed the question of the best sized opening for the stage and devices by which it may artfully present one scene relatively immense and another comparatively small.

Abe Feder provided a deft transition in observing certain common qualities demanded of both visual and auditory features. He stressed the importance of color. Theatres, he declared, are too often overwhelming. Instead of providing a frame for the play, they steal attention from it by unwanted pretentiousness. He completely accorded with the humanistic view initially expressed by the chairman, deploring an effect of cathedral vastness. The ceiling of the stage, he advised, should be brought down to approximately 20 feet. The right course is to bring actor and audience together, either by moving the audience toward the actor or the actor toward his audience. He noted, however, a tendency for the actor to lose scale when stepping out onto the apron. He cast a cautious view on an "epic" theatre and declared the intimate stage preferable. The epic manner he defined as a production on the broadest lines and theatrical intimacy as meaning a stage enabling the audience to see not only the actor's face but his expression. He pointed to the assistance that hearing lends to sight and sight to hearing. To see clearly the expression and the mouth helps us to hear, and hearing helps us to see.

Cyril Harris analyzed problems of sound. The simplest statement to cover the conditions in the theatre he found to be the distinction between sound wanted and unwanted, between the sounds of the production and noises alien to it. He discussed in turn noises from the street, especially those of traffic, noises within the theatre, from the lobby, from various mechanisms, and reverberations from the sounds of the play itself. A building, he pointed out, often settles, creating crevices through which noise issues. Double doors with "sound

lock" were recommended; also the use of such resilient materials as cork.

Russell Johnson carried on the discussion of acoustical problems with a wealth of additional technical detail which his audience was obviously prepared to welcome with enthusiasm. (His paper will appear in full in a later issue of the Newsletter.) The community theatre seating 1,800 to 2,600 was basis for much of his comment. The problems were envisaged as relatively simple where only one type of production is intended, but it was pointed out that often the same theatre is to be used for plays, musicals, operas, concerts, lectures, and much else. Musical comedy and lectures as a rule call for electronic support while natural acoustics are preferred for concerts and plays. Especially auditoriums for concert and speech make antithetical demands. As a rule attempts are unsatisfactory to provide good acoustics in a single theatre for all types of performance. A further problem is presented by acoustical differences between the same hall when sparsely and when totally filled.

Mr. Johnson cited four auditoriums recently constructed as especially interesting from the point of view of multi-purpose designs: those in Montreal, Indianapolis, Columbus, South Carolina, and Jackson, Mississippi. These theatres have upper and lower ceilings, each theatre having a distinctive design of its own.

Richard Snibbe summarized the views presented by the speakers on the fourth panel with special reference to architecture. He observed how many types of people the architect must deal with. His work is restricted by laws, budgets, calculations, patronage, red tape. Zoning regulations were described as falling heavily upon theatres; Philadelphia was cited as a city where restrictions had recently been acutely felt. He mentioned as most urgent the need for integration of techniques. Speaking philosophically, Mr. Snibbe distinguished between sound and false aesthetics and between styling, defined as determination of the total manner of a work, and decoration, which, while in its ideal function fits the parts to the whole, is itself the strategy of designing individual segments. He concluded with a moving quotation from Flaubert, referred to as "the great French realist." The quotation described art at its best as filling us with wonder, as serene, not emotional, incomprehensible, not rational, creating spiritual equilibrium, with gentleness and calm. Brought to this conclusion, the panel could not have ended on a higher note.

Panel Five: the Theatre Architect and His Problems

The fifth and last general panel dealt with theatre design from the architect's point of view. Several members of this panel were kept away from the Conference by the severe storm. A paper unread in Conference, written by Hilyard R. Robinson, is given in part in this Newsletter. **Joel Rubin** began the actual meeting itself with advocacy of unceasing collaboration between theatre architects and other technicians. He repeated the praise of the contribution made by the American Educational Theatre Association, at the same time introducing as chairman James Jewell, leader of the Theatre Architecture Project of that organization. Mr. Jewell introduced Ben Schlanger as the only formal speaker.

Mr. Schlanger referred to his work on a project in theatre architecture for the Ford Foundation. He stressed the importance of the programming period, before the architect draws his plans. In particular he noted the great distinction between small theatres and large. Although he stated his special interest to be in the non-proscenium theatre, he foresaw the majority of new large

theatres as clinging to traditional forms. He also foresaw a certain order coming out of the current chaos, a greatly increased number of theatres built, extremely few being for the regular professional theatre trade. He observed that the designing of theatres as a rule yields the architect comparatively small profit but that "the theatre gets into your blood, just as it does into the actor or the stage-designer."

During the long and lively discussion following, some especially cogent comments were made by Burris-Meyer. He enlarged on the over-all environmental conditions, as matters of parking, ticket offices and cloak rooms made accessible, problems of the lounge, elevators, seats, and wash-rooms, remarking that on the last his aids had collected much statistical data.

It was pointed out that the design of a college theatre is as a rule determined under the scope of the over-all building scheme of its institution.

The paper which **Hilyard R. Robinson** was to deliver at this panel contained these words:

In design, my "Number One" problem has been the **command performance** by certain fossilized areas of the local Building Code. I refer to the stage fire curtain.

Here, on the one hand, is insistence on the installation of a huge, steel truss-framed chassis covered on both sides with wire-reinforced, heavy asbestos cloth . . . the total ponderously counterweighted and motor-automated to descend majestically at the whim to function of a fusible link.

The Code graciously requests an affidavit of structural compliance; to this, my Consulting Engineer notes that the contraption — dynamically loaded — defies accurate stress analysis.

The latest of these gargantuan curtains, naked, cost my Client approximately \$20,000 . . . substantially the price of an elevator orchestra platform in the same theatre.

Mechanically induced flue action up the stage house and through the roof monitors, plus the action of a well-designed sprinkler system (now Code-required, along with an asbestos curtain), should provide at least as much fire safety (control) at only a fraction of the cost of the Code-type asbestos fire curtain.

On the other hand, there is also the Code-compliance problem of a maximum allowance in the auditorium of 14 seats between aisles, plus an antiquated aisle and exit system. Relief offered from this capricious practice is the permission of the so-called "continental" system of seating, confounded by an even more excessive waste of space and exits.

A careful study of the nature and extent of adequate safety engineering involved, undertaken by the USITT (as a composite, organized authority well adapted to examine and recommend meritorious revisions to such safety directions), might well influence and achieve improved and more realistic regulations for these two problems . . . without the extravagance now extant.

In construction, no single problem seems to outweigh the value of knowledgeable and conscientiously supervised coordination of the several equipment specialties with the basic theatre construction.

For example, before the concrete stage structure is poured, approved shop drawings for the stage switchboard should be available, from which sleeves can be located for conduit through the concrete stage structure for wiring services to and from the stage switchboard. This makes it possible to locate the switchboard on the stage in a position that neither poses a conflict nor is

handicapped in wiring connections and switch operational requirements by other stage equipment. Maintaining non-conflicting, easily accessible multiple switch controls for various other stage equipment . . . observing similar precaution in locating fire hose cabinets . . . these are all problems of careful coordination to be checked.

The interplay of concrete and wood finished floors, between the stage wings, performing area, work shop, etc., demands carefully coordinated timing for adequate checking to obtain flush surface continuity, before the concrete is poured and troweled to rough (to receive wood flooring) and finished grades .

Similar vigilance and care in checking are demanded in forming and finishing the auditorium light beams and the installation of gear on which to mount large spotlights so that they will function within the proper range of "light throw" onto the stage. Like consideration should be given to stage lights mounted in side wall lighting slots in the auditorium.

No less attention should be focused on the coordination of the network of service "cat walks" in the attic space above the auditorium ceiling, providing access to and operational platforms for the "spots" in the light beams. The same may be noted about the "cat walks" and counterweight loading platforms in the stage "fly loft" near the gridiron system.

It is when this coordination attention at the field supervision level is lax that troublesome problems begin.

Dr. Werner Ruhnau's Statement:

The eminent theatre scholar and architect, Dr. Werner Ruhnau, presented the following statement to the Conference:

Your discussions and topics indicate to me that your problems are similar to ours in Germany and I, therefore, expect that your solutions may be very similar to ours.

I believe, however, that you here in America have a much better chance to realize the "Theatre of Tomorrow." I believe this because you have had student theatre for a long time. We in Germany still have to create student theatres. On the other hand, you have not had the scope or number of adult theatres which, by historical development, are to us socially meaningful theatres. This burdens us with a schism between the relationship of the actual theatre and its social meaning.

The contemporary theatre, however, is no longer the place for that social meaning but more than ever again the place in which the world becomes conscious to us through the play.

It is our task to intensify that place in this sense. In my opinion, the first endeavor is to accomplish the unity of space. No theatre building divided into stage house, proscenium, and spectator space, but one theatre equipped with technological possibilities for spatial movement, light and acoustics, all uniformly distributed over the entire space; theatre not as an architectural experience but as an instrument for the spatial play. It is sentimental to believe that this is possible to accomplish without highly developed technology and that a few wooden planks suffice. If you envy us for our stage equipment, please remember that the stage house is only a part of the theatre. Tomorrow's theatre will constitute one unit enveloping both the stage and the spectator.

On the other hand, I believe, that tomorrow's theatre will give up its state of enclosedness in order to gain an open unity with landscape of the surrounding city. It

will become a flexible zone in an open artificially climatized city space.

No longer do we have specifically divided stage and spectator areas, actors divided from spectators, but one space for the event and one unified community for the play. The playwright should write not only for the actor, the architect should not see only the architectural experience isolated from the surrounding city space, and the stage technicians should not see only technical problems isolated to the stage. Theatre must correspond to our modern society which also no longer knows only isolated problems.

(Translated by Felix B. Graham)

INTERNATIONAL THEATRE COLLOQUY IN BERLIN, NOV. 21-25, 1960. STATE DEPARTMENT REPORT

An International Theatre Colloquy, with American participation, was held November 21-25, 1960, at the Congress Hall in Berlin. The conference was sponsored by the International Theatre Institute (ITI), the International Union of Architects (UIA), and the International Music Council (IMC). Local arrangements were made by the German section of ITI. Fifteen nations were represented by 200 individuals at the outset, the number increasing to 400 before the end of the week. The three principal themes of the colloquy were (1) theatre construction and modern theatre production; (2) theatre construction and modern architecture; and (3) theatre construction and theatre technique.

Mr. Philip Johnson, Dr. Carolyn Lockwood, Dr. Joel Rubin, and Mr. Ben Schlanger, all of New York, and Professor Richard J. Neutra of Los Angeles were among the 23 principal speakers during the five-day colloquy. American participants coming from the United States expressly to attend the meetings were as follows:

Attending under grants from the Leaders and Specialists Program of the State Department's Bureau of Cultural and Educational Affairs:

1. CAROLYN LOCKWOOD — Hunter College Opera Workshop, representing the Metropolitan Opera Association.
2. THOMAS DEGAETANI — Stage Department, Juilliard School of Music, representing the American National Theatre and Academy and its U.S. Centers of the International Theatre Institute and the International Association of Theatre Technicians (AITT).

Attending under German grants administered by the German Center of the International Theatre Institute:

3. JOEL RUBIN — Lighting engineer.
4. BEN SCHLANGER — Audio-visual consultant.

Attending under grants from the Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts:

5. PETER BLAKE — Architect (AIA), Associate Editor, Architectural Forum.
6. ARTHUR BENLINE — Formerly Technical Director of the New York State Building Code Commission and Past President of the Building Officials Conference of America (BOCA).
7. HELGE WESTERMAN — Architect to Pietro Beluschi for Juilliard at Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts.

Attending under incidental subsidization:

8. PHILIP JOHNSON — Architect for the Dance Repertory Theatre at the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts.

All of the Americans took part in the informal meetings between sessions of the colloquy and established

fruitful contacts with representatives from the European nations. The CAO worked closely with Mr. DeGaetani and Miss Lockwood, who had grants under the Leaders and Specialists Program. Mr. DeGaetani distributed brochures to participants with greetings from the U.S. Center of the International Theatre Institute and the International Association of Theatre Technicians. USIS Berlin held a reception for the American participants, members of the executive committee of the AITT, and an equal number of prominent Germans and other European theatre specialists in the home of the CAO. Dr. Carolyn Lockwood consulted with USIS Berlin and the director of the Berlin Cultural Festival concerning the possibility of bringing the Santa Fe Opera Company to the Berlin Cultural Festival in 1961. As a result of a short notice given on their availability, lectures could not be scheduled for Dr. Lockwood or for Mr. DeGaetani either in the Federal Republic or in London.

All Berlin newspapers reported the colloquy in considerable detail as an important event. The highlight of the program on the first day was the lecture by Mr. Philip Johnson on the subject, "Modern Architecture and the Theatre Building." Mr. Johnson traced the development of modern theatre architecture from the period of the twenties to his own modern design for the bell-shaped theatre, seating 2,500, for the Lincoln Center for Performing Arts. He also referred to Harvard's multi-form theatre and to the Frank Lloyd Wright theatre in Dallas, illustrating his lecture with slides and blueprints.

On the second day Dr. Carolyn Lockwood spoke on the American university theatre, which has stimulated the entire range of theatre art in the United States because of their experimental nature and their use as training centers for developing new talent. Miss Lockwood emphasized the spiritual and economic freedom of the amateur theatres in the United States, and their range of influence on national taste as well as their influence on the professional theatre. She predicted that about 750 new theatres would be needed and probably would be built in the United States within the next decade, which would bring the total number of theatres in the U.S. in excess of the number of theatres in Europe.

Mr. DeGaetani's article, entitled "Theatre Architecture," which was distributed to the participants, reported 2,800 different Drama Groups in the U.S., 750 opera companies and workshops, 750 dance groups, 1,100 symphony orchestras, and "chamber music and choral societies which defy enumeration." Dr. Joel Rubin, American lighting engineer, and Mr. Ben Schlanger, American audio-visual consultant, contributed lectures on stage machinery, stage lightings, and visual and acoustic problems on the fourth day of the meetings, when the general topic under discussion related to theatre construction and stage technique.

There was general agreement that problems of theatre construction had never been demanding as at the present time. Although it would have been interesting for the participants and for the public to learn of the situation in each country in regard to its own problems, the colloquy was more concerned with technical details than with national interests. Nevertheless, the participants seemed to take great interest in U.S. efforts, especially in the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. Newspaper articles commented on Philip Johnson's statement that a seating capacity of less than 2,500 would make a profit doubtful, and on Miss Lockwood's emphasis on the vital nature of the non-professional theatre in the U.S. Miss Lockwood's slides on the arena theatre

within the university building, or outdoors, and on the Harvard multi-purpose theatre drew the comment that these might be useful experimentally but that they would hardly be suitable for general use.

USIS Berlin regards Mr. DeGaetani's efforts to secure American participation in this international colloquy as highly creditable. American theatre architects and technicians have apparently not heretofore been very active in the international efforts relating to their specialization. The colloquy was beneficial to U.S. interests in the opportunity provided to show that American problems in theatre construction stem from the particular interest in our country for amateur participation in dramatic productions, in our willingness to experiment, and in our individual initiative.

For the Acting Assistant Chief of U.S. Mission to Berlin.

Charles F. Blackman
Public Affairs Officer

NOTES ON THE BERLIN COLLOQUY BY PETER BLAKE

During the various discussions, the only real controversy to develop concerned the problem of the multi-form theatre. Curiously enough, there was quite a bit of confusion throughout the Colloquy over the difference between multi-form and multi-purpose theatres: most of the participants seemed agreed that the multi-form theatre — i.e. a theatre that could be used very flexibly to stage any number of different, dramatic productions, and that could be used to create any number of different actor-audience relationships — had a great deal of validity.

Multi-purpose theatres — i.e. theatres that might be used for drama, or opera, or ballet, or concerts, or symposia, or basketball games — interested only the American delegates; it seems that every other civilized country is sufficiently well-heeled to be able to afford half a dozen special-purpose theatres in every community. The West Germans are building more theatres-per-citizen than just about anyone else; only the Americans consider themselves fortunate if they have **one** theatre in a given community — and this one theatre has to serve every conceivable purpose.

In debating the validity of the multi-form theatre, the speakers (once they get their definitions straight) were roughly divided into two, extreme groups: the first group, consisting of the German theatre architect Runauh and several colleagues from England and the U.S., seemed to believe in a completely "anonymous" theatre space, in which the performance alone mattered and the architecture was, in effect, "painted out." (Runauh's multi-form theatre at Gelsenkirchen is painted black inside to neutralize all architectural effects.) The second group, consisting primarily of Philip Johnson and a few of the older German and French theatre architects and technicians, believed that architecture could and should make a positive contribution to the dramatic spectacle; and that our time, just like other periods in theatre architecture, might develop positive architectural forms that would support and heighten the impact of any contemporary dramatic performance. (There were one or two amusing comments from this group on the theatre-in-the-round: one German technician quoted a veteran actor as saying, when asked what he thought of the theatre-in-the-round, "well, you know, as I grow older, I am coming to the conclusion that man has a front, and a back.")

One of the most impressive presentations was made by Dr. Carolyn Lockwood of the American delegation, whose material related principally to teaching theatres, dramatic workshops, etc. Delegates from other countries were obviously impressed by the amount of work being done in the U.S. in this field. It was also clear that a very special case for the multi-form theatre could be made in this area of almost daily experimentation. Discussions in this area were generally disappointing. Some speakers (especially some of the German speakers) turned out to be special pleaders for commercial firms interested in theatre equipment; others were so general in their comments as to contribute very little fresh information.

Without wishing to appear parochial, it seemed to me that here, again, the clearest, simplest and most effective presentations were made by members of the American delegation: Dr. Joel Rubin speaking about stage-lighting, and Ben Schlanger speaking on sight lines.

The feeling of most delegates was to reject elaborate, technological tricks and to return to simple, effective and direct spatial and visual relationships. There was some suggestion that a tendency, in the United States, is to build only one theatre per community, and then to make that one theatre as flexible as possible by various, complicated bits of stage and auditorium machinery — all of which, in the end, might result in making this **one** theatre almost as expensive as **two** special-purpose theatres would be — and not nearly as workable. However that may be, the majority seemed to be impressed by one German playwright who said that all he wanted from the theatre architects and theatre technicians was a couple of planks on which to have his plays performed — and to hell with electronics, automation, pistons, elevators, and so on.

Perhaps the most interesting source of information on theatre design in the Soviet Zone was an exhibit in East Berlin, arranged by the East German Government's cultural affairs people, apparently to attract some of those who came to the Colloquy in West Berlin. Although much of the material exhibited was in the form of models (rather than photographs of completed structures) — which, behind the Iron Curtain, almost always means that it has not, and may never be realized — it was interesting to find that the East German Government has a central unit that does research on theatre technology, and advises towns and cities on the design of theatres and related matters. Several Americans who visited the exhibition were impressed by the fact that such co-ordinated research was being done and that its results were being disseminated to all interested parties; my own feeling was that while this was all very admirable, the results were, generally, unimpressive and the research was nowhere near as experimental or imaginative as that carried on under our various, disorganized systems.

MEETING OF THE USITT SUB-COMMITTEE ON THEATRE ENGINEERING

At its meeting, March twenty-eighth, the Sub-Committee on Theatre Engineering reviewed 51 research items outlined by the Standing Committee on Theatre Architecture, Engineering and Construction, during the February Conference.

The following projects were undertaken by personnel of the Standing Committee on Theatre Architecture, Engineering and Construction:

1. A report on "Space Requirements for Mechanical

and Electronic Electrical Equipment" — Felix Graham.

2. "A Glossary of Technical Terms."

A. Bibliography of existing glossaries

B. Compilation of a single up-dated glossary

Caroline Lockwood will be assisted by Donald Swinney on this project.

3. "Compilation of a Syllabus for a One-Year Comprehensive Graduate Course in Theatre Engineering" — William Davis and Leland Watson.

4. "A Report on the Synchro-Winch System" — Donald Swinney.

5. "A Report on Dimming System Types" — Stephen Skirpan.

6. "Horizontal and Vertical Scenery Handling" — Anton Maurer.

7. "Geometric Requirements for Projecting Lighting" — Joel Rubin and Leland Watson.

8. Recalling the meeting, February fifth, of the Committee on Theatre Architecture, the discussion turned to the AITT Code Project, which was endorsed at that time. It was agreed that any "national declaration" formulated in time for the proposed June London Congress of the International Association of Theatre Technicians (AITT) would be premature and ill-advised. However, it was felt that steps should be taken immediately which would lead, ultimately, to code revisions. These steps were discussed and shaped into a project as follows: "Classification of Elements to be considered in New Code Writing" — Arthur Benline, to be assisted by committee members doing research in the following areas: A. "Sprinkler Systems" — James Church. B. "Audience Seating" — Ben Schlanger. C. "Smoke and Exhaust Ventilation" — Vincent Bianculli. D. "New Materials" — Caroline Lockwood. E. "Substitutes for the Curtain" — William Davis. Mr. Kook mentioned availability of a code report done by Mr. Kroll for Harrison and Abramowitz.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS ON THEATRE ARCHITECTURE

This bibliography is provided as an activity of the Theatre Architecture Project, American Educational Theatre Association. Suggestions and comments are welcomed. Further information regarding these publications is available through Ned A. Bowman at the Department of Speech, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh 13, Pa.

1. "Arena Theatre Designed for D. C. by Harry Weese," **Progressive Architecture** (June '60), p. 65. Plan and Photograph of model. Arena is scheduled for completion in Fall, 1961.
2. "Arts and Cultural Centers; An Exhibition at the Octagon Gallery," **American Institute of Architects Journal** (May '60), pp. 50, 51. Illustrations only: Canadian Shakespearean Festival, Stratford, Ont.; Kleinhans Music Hall, Buffalo; Lincoln Center, New York; Municipal Opera House, Sydney, Australia.
3. "Auditoriums: Flexible Stage," **Progressive Architecture** (March '60), p. 160. A unique "dresser drawer" two level forestage is substituted for an elevator lift. Evanston High School: Evanston, Illinois. By Perkins and Will.
4. Bagenal, Hope. "New Theatre Problems and the Guildhall School," **Theatre Notebook**, XIV, No. 1 (Autumn, '59), pp. 13-16.
5. Brustein, Robert. "Scorn Not the Proscenium, Critic," **Theatre Arts**, XLIV, No. 5 (May '60), pp. 8-9. The

- major ills of Broadway theatre are not to be solved by architectural reform, but by better plays and more originality.
6. "Building for the Performing Arts," **Architectural Forum**, CXII, No. 6 (June '60), pp. 86-107. A series of four articles, liberally illustrated. Constitutes a sampling of recent architectural conceptions, with emphasis on types other than educational theatres.
 7. Cole, Wendell. "The Theatre Projects of Frank Lloyd Wright," **Educational Theatre Journal**, XII, No. 2 (May '60), 86-93. Discussion of eight projects by Wright, only two of which have been realized. Also see: "FLW's Dallas Theatre," **Architectural Forum**, CXII, No. 9 (March '60), pp. 130-35.
 8. "A Geodesic Dome Theatre for the San Diego Children's Zoo," **Arts and Architecture** (January '60), pp. 16, 17.
 9. "International Contest for the Construction of a National Theatre at Luxembourg," **l'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui** (Paris), XXX, No. 86 (October-November '59), pp. xix-xxi. Three projects granted first, second and third prizes.
 10. Jennings, John. "Winthrop Ames' Notes for the Perfect Theatre," **Educational Theatre Journal**, XXI, No. 1 (March '60), pp. 9-15. A critique of notes made by Ames in 1907 during a European trip, while planning a theatre in Boston.
 11. "A Look in the New Salzburg Festival Hall," **Die Buhne** (Vienna), Heft 21 (June '60), pp. 14-15. Pictures and plan: A sketchy treatment of the completed building. Also see: Nordegg, Sepp, "Salzburg's New Festival House," **Die Buhne**, Heft 19 (April, '60), p. 11.
 12. Miller, James Hull. "The General Auditorium," **AIA Journal** (August, '60), pp. 73-78. A strong argument for the theatre of a single architectural space, with considerable gratuitous information.
 13. "A Modern Theatre by Richard Neutra, Architect," **Arts & Architecture** (May '60), pp. 15-17, 28, 29. A First Honor Award in the competition for the City Theatre of Dusseldorf. Plans, drawings, photographs of model.
 14. Moro, Peter. "Civic Theatre, Nottingham," **Architectural Review** (January '60), pp. 26-27. The "Playhouse Theatre," with Richard Southern as consultant.
 15. "New Theatre by Werner Ruhnau, Rave and M. C. Von Hausen, Architects," **Arts and Architecture** (March, '60), pp. 18-19, 32. Gelsenkirchen, Germany. Exterior photographs, plan.
 16. Ruhnau, Werner, Wassili Luckhardt and Karl Wilhelm Ochs. "Within and Without in Theatre Building," **Bühnentechnische Rundschau**, LIV, Heft 4 (August '60), pp. 7-11. Interesting speculation about future developments by three German practitioners. Sketches of Ruhnau's project for a Schauspielhaus Dusseldorf, with the single architectural space comprised of elevated podiums: a "space piano."
 17. Schmalor, Rolf. **Architektur Wettbewerbe**, "Architectural Competitions," Heft 25: **Theater und Konzerthäuser**. Stuttgart: Karl Kramer Verlag, 1959. 120 pages, 216 illustrations, about \$3.00. Devoted entirely to recent competitions for theatres and concert halls. Contains a concise history of theatre architecture.
 18. "The Werkbund at Cologne," **Casabella** (Milan) No. 237 (March '60), pp. 20-22. Three pages of large photographs of Henri Van der Velde's tri-partite theatre completed in 1914. Interior and exterior photographs; plan. Also see the translation, p. ix, "A Decisive Work: The Cologne Theatre."
 19. Conant, James B. **Recommendations for Education in the Junior High School Years**. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1960.

Page 31: "Satisfactory instruction requires that the following facilities be available for pupils in grades 7 and 8: (1) a well-stocked library . . . ; (2) a gymnasium with locker rooms and showers; (3) specially equipped home economics rooms for girls and industrial arts rooms for boys; (4) an auditorium or assembly space for at least half the student body; (5) cafeteria space for at least one-third of the student body."

Page 32: "Student assemblies are an important device for promoting school spirit as well as a useful instructional aid, especially in music and dramatics. As with the library, however, a note of caution is in order. Too often handsome auditoriums are not used extensively enough, probably because of scheduling problems. Frequently the auditorium is satisfactorily combined with the cafeteria, which, like the gymnasium, may not be a necessity in every school throughout the country."
 20. DeGaetani, Thomas. "Theatre Architecture; or: How Does It Look from Where You're Sitting?" **The Juilliard Review**, VII (Spring '60), pp. 4-11. A brief historical survey, liberally illustrated.
 21. English, John. "A New Deal for the Theatre — II," **New Theatre Magazine**, II, No. 1 (October '60), pp. 19-25. Detailed development of planning for the Arena Theatre — a three-side arena.
 22. Feder, Abe. "Theatre Form Through Light," **American Institute of Architects Journal** (October '60), pp. 81-83. Basic suggestions for lighting the auditorium and related audience areas.
 23. Miller, James Hull. "Why Theatre Architecture Lags," **Players Magazine**, Part I: XXXVII, No. 1 (October '60), pp. 6-7; Part II: XXXVII, No. 2 (November '60), p. 30. An evaluation of problems which beset the educational theatre planner.
 24. Moro, Peter. "Theatre Today," **Architectural Design** (September '60), pp. 358-68. Prognostication on building design, with sections treating Germany, France, Luxembourg, Roumania, the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States, Brazil and India. Several less-publicised examples. Photos, plans and sections.
 25. "Das neue Festspielhaus in Salzburg," **Bühnentechnische Rundschau**, No. 6 (December '60), pp. 32-43. A comprehensive report with many illustrations, including a color photograph of the auditorium.
 26. Priefert, Ernst. "Shape and Acoustics in Recent German Concert Halls," **Architectural Design** (July '60), pp. 282-88. Considers many European theatres, and includes photos, plans and sections.
 27. Schweicher, Kurt. "Theaterbau in Deutschland," **Form** (Köln), X (1960), pp. 10-21. Critical commentary on post W.W. II German theatre building, based on recent competitions at Kassel and Gelsenkirchen. Nine pages of photographs of the two, with critical captions in French, German, and English.
 28. Southern, Richard. "A University Theatre," **New Theatre Magazine**, I, No. 4 (July '60), pp. 21-24.

- Description of a "double stage" theatre for the University of Southampton. Sketches by the author.
29. "The Theatre Automatique," **Architectural Forum** (October '60), pp. 90-96. Excellent coverage of the completed Loeb Drama Center at Harvard, with much attention to Izenour's contributions. Also see: "Drama Center for Harvard," **Architectural Record** (September '60), Cover, pp. 151-60. Extensive graphic information, with several photographs of the exterior and audience areas.
 30. Uffholz, Jacques, "Fahrbarer Theatersaal," **Bauen und Wohnen** (October '60), pp. 385-90. Project for a travelling theatre of modular wheeled units, designed as a thesis project at the Ecole Polytechnique de l'Université Lausanne.
 31. **Werk** (Winterthur), XLVII, Heft 9 (September '60). Special issue on theatre architecture: Hans Curjel, "Tendenzen im heutigen Theaterbau," pp. 297-300; Werner Ruhnau, "Aus der Sicht des Architekten," pp. 309-311; Teo Otto, "Aus der Sicht des Bühnenbildners," p. 326; "Aus der Sicht des Akustikers," pp. 338-40. Also features on Wright's Dallas, Texas; Stratford, Ontario; Gelsenkirchen; Salzburg's Festival Hall; Luxembourg National Theatre; Bahia, Brazil; Brasília; Tampere, Finland; Teatro Vittorio Gassman in Rome; Theater am Hechtplatz in Zurich. Project photographs of Alvar Aalto's Essen opera house, and competition submissions for the Schauspielhaus Dusseldorf.
 32. Wogenscky, Andre. "The Toric Theatre," **Cimaise** (Paris), VII (April, May, June '60), pp. 116-22. Stimulating idea for a theatre shell based on the torus form, and surrounded entirely by water. Plans and section of a project. Text in four languages.
 33. "Auditorium Building, Hamburg University," **Architectural Review**, CXXIX (March '61), pp. 159-61. An auditorium partition which sinks into the floor makes this solution noteworthy. The 600-seat section beyond the partition is designed for separate use, eliminating less desirable lateral seating.
 34. "Brasilia; le Theatre," **l'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui** (Avril-Mai '60), p. 91. Plans and section for Oskar Niemeyer's theatre complex.
 35. "Concorso per il Teatro comunale di Alessandria," **Architettura** (Rome), VI (Maggio '60), p. 68. Two entries in the competition for a 1700-seat community theatre.
 36. "Concours pour le Palais des Soviets, Moscou," **l'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui** (Septembre-Novembre '60), pp. LX-LXII. This competition for a complex of large assembly spaces provides interesting comparison with the results of a similar international competition in 1931-32, in which work of such men as Gropius, Poelzig and le Corbusier was represented.
 37. "Concours pour le Theatre de Dusseldorf," **l'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui** (Septembre-Novembre '60), pp. XIX-XX. Two of three first prize submissions are reproduced: that of Richard Neutra, and of Bernard Pfau. See also Items 13, 16 and 31 of this bibliography.
 38. Dufet, Michel. "Le role respectif de Perret et de Bourdelle dans la facade du Theatre des Champs-Élysées," **l'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui** (Decembre '60-Janvier '61), p. X. Discussion of historical interest regarding design of the theatre's facade. Also see "A propos du Theatre des Champs-Élysées d'Auguste Perret," **l'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui** (Avril-Mai '60), p. XIII.
 39. Furduev, V. "Architectural-acoustic Design of Some New Concert Halls," **Arhitektura SSR** (Moscow), Nr. 12 (1960), pp. 43-46. (Not translated.)
 40. Izenour, George. "An Experimental Theatre," **Perspecta; The Yale Architectural Journal**, No. 5 (1959), pp. 66-72. The author's project for a flexible system-controlled theatre at Yale University. A very significant document in theatre planning.
 41. Johnson, Russell. "Auditorium Acoustics for Music Performance," **Architectural Record** (December '60), pp. 158-65, 182. Presents the dilemma faced by acoustical planning of the multi-purpose auditorium, and outlines some recent solutions. For a more detailed version of the same article, see **Musical America**, LXXX, Nos. 3 and 4 (February and March '60).
 42. Lanzi, Luigi. "Il nuovo Festspielhaus di Salisburgo," **l'Architettura** (Rome), VI (Settembre '60), pp. 395-404. Detailed coverage of Clemens Holzmeister's Salzburg Festival Hall, with special attention to problems of the site and interior design. Also see Items 11 and 25 of this Bibliography.
 43. Marshall, Norman. "Theatre Design," **Drama** (Winter '60), pp. 25-27. A critical report on a Conference on the Architecture of New Theatres, held at the Institute of Advanced Architectural Studies at York, in September, 1960. The observer indicates a paucity of critical information about the practical aspects of theatres constructed recently outside of Great Britain.
 44. "Projets recents aux Etats-Unis," **l'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui** (Septembre-Novembre '60), p. L. Brief information on the Clowes Memorial Hall project for Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana, by John M. Johansen.
 45. Rose, Kieth. "Ripple Tank Experiments," **Architectural Design** (February '61), pp. 86-88. An illustrated discussion of ripple tank analysis, pointing out advantages and limitations of this method for study of auditorium acoustics.

THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE FOR THEATRE TECHNOLOGY

At its first meeting our Advisory Committee acknowledged the need for a national non-profit organization representing architectural, presentational, and operational experience in the living theatre on the academic, community, and professional theatre levels.

It was generally agreed that the importance of and need for such an organization could not be minimized at a time when America is entering a period of planning and construction of theatres and cultural centers unparalleled anywhere in the world. On April 11, 1960, the ANTA Board of Directors approved a motion for the support, moral and material, of the U.S. Center's efforts to form such an organization. The American Educational Theatre Association had also pledged such support at its national conference in Washington in December, 1959. On September 21, 1960, the Advisory Committee approved the Certificate of Incorporation for THE U.S. INSTITUTE FOR THEATRE TECHNOLOGY, whose stated aims and purposes are as follows:

1. To conduct research and investigation in the field of theatre planning and design, construction,

- equipment, presentation, and operation.
2. To combine and conserve the results of such research and investigation and make the same available to the members of the corporation.
3. To publish and disseminate the results of studies undertaken within the scope and purposes of the corporation.
4. To assist in the establishment of contact between members of the corporation, and the personnel of such members for the better interchange of knowledge in the field of theatre technology.
5. To recommend practices in the field of theatre planning and design, construction, equipment, presentation, and operation, based on the experience of those engaged in living theatre, both dramatic and musical, on all levels as developed by research and investigation in those fields.
6. To provide representation and participation in conferences, assemblies, and other gatherings where matters of theatre planning and design, construction, equipment, presentation, and operation are discussed.

OFFICERS OF THE INSTITUTE

PresidentThomas DeGaetani
 Vice-PresidentBen Schlanger
 Technical SecretaryJoel E. Rubin
 Secretary-TreasurerJohn Cornell

Chairmen of Committees

Standing Committee on Theatrical PresentationPeter Cott
 Standing Committee on Theatre Architecture, Engineering
 and ConstructionFelix Graham
 Sub-Committee on Theatre ArchitectureEric Pawley
 Sub-Committee on Theatre EngineeringHans Sondheimer
 Sub-committee on Theatre ConstructionArthur Benline
 Standing Committee on Theatre AdministrationMelvin White
 Sub-committee on Community Theatre Administration.....John Havens
 Sub-committee on Educational Theatre Administration

Joseph Londin
 Publication and Research MaterialHenry W. Wells
 Public Relations and CommunicationsNorman Redmon
 Membership CommitteeRobert Rowe Paddock
 Assisted byRobert Cahlan
 Program CommitteeBen Schlanger

Communications regarding the USITT NEWSLETTER should be addressed:

Henry W. Wells, Box 73, Low Library, Columbia University,
 New York 27, N. Y.

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

NAME:

ADDRESS:

PROFESSION:

ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION:

TYPE OF MEMBERSHIP: (Check one)

Individual @ \$8.00 per year ()

Lifetime @ \$500.00 ()

Organization @ \$16.00 per year ()

Student Associate (Non-voting) @ \$4.00 per year ()

Commercial Sustaining (Non-voting) @ \$100.00 per year ()

USITT COMMITTEE(S) IN WHICH I WISH TO PARTICIPATE: (Please check at least one)

Committee On Theatrical Presentation ()

Committee On Theatre Architecture ()

Engineering ()

Construction ()

Committee On Theatre Administration ()

Committee On Publication and Research Material ()

Committee On Public Relations and Communications ()

Payment enclosed ()

Date Signature

Mail to U. S. Institute for Theatre Technology, P.O. Box 291, Cathedral Station, New York 25, N. Y.
 Publication of the USITT NEWSLETTER is made possible by individual and organizational membership dues, and the following Commercial Sustaining Members: **Century Lighting, Inc.**
Syska & Hennessy, Inc.

Century Lighting, Inc.

After Five Days Return to:

U. S. INSTITUTE FOR THEATRE TECHNOLOGY

P.O. BOX 291, CATHEDRAL STATION

NEW YORK 25, NEW YORK