



# The Architecture Lobby

Goes to the AIA Convention

[www.architecture-lobby.org](http://www.architecture-lobby.org)

@Arch\_Lobby

#Spaceworkers

## **SOME SENSIBLE POLICIES TO DEMAND OF AIA LEADERSHIP**

The Architecture Lobby is here to help. Sometimes that means thinking well beyond the AIA and organizing on our own, sometimes it means issuing rebukes, sometimes it's theorizing and, as we detail on this page, sometimes it means recognizing where the AIA is and being advocates for the reasonable elements of their proposals.

1) The AIA has correctly identified a "pipeline problem" rooted in the cost barriers associated with entering college/grad school/licensure/just-being a-young-architect. However, the solution, which emphasizes K-12 outreach and scholarships, is inadequate. The AIA can and should be much more direct in its approach to combating college affordability and become advocates for the living conditions of architects. Policies addressing these issues will inherently address equity in the profession. Some ideas:

- Use AIA PAC dollars to support political candidates who advocate for debt-free college plans.
- Renew and reinvigorate support for the National Design Services Act. Communicate why progress has been slow.
- Ensure (through AIA bylaws and other means) that firms associated with the AIA pay all interns and staff a living wage.
- Incorporate language into ethics code that makes violations of

labor law grounds for expulsion. Establish an independent committee to review and enforce such complaints.

- Incorporate language into the ethics code that prohibits AIA members to blacklist or otherwise discriminate against employees who have reported or taken legal action on discrimination, harassment, or labor law violations.
- Create legal resources and avenues (potentially through the AIA Trust) for employment disputes ranging from discrimination, harassment, misclassification - a sort of "whistleblower's hotline", if you will.

2) Pushes around representation in AIA marketing must be considered a means to an end and not an end in and of itself. There is a fine line between normalizing diversity and promoting tokenization. Tokenization is not a substitute for genuine diversity and inclusion - direct action must be taken. Similarly, language emphasizing the value proposition of inclusion and diversity, as has been the norm in AIA literature on the topic, should be treated cautiously as it dehumanizes marginalized groups by associating their very validity as people to economic productivity.

3) Wage transparency is a proven means of closing gender-gaps in compensation. The AIA should create incentive programs for offices willing to be wage-transparent. Alternatively (or additionally) the AIA could even subsidize third-party auditing for wage-gaps in architecture firms. The AIA itself should be audited for pay gaps as well.

# A RESPONSE TO THE AIA STATEMENT OF VALUES

## Originally Published in The Avery Review Issue 23

Since the embarrassing statement sent out by Robert Ivy for the AIA on November 9, 2016, in support of Trump and the president's infrastructure policies, the AIA has issued backpedaling comments that emphasize their commitment to the values that President Trump undermines every day. Their position in the two apologies, in their "Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion" statement, and in their most recent "Where architects stand: A Statement of Our Values," emphasizes the support of "equity and human rights," sustainability, community strengthening, economic security, and diversity. How are we to interpret this change of executive opinion? The answer is not that it is an about-face but an exposure of a series of tensions inherent in our professional organization, tensions that stymie the AIA's coherence and leadership.

The first tension involves who the organization speaks for. Large firms or small firms? Regional or national? Owners or staff? The goals of each of these are different, and the difficulty of finding common ground has much to do with AIA's ineffectuality. The larger firms want the AIA to concentrate on contracts emphasizing technological changes that affect efficient and future production; the small firms want the AIA to concentrate on traditional owner, architect, contractor contracts, HR structures, and business development. Competition for government projects has been fiercer since 2012, when rules increased the total worth of businesses that could qualify as "small" under the Small Business Administration. Regional components want the AIA to advocate not only for their local professional issues but the political temperature of their district—temperatures that are as diverse as the red and blue state voting patterns (sixty-two out of the top hundred US architecture firms are headquartered in noncoastal states; fifty-two are in states that voted for Trump). Firm owners want to profit from their fees while staff want those fees to go toward higher wages and more benefits. The lack of homogeneity reduces the AIA to a brand protection agency since all players can agree on basically only one thing: the AIA should show the world that architecture is a worthy endeavor.

But a close look at the AIA indicates something beyond fear of divisiveness: an inherent conservatism that aggressively adheres to the status quo, shies away from controversial positions, and privileges management over labor. Here are the statistics for AIA membership: firms between one and nine employees represent 77.3 percent of AIA membership but represent 20.7 percent of the staff membership; those between ten and forty-nine, 17.6 percent of AIA membership but 32.3 percent of staff membership; and those of fifty or more, 5.1 percent of AIA membership but 47 percent of staff membership. This means that the large firms, though underrepresented in firm totality, deliver the majority of staff membership. Given that most of these staff memberships are paid for by their firms, the AIA knows whom to pay attention to. The small firms, in the meantime, are the most vulnerable to changes that might negatively affect their precarious profit margins. Small firm owners have nothing to gain by pushing the AIA to debate who labors under what conditions, with what motivations, and with what fair access to support or promotion. Small firm staff are proportionally underrepresented.

The connection between who does and does not have voice in the AIA and the AIA's lack of principled idealism should not be overlooked; indeed, it is a problem that led to Ivy's pronouncement in the first place. For example, those members who agreed with the Architects/Designers/Planners for Social Responsibility's (ADPSR's) 2014 petition to the AIA to prohibit its members from designing execution chambers and spaces for solitary confinement weren't heard. Nor would the AIA solicit its members via a poll to see whether the AIA should condemn the building of the border wall.

Beyond this, management/labor concerns (which might actually change the dynamic of who has a voice in the AIA) are rarely discussed, obscured by the AIA's emphasis on technology and environmentalism, the two hegemonic narratives that supposedly prove architects are progressive and socially responsible. The recent set of proclamations that do attend to labor issues—the "Investing in the Future" declarations

in the “Statement of Values”; “Where We Stand: Immigration and Visa Restrictions”—are belated responses to the outcry over Ivy’s Trump endorsement. Prior to this, the strongest directives were “Value Your Work” and the 2014 AIA Emerging Professionals Summit in Albuquerque. The first had the lowest possible bar: “It’s very important for the emerging architects to get paid because it really puts a sense of value on what we do” The second, which asked for a “repositioning” of the assigned value of those ten-years-out-or-less workers, resulted in the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) rescinding the label, “intern,” with no change of policy. Both of these campaigns, as well as the recent “Investing in the Future” (“A generation of young people is being held back by a lack of access to education and the crushing burden of student debt...”) also suffer from a naive evaluation of professional impediments, obscuring the fact that the median average wage for architects is \$76,000; compared to lawyers, \$133,500; and doctors, \$169,000; for family doctor to \$519,000 for a surgeon. This is a bourgeois problem, and we are, in the larger economic scheme of things, privileged. But if we are speaking of payback for the cost of education, internship, and professional hoops, the result is pathetic. No wonder architecture struggles to attract and retain minorities with hard-won access to higher education. Either the AIA believes that there is no problem beyond that of the emerging professionals, or it does not know how to address this crucial issue in any direct way.

The second tension is similar to but different from the first. Who is the AIA speaking to? Its members or the public, our potential clients? Ideally, there is no problem in doing both, since satisfied clients make more work for architects, which makes for satisfied architects. But the double agenda produces AIA directives that ensure no advocacy specific to us professionals. Instead of just “we give you inspired design,” why not “we are more valuable, warrant more voice in building development, and deserve better pay than is currently acknowledged”? Client appeasement doesn’t equal architectural advocacy. How often have we heard that the first thing that developers learn is the ease of driving down architects’ fees? The client treats architectural services as a commodity; the architect does not.

At the same time, the-public-must-love-us campaign serves as ideological masking—falsely convincing us architects that the clients’ needs really are the same as ours. One should read the “Look Up!” campaign, ostensibly meant to address the public: “To be an architect is to look up. Even before we put pencil to paper, we are looking up, to...nature, to art, and to history, to pursue [something higher]...” “Look Up!” is not merely a (pathetic) way to convince the public that we are inspired, good, trustworthy, socially motivated, and environmentally sensitive, but it’s a message meant to convince us architects that the reasons we entered the profession—all these things—still hold true, contrary to all evidence. The reality is that the majority of website-sponsored messages put out by the AIA (“Don’t miss A’17, the event of the year,” “Justice Facilities Review Awards;” “Even with uncertainties looming, healthy gains projected for 2017 building activities;” “Architecture firms reported that their billings were essentially flat to start off 2017.... But the future looks more positive overall, ... indicating that there is still plenty of new work in the pipeline”) are dictums meant to disguise architects’ systemic insecurity with images of bliss, honors, success, and meaningful work.

Our final, and broadest, tension concerns the role of architecture within the neoliberal state. Practically and legally, the AIA can only promote the value architecture brings to society and cannot advocate for better remuneration for architects. It is a bind not primarily the fault of the AIA, which was issued consent decrees on two occasions by the Department of Justice (DOJ) for breaking antitrust laws when discussing fee schedules. The 1972 proceeding by the DOJ against the AIA was initiated by the AIA’s suggested fee schedules and its prohibitions against discounting fees and competitive bidding. In the agreed-upon consent decree, the AIA had to amend its Standard of Ethical Practice and submit annually, over the next five years, a report detailing the steps taken to comply with the judgment. The 1990 proceedings cited the president of the Chicago Chapter of the AIA for distributing in 1984 documents proposing a limit to competition based on fees. AIA National, held responsible for its components, was forced again into a consent decree demanding a review of its Code of Ethics, a payment of \$50,000, and a guarantee that every component at every meeting for the next ten years view a video delineating antitrust behavior. The AIA operates under the

fear of further antitrust violations.

But while these consent decrees legitimate the AIA's timidity to advocate for architects, the directive of the antitrust laws—to guarantee competition in all forms of commerce—also works on architecture at a subliminal, ideological level that the AIA is happy to foster. The manner in which “competition at all cost” is absorbed into a profession already emphasizing aesthetic ego is relatively seamless; the psychological infiltration to “COMPETE” fits a profession susceptible to exclusionary modes of individuality and entrepreneurialism. Seventeen years after the end of the last AIA consent decree, the AIA is not only unwilling to broach the subject of fees and wages but has made internal competition of firms against one another a particular point of celebration. At the 2014 National Convention, speakers hawking their ability to charge lower fees for more services were put before the audience as keynotes offering positive examples for the profession.

## ***We Want Advocacy***

One longs for a professional organization that feels confident to argue for what is right, even if it offends those with the purse strings. This goes for unsafe-to-discuss social positions including and beyond prisons, border walls, issues such as poverty, homelessness, deforestation, job outsourcing, fracking, immigration. It includes advocating for issues affecting fair labor and access to the profession, in which case the AIA could follow the lead of the National Association of Law Placement (NALP), which collects data on law firms' billable hours, gender equity, part-time and flex-time policies, parental and family accommodations, and professional development (in addition to laying out principles of fair hiring and legal employment standards). Lawyers likewise are known for having agreed-upon salaries for associates, staying within the realm of legal “transparency” (vs. collusion) by merely revealing salaries that just happen to become standardized. Here, use of the “3rd party survey” implicitly sets the mark that top law firms have to hit to attract the best and brightest employees. One might also take the example of the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGM) of which the AMA is a member, which, in a landmark decision, imposed restrictions on the number of hours residents can work (eighty hours per week, averaged over a four-week period; residents must also be given at least twenty-four consecutive hours off each week).

The AIA's ability to work around antitrust laws is unlike that of medicine or law; there are real limits that are beyond the control of the AIA. Medicine escapes much antitrust review because it does not have a single constituent structure. Regulated by a number of levels of state and private operatives made more complicated by Medicare and Medicaid (which further require both state and private organizational involvement), medicine shields itself from direct antitrust attack “and provide(s) opportunities for...self-protective economic restraint and abuse.” Lawyers, on the other hand, are essential to the primary governmental function of administering justice, and, having historically been “officers of the courts,” are less subject to antitrust law than managers of it.

Antitrust laws ensure competition in all forms of trade; any regulations that compromise competition must be enacted through legislation that argues for a larger social good not provided by market competition. This is where the clout of a professional organization matters. And clout is a function of the numbers in the organization—the American Medical Association (AMA) has 217,500 members; the American Bar Association (ABA) approximately 400,000; and the AIA 89,000—as well as the number of constituent voters that will motivate a legislator to champion or initiate a bill; there are approximately 1.1 million physicians, 1.3 million lawyers, and 225,400 architects. And if the real way to get the attention of the state professional boards is through lobbying, both medicine and law have enormous advantages over architecture. Between 1998 and 2016, the AMA spent \$20 million on lobbyists, second only to the American Chamber of Commerce; the ABA an average of \$1.12 million in the same period; and architects an average of \$300,000. Moreover, institutionally, where the AIA deals only with the protocols of professional behavior but not academic accreditation (NAAB) or licensure (NCARB), law's ABA controls all three, and medicine's AMA all

but academic accreditation (AAMC). This means that both law and medicine have more influence with the state boards that govern professional policies and have the opportunity, for the sake of a thriving profession, to override antitrust laws.

In a meeting between two Architecture Lobby members and Robert Ivy in 2014, Ivy indicated the dilemma that the AIA was in with regard to lobbying, namely that elected officials, who introduce and support legislation, don't have any incentive to attend to the minuscule number and nonexistent politico/economic pull of their architecture constituents. He explained the reality of a weak profession and hence a weak professional organization. It renders the wobbly insincerity of the "We speak up and policymakers listen" pronouncement, in "The Statement of our Value," overt.

### **Upshot**

So what is to be done? Calling for Robert Ivy's resignation misses the point; it addresses a symptom and misses the cause. The AIA has demonstrated neither the will nor the incentive to address fundamental tensions in the profession or deal with structural impediments. We need an organization that is not afraid to advocate for the value of not just "architecture" but architects; at the same time, we need a professional organization that can shed light on more than our inspired ability to "look up!" and will point instead to society's dependence on our delivery of humane spaces. The question then is this: Do we hope for a transformed AIA; put in place a parallel organization that can do what the AIA cannot do; start over with an organization willing to address hard issues, admitting that substantive dialogue always offends somebody; or, deprofessionalize.

**A.** The transformed AIA would need to do these things: It would need to regain our trust by admitting that we are a profession in crisis; that the divisions in the profession outlined here are real; and describe the specific ways the AIA makes choices and compromises among the different constituencies. It would need to demonstrate that it has a vision for the future of the profession that is not the same as the present. It would need to be completely transparent about its lobbying activity. Who is hired to argue in what state and national legislation, and how much money is spent on it? What specifically is the AIA doing when it says, in the "Where Architects Stand: A Statement of Our Values" document, "This is why we advocate for ... [protecting and expanding laws that reflect our values; investing in well-designed civic infrastructure; robust building codes]?" What percentage of the budget goes to legislative action in comparison to organizing self-congratulatory events, the dispersion of honors and prizes, and the salaries of AIA officials, (including the \$514,000 for Robert Ivy)? And finally, it would have to show political leadership motivated by ethical, not merely expedient, choices.

**B.** Form and coordinate with another organization that does the difficult policy work for which the AIA feels inadequate: This would be either a sister organization that advocates for fair labor laws while AIA goes after work for the firms and celebrates its successes or an umbrella organization coordinating and overseeing AIA, NCARB, and NAAB. The first might be a union since unions are exempt from antitrust laws and would have the full authority to speak for the majority of architectural workers. Indeed, a union connecting with the larger Architecture, Engineering, and Construction (AEC) industry, with its not insignificant amount of dollars passing through a relatively small amount of workers' hands, would have significant economic leverage that translates directly into political power. As policy analysts have identified, professional distress leads logically to unionization.

The second, umbrella organization, would be able to assess the larger mission of the profession's viability, not just monitoring existing definitions of the profession. The five "collaterals" that make up the architecture professionalization community—AIA, AIAS, NAAB, NCARB, and ACSA—divide a profession that must still persuade state legislatures and professional licensing boards. As we have seen, this contrasts with law and medicine, fields that link their professional institutions for greater power and legislative effect. The Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) has the Architects Registration Board (ARB) as its licensing other, and together the RIBA and the ARB manage school accreditation, a link that manages its social, political, and economic

influence more coherently.

**C.** Another organization that would take on a different mission altogether: This organization would model, in its own administration and in the firm offices it supports, the ideals that it advocates for the public. Work in all architectural venues would be legal, fair, racially and ethnically diverse, self-empowering, family-oriented, flexible, gender-sensitive, healthy, and happy; they would draw the connection between our actual work experience and the production/design of work (and life) experiences of others. As long as architecture in its own house doesn't practice what it preaches, our ideals for society will remain an abstraction.

It would transcend the scrambling for a too-small pie, making clear why this pie is so small: because the financialization of urban development led by the real estate and financial services industries has been a leading edge of the neoliberal revolution over the past forty years, rewarding those at the very top at the expense of everyone else. It would fight for the deep investments historically achieved by non-market-driven objectives—like good affordable housing—without falling prey to state authoritarianism (a real risk in Trump times). It would self-organize according to the principles of radical democracy and embrace difference, dissent, and antagonisms. It could, indeed, propose an alternative to the free-market economy and argue for a more socially minded, democratically planned economy.

**D.** Deprofessionalization: In distinction to the above suggestions that attempt to bolster the goals of an imperiled profession, one can consider deprofessionalization. While deprofessionalization for many is a negative term depicting deskilling in the "learned professions," it merely alludes to unburdening a group—still competency-certified and still passionately driven—of its ideological hang-ups: aristocratic class identification, specialization that holds us apart from other actors in the AEC industry, the false ideal of superior expertise, ignorance of a complex balance of diverse social forces, unfulfilled notions of autonomy, fictitious ideas of being above business, the expense of elite education.

Professionalism, a construct of liberal capitalism, had three simultaneous goals: to ensure a guiding, elite knowledge sector; to—ironically, at the same time—hark back to pre-capitalist ideals of craftsmanship, universal protection of the social fabric, and noblesse oblige; and offer conventions of standardization, scientific and cognitive rationality, and a progressive division of labor. Those goals are no longer relevant or realistic in today's neoliberal economy, and other organizational mechanisms need to be released.

Deprofessionalization can be seen as acquiescence to market forces or as an immediate leap toward what Hardt and Negri call "the common," or Herbert Marcuse termed nonrepressive society. If the first, this forced plunge into the market (which for all intents and purposes was imposed upon the professions by antitrust law in the '70s and '80s anyway) would force those practicing architecture to rethink their value and power without the crutch of (aesthetic and class) exclusivity. If the second, all the better—a whole new political economy and sociality needs to be designed for it; architects should have a lot to contribute.

Choosing among these various alternatives is clearly linked to one's political stomach and/or one's view of what is practically obtainable. They are laid out here not to encourage an agreement on one course of action—the Architecture Lobby sees itself as an arena of debate, not policymaking—but to initiate the end of a banging-our-heads-against-the-AIA-wall era. The hope is to start a deeper conversation about what we actually want of our profession and the organization that can deliver it. We all want and deserve more.

When Whitney Young Jr. gave the following speech at the 1968 AIA convention, his words received a standing ovation. It is likely they would receive the same response today.

This is problematic - not because of the profession's attitudes towards social progress and equity, but because the critiques Young levelled in this address are nearly as relevant in 2017 as they were in 1968.

Every so often the AIA proclaims it has discovered, as if anew, architecture's social responsibility. But what we want - what we fight for and push towards - is a professional architecture organization that moves beyond rhetoric and marketing to support actual action.

In fifty years, architects should look at this speech and think not of our profession's failures, but of how we overcame them.

## **WHITNEY M. YOUNG, JR. KEYNOTE ADDRESS 1968 AIA CONVENTION PORTLAND, OREGON**

If I seem to repeat things you have heard before, I do not apologize, any more than I think a physician would apologize for giving inoculations. Sometimes we have to give repeated vaccinations, and we continue to do so until we observe that it has taken effect. One need only take a casual look at this audience to see that we have a long way to go in this field of integration of the architects. I almost feel like Mr. Stanley looking for Dr. Livingston—in reverse—in Africa. I think I did see one and wanted to rush up and say: Dr. Livingston, I presume!

**As a profession, you are not a profession that has distinguished itself by your social and civic contributions to the cause of civil rights, and I am sure this has not come to you as any shock. You are most distinguished by your thunderous silence and your complete irrelevance.**

**Now, you have a nice, normal escape hatch in your historical ethical code or something that says after all, you are the designers and not the builders; your role is to give people what they want.**

Now, that's a nice, easy way to cop out. But I have read about architects who had courage, who had a social sensitivity, and I can't help but wonder about an architect that builds some of the public housing that I see in the



cities of this country. How he could even compromise his own profession and his own sense of values to have built 35- or 40- story buildings, these vertical slums, and not even put a restroom in the basement and leave enough recreational space for about 10 kids when there must be 5,000 in the building. That architects as a profession wouldn't as a group stand up and say something about this, is disturbing to me.

You are employers, you are key people in the planning of our cities today. **You share the responsibility for the mess we are in terms of the white noose around the central city. It didn't just happen. We didn't just suddenly get this situation. It was carefully planned.**

I went back recently and looked at ads when they first started building subdivisions in this country. The first new subdivision—easy access to town, good shopping centers, good schools, no Negroes, no Jews allowed—that was the first statement. Then they decided in New York that that was cutting the market too close, so they said the next day, “No Negroes allowed.” And then they got cute when they thought everybody had the message, and they said “restricted, exclusive neighborhood, homogenous neighborhood.”

Everybody knows what those words mean. Even the Federal Government participated.

They said [there] must be compatible neighborhoods for FHA mortgages, homogenous neighborhoods. The Federal Government participated in building the nice middle-class housing

in the suburbs, putting all the public housing in the central city. It took a great deal of skill and creativity and imagination to build the kind of situation we have, and it is going to take skill and imagination and creativity to change it. We are going to have to have people as committed to doing the right thing, to inclusiveness, as we have in the past to exclusiveness.

**You are also here as educators. Many of you are in educational institutions. I took the time to call up a young man who just finished at Yale and I said “What would you say if you were making the speech I'm supposed to make today?” Again, not quite as sedate and as direct as your young student here because he did have some strong observations to make. He did want you to become more relevant; he did want you to begin to speak out as a profession, he did want in his own classroom to see more Negroes, he wanted to see more Negro teachers. He wanted while his classwork was going on for you somehow as educators to get involved in the community around you.**

When you go to a city—Champaign-Urbana, the University of Illinois is about the only major institution and within two or three blocks are some of the worse slums I have seen in the country. It is amazing how within a stone's throw of the School of Architecture you have absolutely complete indifference—unless you have a federal grant for research, and even then it's to study the problem.

**I hope you accept my recommendation for a moratorium on the study of the Negro in this country. He has been dissected and analyzed, horizontally and vertically and diagonally. Thank you, very much. And if there are any further studies—I'm not anti-intellectual—I hope we'll make them on white people.** And that instead of studying the souls of black people we'll be studying the souls of white people; instead of the anatomy of Watts, we'll do an anatomy of Cicero, an anatomy of Bronxville.

What's wrong with the people in these neighborhoods? Why do they want—themselves just one generation removed from welfare or in many cases just one generation within the country, where they have come here sometimes escaping hate and have come here and acquired freedom—why do they want to turn their backs and say in Cicero, "Al Capone can move in, but Ralph Bunche can't?" Why are they so insecure? Why do people want to live in these bland, sterile, antiseptic, gilded ghettos, giving sameness to each, compounding mediocrity in a world that is 75 percent nonwhite, in a world where in 15 minutes you can take a space ship and fly from Kennedy to South Africa? Why would anybody want to let their children grow up in this kind of situation? I think this kind of affluent peasant ought to be studied. These are people that have acquired middle-class incomes because of strong labor unions and because they are living in an unprecedented affluent period. But in things esthetic and educational and cultural, they leave a lot to be desired. They wouldn't know the difference between Karl Marx and Groucho Marx.

This is where our problem is. We can move next door to Rockefeller in Tarrytown, but I couldn't move into Bronxville. Any white pimp or prostitute can move into Bronxville. A Jewish person could hardly move into Bronxville, incidentally.

**As a profession, you ought to be taking stands on these kinds of things. If you don't as architects stand up and endorse Model Cities and appropriations, if you don't speak out for rent supplements or the housing bill calling for a million homes, if you don't speak out for some kind of scholarship program that will enable you to consciously and deliberately seek to bring in minority people who have been discriminated against in many cases, either kept out because of your indifference or couldn't make it—it takes seven to ten years to become an architect— then you will have done a disservice to the memory of John Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Bob Kennedy and most of all, to yourselves.**

You are part of this society. It is not easy. I am not suggesting the easy road, but the time has come when no longer the kooks and crackpots speak for America. The decent people have to learn to speak up, and you shouldn't have to be the victim to feel for other people. I make no pretense that it is easy.

Finally, let me dwell on your role as men, because I think this probably more basic than anything. Sure, you're architects. You're a lot of things—you're Republicans, Democrats and a few John Birchers. You're a good many

things but you're a man and you're a father. I would hope that somehow you would understand that this issue, more than any other of human rights, today separates the phony from the real, the man from the boy, more than anything else.

Baseball's Rickey solved the problem of attitudes and how long it takes. I agree with you that it takes a long time to change attitudes. Doesn't take any time to change them overnight. When he brought Jackie Robinson to the Dodgers, there was this ballplayer who said I'm not going to play with that "nigger." He thought Rickey would flap like most employers. I imagine most architects thought he would say that he'd pull away.

But he didn't know Rickey very well. Rickey was kind. He said, "Give him three or four days." Well, at the end of a few days, Robinson had five home runs, stolen many bases and this fellow was reassessing his options. He could go back to Alabama and maybe make \$20 a week picking cotton, or stay there with the Dodgers and continue to work and, now it looked like Jackie would get him into the World Series and a bonus of \$5,000, which he did. The only color he was concerned with was green.

We see it happening in Vietnam. White boys from Mississippi in Vietnam develop more respect and admiration for their black sergeant in one week because they too have made their own assessment and have decided to be liberal white boys from Mississippi instead of a dead white bigot. They're interested in survival and the sergeant is skilled in the art of surviving, and they say "Mr. Sergeant"—changed

overnight.

Why is it that the best example of American democracy is found in the muck and mire of Vietnam? Why is it that the greatest freedom the black man has is the freedom to die in Vietnam; and as they die, why do his loved ones, their kids and their wives and their mothers have to fight for the right to buy a house where they want to?

There is something wrong with that kind of society.

**So, what's at stake then is your country, your profession, and you as a decent civilized human being.** Anatole France once said, "I prefer the error and enthusiasm to the indifference of wisdom." For a society that has permitted itself the luxury of an excess of callousness and indifference, we can now afford to permit ourselves the luxury of an excess of caring and of concern. **It is easier to cool a zealot than it is to warm a corporation.**

An ancient Greek scholar was once asked to predict when the Greeks would achieve victory in Athens. He replied, "We shall achieve victory in Athens and justice in Athens when those who are not injured are as indignant as those who are."

And so shall it be with this problem of human rights in this country.

- 1 ENFORCE LABOUR LAWS THAT PROHIBIT UNPAID INTERNSHIPS, UNPAID OVERTIME; REFUSE UNPAID COMPETITIONS.
- 2 REJECT FEES BASED ON PERCENTAGE OF CONSTRUCTION OR HOURLY FEES AND INSTEAD CALCULATE VALUE BASED ON THE MONEY WE SAVE OUR CLIENTS OR GAIN THEM.
- 3 STOP PEDDLING A PRODUCT—BUILDINGS—AND FOCUS ON THE UNIQUE VALUE ARCHITECTS HELP REALIZE THROUGH SPATIAL SERVICES.
- 4 ENFORCE WAGE TRANSPARENCY ACROSS THE DISCIPLINE.
- 5 ESTABLISH A UNION FOR ARCHITECTS, DESIGNERS, ACADEMICS, AND INTERNS IN ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN.
- 6 DEMYSTIFY THE ARCHITECT AS SOLO CREATIVE GENIUS; NO HONORS FOR ARCHITECTS WHO DON'T ACKNOWLEDGE THEIR STAFF.
- 7 LICENSURE UPON COMPLETION OF DEGREE.
- 8 CHANGE PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURE ORGANIZATIONS TO ADVOCATE FOR THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF ARCHITECTS.
- 9 SUPPORT RESEARCH ABOUT LABOR RIGHTS IN ARCHITECTURE.
- 10 IMPLEMENT DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVES TO THE FREE MARKET SYSTEM OF DEVELOPMENT.

The Architecture Lobby, Inc. is an organization of architectural workers advocating for the value of architecture in the general public and for architectural work within the discipline. It believes that the work architects do – aesthetic, technical, social, organizational, environmental, administrative, fiduciary – needs structural change to be more rewarding and more socially relevant. As long as architecture tolerates abusive practices in the office and the construction site, it cannot insist on its role in and for the public good. Learn more at [www.architecture-lobby.org](http://www.architecture-lobby.org)