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Dr. J. Gordon Davies (England)
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The Jerusalem Congress: An in-depth exploration of: SACRALITY: MEANING AND FORM

The Jerusalem Congress: International, interfaith, intercultural and interdisciplinary — Within the framework of man’s spirit, it will deal with his environment, value systems and modes of expression

The Jerusalem Congress: Confronting sacred space — Christian, Jewish and Moslem holy sites

The Jerusalem Congress: Exploring exterior space as an expression of man’s interior space

The Jerusalem Congress: Discussing the meaning of sacrality — the function of sacred spaces for the great Western and Eastern religions of the world — projections for the use of sacred space in contemporary society

The Jerusalem Congress: Join your professional colleagues — architects, town planners, religious leaders, artists, craftsmen — in an exciting program

Tour:
14-day extensive tour of the Holy Land visiting sites sacred to Christians, Jews and Moslems, including trip to Athens and Corinth, Greece — Monday, Sept. 3 thru Monday Sept. 17.

Total cost: Round trip airfare from New York, hotels, meals, etc. plus registration and participation in 3rd International Congress, special cultural and museum events, $880.00.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS — JERUSALEM

INTEREST FORM

SEPTEMBER 3-17, 1973

☐ I am interested in attending the Jerusalem Congress.
☐ I am, ☐ am not interested in the package tours.
☐ My spouse will accompany me.

NAME(S): ____________________________

STREET ____________________________

CITY ____________________________ STATE __________ ZIP CODE __________

☐ Enclosed is my advance on registration of $50.00 for each registrant. I understand that registrants will be listed for hotel assignments in the order in which advance fees are received in the Congress Office. (Make check payable to: 1973 International Congress.) I further understand that all money is refundable until August 2, 1973.

NOTE: Send this form and check (if enclosed) to:
1973 INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS
to MR. JOHN POTTS, TREASURER
287 PARK AVENUE SOUTH
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10010
NOTES & COMMENTS


The Jerusalem Congress will bring together world renowned architects, artists, government leaders, theologians, religious leaders and media personnel who will provide Congress registrants with an in-depth exploration of the Congress theme: "Sacrality: Meaning and Form."

The city sacred to Christians, Jews and Moslems will offer a fitting background for the Conference theme. Tours have been arranged prior to the official Congress opening on September 9, encompassing the coastal area of Haifa, Galilee as well as Jerusalem—Old City and New City. Registration is open to architects, ministers, laymen, educators, students and other interested persons.

Mayor Teddy Kollek of Jerusalem is Chairman of the Host Committee for the Congress, and has planned a series of special museum and cultural events in conjunction with it. Rabbi Moshe Davidowitz, New York University, is chairman of the U.S. Steering Committee for the Congress; other members are John Potts, the Rev. Roger Ottmayer, Robert E. Rambusch. Architect members of the planning committee include Daniel Schewartzman, FAIA, New York, N.Y.; Nils M. Schweizer, FAIA, Winter Park, Fla.; Edward A. Sovik, FAIA, Northfield, Minn.; Anthony Tappe, AIA, Boston, Mass. and Harold E. Wagoner, FAIA, Philadelphia, Pa. For further information write:

1973 International Congress
Box Mr. John Potts, Treasurer
287 Park Ave. South
New York, N.Y. 10010

Atlanta Conference—Celebration Feast

After three days of listening and speaking, agreeing and often disagreeing, who can describe the child-like magic, spontaneous feelings, and momentary exaltation caught on four kaleidoscopic screens from humming carousels above a meadow of tables? There groups of participants shared insights that ranged in mood from homilies to playful mockery of role. After moments both hilarious and grave, a bush, edged with hallowed words, came over this collection of people, awed by the utter simplicity and deep meaning of sipping from a common goblet of water and breaking and sharing bread.

No wonder then that small groups clung together after the Celebration, the Agape, was over. Participants seemed reluctant to leave one another's company—the closeness and joy of it a thing to be treasured, remembered, and carried away.

The 33rd Annual Conference on Religious Architecture formally closed on Friday evening, April 28, with a Celebration led by various conference chairmen. The meal was followed by facetious awards from the facilitators to the hardworking chairmen, Harold E. Wagoner, Henry Lee Willet and Henry Jung. Colloquy groups variously summarized their two-day probing through ingenious skits, dialogues and symbolic actions. The Rev. Horace Allen then led the group in the traditional breaking of bread, a moving ceremony which fittingly expressed the fellowship and friendship felt by participants during the conference.

The Award of Merit was made to the Buckingham-Virginia Slate Corporation by the Products and Crafts Exhibit jury at the 1972 Atlanta Conference on Religious Architecture. The jury, composed of Preston Stevens, Jr., AIA, Maureen McGuire, GRA, and Sister Maria-Edward stated that Buckingham's exhibit maintained the theme of the Conference—"New Spaces for the Gathering Community"—while providing an effect of future change. It displayed a beautifully sophisticated material which was at the same time earthy.

Three other product exhibits received honorable mention. They were: The Blenko Exhibit, tailor-made for the occasion in all its simplicity and beauty; The Stained Glass Association of America, though large and complicated, it solved the problem of displaying a number of excellent displays; The Endicott Church Furniture Company's dignified display which was subtle and had great impact visually.
Above All - a natural Buckingham® Virginia Slate Roof

Architect, Harold Wagoner, FAIA, stated that one of his first considerations in designing the National Presbyterian Church and Center, Washington, D.C., was to have the structure protected by a trouble free and maintenance free roof. In choosing Unfading Buckingham® Virginia Slate for the roofing material, he also obtained a rare combination of beauty, dignity and durability in natural slate that is in keeping with and complimentary to the other natural stones used extensively throughout the structure.

Buckingham® Slate is meeting the challenge throughout the country as a quality material of natural beauty and texture for use as roofing, flooring, paving, exterior or interior panels, stools, treads, and many other practical uses. Write for information or see our catalogs in “Sweet’s Architectural File”. A little slate . . . a lot of distinction, when it's Buckingham Slate®.

See our exhibit at the Annual Conference on Religious Architecture, Atlanta, Georgia, April 26th–28th.
NEW PROJECTS OF INTEREST

(Editor's Note: This issue of FAITH & FORM introduces a new feature in the Guild journal, "New Projects of Interest." Limitations of space prevent feature coverage of many new projects of architectural merit and/or special interest. A committee of three GRA members has been appointed to review new projects submitted for editorial consideration, and to select from them those of greatest interest for brief editorial treatment. Architects are invited to submit photographs and copy on new projects in various stages of completion.)

St. Procopius Abbey
Lisle, Ill.
Architects: Loebl, Schlossman, Bennett & Dart
Chicago, Ill.

The new St. Procopius Abbey in Lisle, Ill. is built on an 80-acre rolling woodland site and consists of an 800-seat abbey church and the monastery itself, totalling 100,000 square feet. The design, by Edward Dart of Loebl, Schlossman, Bennett & Dart of Chicago, is contemporary, using common brick, wood and textured concrete. It blends with the hillside site selected because of its proximity to the two schools operated by the Lisle Benedictines.

Mr. Dart has chosen to emphasize the residential character and scale of the abbey rather than the institutional. To communicate the intensive Christian life, which the monks share, the building was designed to express order, simplicity, restraint and austerity. At the same time, it promotes privacy, community closeness, individuality and human dignity.

The program for the abbey was formulated from the results of questionnaires to determine what the monks thought most important in a new home, and what was essential in the building of a new abbey. Chairman of the planning committee, Father Michael Komechak, O.S.B. said: "The monks will live here for the rest of their lives. We wanted the building to be an expression of contemporary monastic needs. If the building is a success, it's a double victory".

Continued on p. 27
Jury Report—Architectural Exhibit—
1972 Atlanta Conference on Religious Architecture

JURY:
Henry Howard Smith, AIA, GRA -
Chairman
James H. Finch, FAIA,
Atlanta, Ga.
William W. Gillillen, AIA, GRA,
Columbus, Ohio
Daniel Schwartzman, FAIA, GRA,
New York, N.Y.

After the painful procedure of eliminating those projects which had ignored the clearly stated purposes of the exhibit, the jury discussed at length the criteria for judging the projects and agreed to give first consideration to successful "theological expression." In addition, such concepts as "imaginative design," "powerful form," "skillful siting," "fulfillment of given program," "balanced solution for worship, education, administration and fellowship" went into the judging.

An over-all review of the entries revealed that they fell generally into the following categories: (1) regional religious centers; (2) moderate-sized suburban religious centers; (3) inner-city buildings for worship, education, community services; (4) shopping center mall projects for worship, education, community services; and (5) alterations and additions to existing religious buildings. The jury's awards were made for architectural excellence without regard to category. Major consideration was given also to skillful organization of the plan elements, the use of building materials to enhance their inherent beauty, and integration of appropriate works of art. Twelve projects were selected for Honor Award Certificates from the Guild for Religious Architecture and will also become part of the 1972 Guild Traveling Exhibit.

(Note: Requests for reservation of the traveling exhibit handled through GRA office, 1777 Church St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.)

First Baptist Church
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico

ARCHITECTS:
John F. Beidleman
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico
Dimensional Dynamics
Valley Forge, Pa.

A fine example of a religious building of limited size as part of a church-sponsored high-rise office complex to serve the religious and educational needs of a high density population area.

St. Olaf's Catholic Church
Minneapolis, Minn.

ARCHITECTS:
Frederick Bentz & Milo Thompson
Minneapolis, Minn.

A chapel within an office building complex which has an elegant simplicity and is a direct statement of religious participation by the business community.
Bethlehem Lutheran Church
Santa Rosa, Cal.

ARCHITECTS:
Duncombe, Roland, Miller
Santa Rosa, Cal.

The strong triangular pyramidal room form and commanding site relationship are directly expressed in the excellent interior.

Church on the Mall
Plymouth Meeting, Pa.

ARCHITECTS:
Hassinger & Schwam

A religious center designed to fit a limited site adjacent to a multi-story commercial building with direct communication with a shopping center mall and with a market place ministry.
Religious Facilities Center
Columbia, Md.

ARCHITECTS:
Huygens & Tappe' Inc.
Boston, Mass.

Gaudreau, Inc.
Baltimore, Md.

A simple and direct architectural envelope for an interfaith center. The restraint in the use of symbolic decor adds the appropriate interior architectural expression.

Christ Church
Bay St. Louis, Miss.

ARCHITECTS:
Blitch Associates
Bay St. Louis, Miss.

The church captures with uncomplicated form and elements the timeless charm of the great New England church. The interior of laminated, natural wood bents unfortunately fails to achieve the quality of the exterior design.
St. Matthew's Episcopal &
Wilton Presbyterian Church
Wilton, Conn.

ARCHITECTS:
SMS Architects
New Canaan, Conn.

Dual denominational religious center
with an Episcopalian Main Sanctuary
and a Presbyterian Parish Hall beauti­
fully arranged around a court for op­ti­
mal sharing of the educational and
administrative facilities. The exterior
has strong form achieved with simple
building material.

Sacred Heart Church
Sterling, Ill.

ARCHITECTS:
Prisco, Duffy & Associates
Aurora, Ill.

Liturgical Furnishings Consultant:
William Schickle

The simple geometry of its exterior
components lead to an interesting
mass. The open form of the bell tower
was a good idea—not too well exe­
cut ed. The interiors are warm and
friendly.
First Christian Church
Kirksville, Mo.

ARCHITECTS:
Anselevicius/Rupe Associates
St. Louis, Mo.

A beautifully calm environment for worship enhanced by a masterful scheme of natural lighting for the interior. The exterior proportions and use of material are excellent.

Newman Student Center,
University of Maine
Orono, Maine

ARCHITECT:
Willoughby M. Marshall
Cambridge, Mass.

Its consistent geometric form and color of furnishings arranged for multi-use of the changing moods of students are excellent. All of this is reflected in the form and scale of its exterior elements.
Church of the Covenant
Cleveland, Ohio

ARCHITECTS:
Richard Fleischman & Associates
Cleveland, Ohio

An example of the skillful use of a limited, residual site to provide an architectural invitation to the younger members of the community to participate in church educational activity.

Church of St. Stephen
Andka, Minn.

ARCHITECTS:
Voigt & Fourre' Inc.
St. Paul, Minn.

Its strong architectural form and straightforward use of logical material were admired. It is particularly noteworthy for its skill in organizing the sanctuary seating of 1500 to retain a sense of close participation in the services by all congregants.
The Return to the Non-Church*

by

E. A. Sövik, FAIA
Sövik, Mathre & Madson
Northfield, Minn.

It has become clear to everyone who thinks about building places of worship that the erstwhile fashion of imitating the ecclesiastical architecture of earlier times is not justified. There are many good reasons for this consensus and for the changes that have come in the course of its emergence. Even though the church architecture of the last couple of decades is so varied that it sometimes seems capricious (and sometimes is), I believe there has been a sort of progress in the last half century—or at least a directional movement. I find in the work that has been done a pattern which, if not chronologically systematic, is still subject to analysis. And I think that if we reflect on the course through which church design has passed, we can discern where we are going, or where we ought to go if our courage doesn't fail. In some degree we are already there.

TECHNOLOGY

Since we have been living in an age of technology, and since technical matters are a part of the architect's profession, it isn't surprising that the elements of church building that gave way first to the pressures of the new age were technical factors. Masonry structures and stone or timber vaulting were superseded by the device of concealing steel skeletons in masonry or wood sheathing. This gave the illusion of the ancient forms, but the result can be described more fairly as stage scenery than as authentic architecture. Architects who preferred authenticity looked for ways to recover it. And in 1922 August Perret made drawings for a church in Raincy, near Paris, which was to be concrete—partly cast in place and partly precast. He won the competition with a cost estimate far below that of other more conventional designs and saw the church built. It has been considered one of the early classics, and it is indeed a notable structure. But it is really a sort of concrete gothic—a medieval conception interpreted in 20th century technology.

Later in the same decade Otto Bartning, a German, who headed the Bauhaus for a time, was commissioned to design a church for an exposition in Cologne. He used exposed steel framing and copper panel "curtain wall." It is apparent in this work too that the principal achievement was the technical one. (It had other virtues too since—as will be noted later—Bartning was theologically sophisticated; but they were not very notable.)

ESTHETICS

Architectural esthetics have always been to a high degree a response to structure and other technical matters. So it has been inevitable that as new technology appears, a new esthetic should also. One early (1930) and noteworthy example was Böhm's St Engelbert in Cologne. Here the structure is a series of radiating vaults—elliptical in form rather than pointed or round-headed, sheathed in copper. The church seemed and still seems esthetically new. But the plan is basically that of Charlemagne's chapel fifty miles away and 1100 years earlier.

A number of gifted architects have designed churches with the same virtues and limitations in the years that have followed. Eliel Saarinen's Christ Lutheran in Minneapolis, Tange's St. Mary's Cathedral in Tokyo, Mies' little chapel at Illinois Tech are all examples of technical and esthetic sophistication coupled with theological naivety. Their newness and that of any number of other churches has been architectonic, with little or no attention to the changes that have taken place in this century in the areas of churchmanship, theological perceptions, ways of worship, or the general piety.

Nevertheless these things have been changing. And if places of worship are to be seen as images of faith as they always have been, these changes ought to be revealed in the

* Address given at GRA Regional Conference, Dallas, Tex., June 2-4, 1972
architectural form. Church design ought to respond to them as well as to the changes in the esthetic and technical milieu.

The changes in the church have been both varied and profound. And the fact is that we are able to observe their effects on building forms. I should like to comment on some important ones.

THEOLOGY

Bartning, who designed the steel church at Cologne, had proposed earlier that the long, narrow proces-sional or axial plan is inappropriate to Christian understanding. The proper view of the congregation, he said, was that of a cohesive community of clergy and laymen whose members should be aware of their unity as the Body of Christ, the household of God, the family of believers. When they meet it is not as individuals at prayer, but as a community acting together. He saw the circular plan as the proper reflection of this self-understanding, and made a model, called the Star Church, with altar in the center and a full ring of people about it. By now this image has been built many times. And its general propriety as a formal expression is broadly accepted.

The Star Church, as Bartning conceived it in 1922, had an architectural form of strong ecclesiastical character, with internal piers, pointed vaults and other details typical of conventional church buildings. The theological implications of this design character are no longer acceptable. The round church Bartning later designed for Essen, despite its rather clumsy forms, and several other round churches, notably Sep Ruf's cylinder in Munich, are much better. For their general character is not ecclesiastical but secular. I shall need to expand on this because it is very important.

Although there are instructive exceptions provided by Mennonites, Puritans and others, Christians have been accustomed to worshipping since the fourth century in places that have been called "churches," or "sanctuaries"—places which have had a specifically ecclesiastical character. Until the time of Constantine, however, Christians were accustomed to meeting in homes or other convenient places. (The exceptions, where Christians built specific buildings for worship are few, and we know little about them.) Curiously, one of the allegations made against Christians was that they were atheists because they had no temples or shrines.

The assumption usually made is that the Christians of the patristic age were too few, or too poor, or too persecuted to build churches. But when one reads about the early centuries one is struck by the record of many successive decades without persecution in a tolerant empire, during which Christians may reasonably have assumed that persecution was past. One is struck also by the reports of fairly large Christian communities, and by the evidence of some considerable wealth and high position.

J. Gordon Davies, whose book, The Secular Uses of Church Buildings, provides a scholarly study of the matter, asserts: "The fundamental explanation of the lack of church buildings is a theological one." Other scholars agree. The early Christians refrained from building temples, shrines, ecclesiastical and liturgical buildings because they didn't believe in them. Let me cite Davies at further length, including his own quotation from Lohmeyer:

"Since the focus of the divine presence is no longer a physical building, but the living community in the world, any idea of the profane as the sum total of common life outside the sphere of the holy is foreign to New Testament thought... The division of life into a sacred area and a profane area... is no longer valid. This does not mean that the sacred and the secular have become indistinguishable but that, through Christ, they have been united. This is apparent from the form and context of early Christian worship. The eucharist cannot be distinguished by its form from all secular acts as a sacrifice can; its form is in fact constituted by the ordinary daily custom of men and its context is their daily life centered in the home. Christian worship is characterized by the usual and the familiar, even in its prayers and actions, and it can take place wherever men satisfy their hunger with thanksgiving to God and in fellowship with the Master. The homeliness of one's own house, or the beauty of the countryside take the place of the holiness of a particular building with the holy altar and sacred sacrifices."

The change that took place after Constantine made Christianity the official religion and great masses of people attached themselves to the Church compromised these early positions. It is not hard to understand the process. But that it was a gradual change is suggested by the fact that as late as 428, the Bishop of Rome asked the clergy to wear ordinary garb, and not special garments. And more to the point of our concerns is the fact that when Christians began to build special liturgical buildings they adopted as models not the shrines or temples of religion, but the basilicas, which were secular meeting halls, thus continuing the association of Christianity with the ordinary, everyday world. The transformation of these secular spaces into "houses of God" took generations.

What seems to be of central importance to our interests is that Christian theology has generally recovered in the last decades a concept of the relationship between secular and sacred which ties us back to the pre-Constantinian church. This perception is affecting the life of the church in many areas; it is also revolutionizing the approach to providing places for worship.

I don't want to imply at all that Christian congregations should suddenly stop building in order to conform to practices of the patristic age. This is not the patristic age; congregations are different in many ways. And the society and culture in which congregations exist are different in many ways. We should be looking for ways of providing shelter appropriate to our times, but consistent with the Christian understanding we share with the early churchmen.

I think this means that our places of worship must not be conceived of as distinctive "holy" places as are most of those we know and have been building, but should be fully secular in character. They should not be seen exclusively or specifically as places of worship but should be offered to our communities for purposes other than worship. They should be so designed as to be very flexible, not so much because the flux of liturgical usages demands it (though this would be reason enough for flexibility), but because the commitment of these spaces to events other than worship requires it.

Now I want to say what I think this means in more detail. It means that the structures we build to shelter our
assemblies should not seek to be different in style or general appearance, in the use of materials, or in the detailing from other good structures we design. A church building should not “look like a church.”

We must commit ourselves wholly to the sense that these buildings which our churches own are not God-boxes. We cannot make God-boxes; He will not be contained. The encounter between God and men is not limited to certain places or certain kinds of places. We cannot build temples or shrines or fanes. And if we try to build that sort of structure, a building that implies by its shapes, materials or details that religion is separated from the common life of men, we are asserting a heresy; God is not separated from the common life of men. Perhaps we should stop calling these buildings “churches,” and return that word entirely to its original meaning—to designate the community of believers.

In brief, we must build secular buildings, not ecclesiastical ones—as secular as the stable in Bethlehem, the hillside in Galilee, the upper room in Jerusalem, and the restaurant at Emmaus.

But let us understand very clearly that when I speak of “secular” architecture I do not mean dull, ordinary, commonplace, humdrum, run-of-the-mill, prosaic, everyday architecture. The point is not that this sort of architecture is inappropriate for a place of worship. It is not fitting for the children of God in any circumstance or enterprise. It is just not proper that people who believe that God has entrusted the care of the world to men should ever build banal or careless or ugly structures, whether they be gas stations, or cattle sheds, or retail stores. But it is most of all improper that those buildings which are taken to be symbols of the mind and values of religious people should be careless or banal or ugly or prosaic.

If the religious vision asserts that we live in the presence of a transcendent mystery, then the witness to this consciousness ought to be made in our architecture as well as in our words. Those forms of nature or art which bring us most readily to sense the transcendent are the complexes of experience we call beautiful. The ancient and universal companionship between the priest and the artist has developed, there can be no doubt, because beauty is a portal through which people glimpse the transcendent. There is therefore a persistent urgency that when Christians undertake to deal with their environment they should make it beautiful.

If Christian theology sees the world as God’s habitation—the meaning of the Incarnation as the evidence that

God is among men—it should affect the way Christians build. The architectural form should imply that we do not meet God in some exotic and fanciful place, as if we wished to escape from the world, but in an utterly real, authentic and earthly circumstance. Our non-churches ought to have much more of these qualities than do almost all of the churches we know. And they ought to be much more forthright and artless than the meeting places we find in most hotels, restaurants, and other secular places of assembly as well.

And if Christian theology sees men as the crown of creation, honored by the presence of God among them, and asserts that the greatest of virtues is mutual concern, care and love, then the buildings Christians erect ought to be of evidence of this ideal. Their character ought not to be overpowering, presumptuous, brutal, harsh, or in other ways inhumane, as are some of our church buildings and many of our other environments. There ought, instead, to be the quality of hospitality, grace, generosity, humanity.

LITURGY

These last paragraphs have been a minimum exploration of what the results ought to be of the theological renewal through which we have been passing. There are also some implications of this renewal for liturgical practice and therefore for the spaces in which liturgy is sheltered.

One of the important changes is that whereas liturgy is sheltered and defined as a central event in which all present are participants in contrast to forms in which laymen are seen as audience and clergy as performers. Architecturally the form which most explicitly supports the latter and archaic understanding is the traditional two-room ecclesiastical building with its nave for the laymen sharply separate from the chancel or choir for the performers. The round rooms such as Bartning and others designed and the fan-shaped spaces, which have for practical reasons succeeded in recent years, are in obvious ways an improvement. But they, too, have their faults. They are one-room churches, to be sure, but the encouragement to the audience-performer division has not been dissolved. They are spaces with a single, immovable and built-in focal area; the image of stage or arena is still present.

What is required is a space in which, as much as possible, action and congregation are merged; in which liturgical furniture and accoutrements are dispersed; and in which the members of the corpus christi are conscious of and participate not only in the action of the liturgical leaders but in each other as well. Such an intention is not likely to be accomplished in fixed and rigid symmetries or formal geometrical patterns such as a circle or a fan.

There has also been a renewal of the awareness that the liturgical event depends not on objects but on people, on actions rather than on things. The erection of elaborate and imposing altars or pulpits or crosses as foci for devotion are inimical. The holiest things in the place of worship are the people—not the objects or symbols. And all the things, which need not be very many, are their servants. It is quite proper that when the people are not present the place of worship should seem incomplete—a place in waiting.

Another consideration of the liturgical space is that it is not to be thought of as a place of privacy. We are free to provide such spaces where they are needed, as they often are; but the liturgical space is not such a place. It is not a place of private prayer, but of common prayer. In general this suggests that dim “religious” lighting, special quietness, and other features which support the character of a shrine are mistakes.

Possibly the quality which needs particular emphasis in the non-church—because it is the one which most clearly demonstrates the non-ecclesiastical and secular character—is that of flexibility. The reason is dual. In the first place the nature of the liturgy as it is now being recovered or generated includes the creative, the changing, the unexpected. No longer do we assume that the ideal forms of worship should be fixed in a regular and predictable detail. (It is true that the so-called non-liturgical churches have always asserted that they disliked fixed patterns; but it is also true that in practice they have tended to routines almost as rigid as those of the liturgical churches.) James White’s book, New Forms of Worship, an excellent and scholarly discourse, says that in addition to the formal skeletons of liturgy, good worship requires continual creativity, change and variety in response to the changing world. Those who have read Gregory Dix will recall, that his comprehensive study of the patristic liturgies describes them as full of variety also.

What this seems to ask of the places where we worship is that they should be rooms of simple shape without insistent foci or features that limit the arrangement of people and things within them; and that the furnishings, equipment and whatever symbolic devices seem appropriate adjuncts to the liturgical enterprise should all be movable if not portable.
It does not mean that the *things*, the furniture, the symbols, the artifacts and the art should be eliminated. Indeed, as many people have observed, we are seeing a surge of interest in the non-verbal, an increasing sensitivity to the arts, and a growing appreciation of the sensual experience in contrast to the rational and discursive. So the need for the artist and the artisan is not diminished; quite the opposite. Those who have been devoting themselves to the ecclesiastical arts and are fearful that their skill and livelihoods are becoming obsolete should take heart. Their arts are more than ever necessary, but the clues to the direction of change, it seems to me, are several; they relate to the desire for flexibility, for secularity and for truly human service. If a room is to be flexible, for instance, it is clear that the pew, with its ecclesiastical associations, needs to be replaced by another kind of seating. If we eschew the ecclesiastical style, the furniture, the symbols, the artifacts and the art should be eliminated. Indeed, as many people have observed, we are seeing a surge of interest in the non-verbal, an increasing sensitivity to the arts, and a growing appreciation of the sensual experience in contrast to the rational and discursive. So the need for the artist and the artisan is not diminished; quite the opposite. Those who have been devoting themselves to the ecclesiastical arts and are fearful that their skill and livelihoods are becoming obsolete should take heart. Their arts are more than ever necessary, but they need to change.

The clues to the direction of change, it seems to me, are several; they relate to the desire for flexibility, for secularity and for truly human service. If a room is to be flexible, for instance, it is clear that the pew, with all its ecclesiastical associations needs to be replaced by another kind of seating. If we eschew the ecclesiastical style, the furniture, the symbols, the artifacts and the art should be eliminated. Indeed, as many people have observed, we are seeing a surge of interest in the non-verbal, an increasing sensitivity to the arts, and a growing appreciation of the sensual experience in contrast to the rational and discursive. So the need for the artist and the artisan is not diminished; quite the opposite. Those who have been devoting themselves to the ecclesiastical arts and are fearful that their skill and livelihoods are becoming obsolete should take heart. Their arts are more than ever necessary, but the clues to the direction of change, it seems to me, are several; they relate to the desire for flexibility, for secularity and for truly human service. If a room is to be flexible, for instance, it is clear that the pew, with all its ecclesiastical associations needs to be replaced by another kind of seating. If we eschew the ecclesiastical style, the furniture, the symbols, the artifacts and the art should be eliminated. Indeed, as many people have observed, we are seeing a surge of interest in the non-verbal, an increasing sensitivity to the arts, and a growing appreciation of the sensual experience in contrast to the rational and discursive. So the need for the artist and the artisan is not diminished; quite the opposite. Those who have been devoting themselves to the ecclesiastical arts and are fearful that their skill and livelihoods are becoming obsolete should take heart. Their arts are more than ever necessary, but they need to change.

The flexible space, as I have said, is fruitful because it serves the liturgy well. But its second advantage is that it can serve purposes other than those of worship. And this it must do. For if the structure is used only for the purposes of worship, it will almost inevitably come to be thought of as a sanctuary, a "holy place." It would become a church, not a non-church; and this would be destructive of the understanding of the Christians who gather in it.

But more important: as Jesus was the "Man-for-Others," his followers ought to be men-for-others. What they do ought to be done unselfishly, and when they build, they ought to consider from the beginning that their enterprise can be shaped so as to serve the good of the people around them—the neighborhood or town or city. Those who attended the Annual Conference on Religious Architecture in 1970 may remember Dr. Edward Grey's injunction in this regard: "A church should not build at all," he said, "if the only needs it seeks to serve are its own."

It is obvious that if a congregation takes a broader position, its aims will be directed toward flexibility. All those things which serve a changing and creative liturgical practice ought to be accepted as part of the program. Furthermore there ought to be provision for rear screen projection, and for variable acoustics. Neither of these devices is any longer a novelty in a place of worship. Nor is the kind of churchmanship which seeks eagerly to serve the general community with its whole building. We expect to see one of our new centrums used during the coming year for concerts, theater, dance, a cinema festival, dinners, lectures, and probably for political events. And all these events are planned as events which will engage and hopefully enrich the lives of many people beyond the parish. It can be expected, I should think, that some of them will learn to understand something about the life of God in the world and the commitment of Christian people to their neighbors.
RELIGIOUS ARTS EXHIBITION—
33rd National Conference on Religious Architecture
Atlanta, Ga., April 27-28, 1972

"Way of the Cross"

Second Award:
"Resurrection" — Batik Tapestry
Stephen Blumrich
3223 Hyde St
Oakland, Cal. 94601

Third Award:
"Deposition" bronze sculpture
Gerald Bonnette
12487 40th St. So.
Newport, Minn. 55055

FAITH & FORM regrets that no photograph is available of the first award winner at the Atlanta exhibition—a stained and faceted glass by Benoit Gilsoul.
Honorable Mention:
"Tree of Life"
John T. Acorn
College of Architecture
Clemson University
Clemson, S.C. 29631

Special Citation:
"Pieta" and "Way of the Cross"
Nancy Snooks
127 S. Arden Blvd.
Los Angeles, Cal. 90004
Wheeling and Dealing in the Vineyards of the Lord:
Churches as Real Estate Entrepreneurs*

by
The Rev. Virgil E. Murdock
Executive Director
Benevolent Fraternity of Unitarian Churches
Boston, Mass.

In the beginning the Congress of the United States of America, by passing the Housing Act of 1961 and subsequent Acts, created “low- and moderate-income housing programs.” Non-profit sponsors and limited dividend sponsors created them.

Now the reason for this new act of creation, we are told, was to encourage construction of places of habitation for those who were either too rich to live in the so-called public housing—built and owned by quasi-governmental agencies called public housing authorities, but too poor to live in private housing so-called—that is, housing built, financed and owned by non-governmental parties. But some there were who cynically said that this creative act was really the result of naive expectation, or political expediency, or a combination of the two on the part of the members of Congress, and yea even unto the President of the United States. Some there were—and some there still are—who say that this new creation is more successful at making rich men richer than housing poor people better.

In any event, the act of creation occurred, and many people in churches, both clergy and laity, usually without first consulting the Gospel according to Luke, or other Holy Writ, accepted the invitation to become doers of good, at no cost to themselves, as officials in high places assured them they could.

And so it came to pass in those days, and in these days as well, that the good people of the first Church in Anywhere, USA, organized a non-profit corporation, hired themselves lawyers, consultants, builders, accountants, and managers—and yea even architects employed them. And they built a hundred, or two hundred, or even three hundred dwellings on vacant land near their church. Since they planned to build but one group of places of habitation, and indeed built no more, they came to be called a “one-shot sponsor.”

It came to pass also that an assembly of high priests, bishops and assorted other church bureaucrats saw what the First Church had accomplished, and seeing that it was good, they decided among themselves after much discussion, and even prayer, that if one project was good, would not five, or ten, or even a hundred such projects be even better, and so they organized a non-profit corporation and set out to build many projects, so that they came to be called “multi-project sponsors.”

Now, there were in the same city in those days, certain businessmen who had heard of the great creative act of the Congress and President of the United States of America and had seen the good works performed by both the First Church and the National Church and decided that not only could they do the same good works, but they could make a handsome profit also. And so, they organized themselves into “limited-dividend” and “limited-distribution” partnerships and began rehabilitating old buildings and building new buildings as places of habitation for low- and moderate-income individuals and families. Not only did they build and rehabilitate many houses, but they reaped also great harvests of profit by selling parts of their partnerships to rich men like themselves who could use the paper losses on the building and operating of the housing projects, due to the rapid rate of depreciation allowed by the great creative act of the U.S. Congress and President. They then came to be called “profit-motivated sponsors.”

Now the church sponsors, both one-shot and multi-project, were sorely grieved, seeing that they had not been able to reap great harvests of dollars in like manner. As churches they had no need of tax write-offs and the great creative act of the Congress and the President of the U.S. did not allow them to sell their depreciation, so it fell upon barren ground and the wind blew it away so that it was lost forever. But then the wise men of the church said to themselves: “Why do not we as church non-profit sponsors become partners in limited-dividend partnerships so that we may reap this rich harvest for our own good purposes. So, in these latter days, some church non-profit sponsors remain pure—that is, not tainted with the profit motive; others have begun to make alliances with the profit-motivated sponsors and as a result of these entanglements they shall be called “mixed-motive sponsors,” a strange being—at once avowedly non-profit but yet hoping to make a profit, for their own good purposes to be sure.

I have told you these things so that you, both as architects and church people, might better understand and recognize these strange beings: pure
non-profit sponsors, pure profit-motivated sponsors and mixed-motive sponsors, all of which could be either "one-shot" or "multi-project" sponsors involved in either rehabilitation or new construction of housing for rental or sale.

Let me now relate to you a strange tale which I know to be true so that you may more clearly see how these strange things I have related came to pass. There once was an association of 39 Unitarian Universalist Churches in the neighborhood of Boston in Massachusetts, called the Benevolent Fraternity of Unitarian Churches which had gone about doing good in all the years since 1826 A.D. When, in the fullness of time, it was decided that their method of doing good was seen to be neither very useful nor very necessary, they sent out a man to find new ways of doing good.

I was that man, so I know whereof I speak. I looked many months for new ways of doing good, and lo, messengers from the Federal Housing Administration and the Boston Redevelopment Authority came to me with a dream, and said to me: "Why not build places of habitation for the poor?" But I replied: "We are a small group of men and women, with many preachers among us, who have operated settlement houses and neighborhood centers, who have ministered to students, the elderly, the sick and the poor. How can we be reborn in an instant to be hewers of wood and layers of brick?"

Then they took me to a high hill overlooking the city and showed me how such a great transformation could take place, and at no cost to us at all. "Land," they said, "we will sell to you at a very low price. At great cost to ourselves we will acquire two whole city blocks, demolish the buildings thereon, and sell it to you at a minimal price." This miracle they called "Urban Renewal."

"Money," they said, "we will lend to you for only 3% interest (later lowered to only 1%). Enough we will lend you not only to buy the land and build the buildings, but even yet 2% more to help you put the project into operation." The first of these miracles they called "below-market rate interest" and the latter one "AMPO" (amount to make project operational).

"Taxes," they said, "will be lowered to only 15% of the gross income of the project and during construction you will pay even less." This miracle in Massachusetts is called a "121A charter" by some — and by others a tax deal.

And then, miracle of miracles, they said: "If, even after a land subsidy, an interest subsidy, and a tax subsidy, the rents are still too high for some people, we will subsidize their rents directly by paying you a part of their rent each month." And these additional miracles they called "public housing leasing" and "rent supplement payments."

Truly it was too much for one man and one institution to withstand. All that miraculous assistance plus all the professional help we needed. Why certainly here was a way in which we could do great good, at no expense to ourselves, and perhaps, if the buildings stood for forty years, leave a legacy of valuable real estate to future generations. And so it came to pass that it was moved, seconded and voted that the Benevolent Fraternity of Unitarian Churches would organize a non-profit housing sponsor corporation, and that it should be called Joseph Tuckerman Memorial, Inc. after our founding father.

Then it was that we set out for a community called Lower Roxbury where we first acquired nine buildings and rehabilitated them for sale to low-income families using FHA miracles numbered 221(h), 312, and 220. Later it came to pass that the Boston Redevelopment Authority delivered to us, as they had promised, two parcels of land totalling about four acres and asked us to build 280 places of habitation for families of low and moderate income. The FHA and its newborn sister, the MHFA, then delivered to us the money, again as they had promised, so that we could buy brick and wood and steel, and could pay men and women to assemble them into buildings for 120 dwellings at the place we call Westminster, and 160 dwellings at the place we call Willard. Sometime this summer (1972) the doors will be opened and with the help of the aforementioned miracles called "public housing leasing" and "rent supplements," low- and moderate-income families will find new homes at Willard and Westminster Place.

But even now, as we search for other places and other ways to do this great good of building homes, there are angels of doubt, or perhaps even messengers of Satan himself, spreading the word in the very midst of all doers of great good and workers of great miracles that what we are doing may not be good at all — but bad. The New Republic, Time and Newsweek — and our own daily newspapers — carry stories saying that the products of our good works and miracles are in trouble, grave trouble. Some even point to us and say: "There is a man who started to build and could not finish."

How did such a thing come to pass? Where did we go wrong — where did we go wrong — where did we go wrong.
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The Student Competition at Atlanta

by
Joseph N. Smith, FAIA
School of Architecture
Georgia Institute of Technology

As a part of the 33rd Annual Conference of the Guild for Religious Architecture (April, 1972), the Georgia Tech School of Architecture was asked to conduct a student competition for the design of a facility for worship and religious education. Working with a committee of Guild members, Professors Arthur F. Beckum, Jr. and Dale A. Durfee directed the competition in a fourth year architectural design class of 28 students during winter quarter of the past academic year.

The students were first asked to choose individually a particular religion to serve as a model for the design. They were to learn the specific requirements for the facility dictated by liturgy, seasonal needs, educational and community service goals. However, more importantly, they were to try to understand the spirit of the religion, and how it can be expressed in a building form to communicate the precepts of the congregation to itself and the public. The students researched the origins of the religion, the changes it had undergone, its contemporary posture and the kinds of buildings built and being built. Most of the prominent organized western bodies were represented in the competition—Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox, Methodist, Presbyterian, Orthodox and Reform Judaic, Unitarian, Baptist, Lutheran, and Episcopal. One student chose to deal with a more inclusive hypothetical ecumenical center.

Concurrent with the first stage, the class investigated the general site, Perimeter Mall Shopping Center. This regional center, on the northern part of Atlanta's perimeter expressway, is the first part of a very large development which, when completed, will include office buildings, apartments, hotels, and a mini-rail internal transportation system. The group felt there were three very promising sites—one "plugged-in" to the center, one at an extension to a future arm of the shopping mall, and one at the edge of the parking lot on what will become in the future, a secondary road serving housing and industry. In spite of the obvious appeal of the "on-mall" location, the perimeter site was chosen as it was felt that it offered better opportunities to explore the aspect of religious expressiveness. The site is opposite the parking lot of the center, however, the church or synagogue would use the parking of the shopping center making a more even parking distribution, since peak days of the religious facility are at low or non-use shopping periods. Consequently, the land needed is considerably less than for a more typically sited suburban church.

Programs were established by each student consistent with the requirements of his chosen congregation. However, all were similar in size being based on a sanctuary seating of 400 with provisions for educational and social uses appropriate to that size congregation.

At the conclusion of this first stage of study and analysis, the students proceeded with the design of their individual projects under the direction of Professors Beckum and Durfee. The completed projects were reviewed by a jury selected by the GRA: Professor-emeritus Julian H. Harris, FAIA, FNSS; Benjamin Hirsch, AIA, GRA; the Rev. Henry Gracz; Gerald Deckbar, AIA; Prof. Arthur F. Beckum, Jr.; Prof. Dale A. Durfee, AIA; and myself.

The First Prize of $150 was awarded to Leslie Spencer for his Methodist Church. Mr. Spencer's submission was notable for its striking and simple concrete structure of compact plan. The designer used particular care in admitting natural light into the sanctuary in such a way as to emphasize the table and pulpit while avoiding a mystical atmosphere.

The Second Prize of $100 was awarded to Robert Rivers for a Congregation of Unitarian Universalists. This building is also compact, having a circular central space surrounded by a gallery serving curvilinear spaces of varying size corresponding to needs. Day-care spaces, classrooms, and other more important areas open onto gardens, while the smaller service spaces (toilets, mechanical spaces, etc.) do not. The entire facility is encompassed in a gently-sloped berm matching in profile the shallow conical roof over the central meeting space. Like many of the projects, an overhead pedestrian connection is made to the parking lot across the perimeter road in anticipation of future heavy traffic.

Robert L. Jones received the Third Prize of $50 for his Roman Catholic Church. This circular plan building, which is also of low profile, arranges the functions with particular regard to the significance of the activities. The baptismal font is placed traditionally in a symbolic position indicating entrance to the religion; however, it grants entrance not only to the space for worship but to the educational and socially-responsive activities. Consequently, the simple roof covers all spaces with the dominant space being circulation and symbolic admission rather than the sanctuary.

Honorable Mentions were awarded to Richard Reisman for his Reform Synagogue and to Frederick W. Hill for his Ecumenical Services Center. Sponsored competitions are of great importance to architectural schools. In addition to the obvious financial gain to the student, they afford the opportunity for work with a wide segment of professional and lay persons—in this case, with a national body representing concern for the buildings used to further man's religious goals. The Georgia Tech School of Architecture was honored to be chosen for this competition. It was a rewarding experience for our students and faculty.
Robert Rivers
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Robert L. Jones
3rd Prize
Roman Catholic Church

Frederick W. Hill
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Liturgy Starts with People*

by
Dr. James F. White
Perkins School of Theology
Southern Methodist University

In a very literal sense, the Greek root of our word "liturgy" begins with "people." And that is important to remember on more than just a linguistic basis. Most of our problems in worship today, I am convinced, grow out of our ignorance of and lack of concern for people. If there is one important thing to be observed in the last decade, I think it is the splintering of society, from which we have been forced to accept a plurality of moralities, generation gaps and life styles. Surely pluralism is a key word to understanding people in our time.

I can illustrate this best by referring to a recent best-seller, Charles Reich's The Greening of America. This work of pop-sociology gives us some useful labels to identify three types of "consciousness." Consciousness I is the self-reliant individual with a strong belief in work, the product of a stable society. In worship, he prefers the "old" hymns, those of late nineteenth-century vintage. Consciousness II is the corporation man, whose identity arises from being "with" some giant corporation and who believes in working for reform within the system. He prefers the "good" hymns, i.e., music of the eighteenth century or earlier. Reich's description of Consciousness III is the most interesting. It appears most conspicuously in the youth culture with its indifference to the hangups of the corporation man. It insists on the individual being free to be himself and yet warmly to be identified with his own community. This type of individual prefers to sing "something that moves."

I describe these differing types not to praise or to condemn any one of them. Indeed, quite the opposite, for the gospel calls us to love and serve them all. But I cite them to show the obvious—the plurality of the types of persons within our society. It is painful, though, to raise the question as to how sensitive we have been in our worship to the cultural expressions of each of these three types of consciousness. If these cultural expressions are theologically neutral, and I am convinced they largely are, then can we defend a type of worship that favors one to the exclusion of others?

As an example, most of our suburban congregations maintain a style of worship that is thoroughly Consciousness II. The service always proceeds from the top of the upper left-hand corner of a piece of paper (the bulletin) to the bottom of the right-hand page. Nothing unexpected ever happens; we never get off the track; and we always get to the end. We usually manage to do it in almost exactly sixty minutes, no more and no less. This is fine for Consciousness II; it thrives on security and comfort. But Consciousness I has a nostalgia for worship that had a bit of spontaneity—some foot-tapping music and an occasional "Amen." And Consciousness III demands spontaneity—though under different forms.

Two models have increasingly emerged in recent years. In one of these there is an attempt to have a service in which there is something for all the groups within the congregation, including children who are the most neglected group of all. This is an eclectic approach and works best in a small or moderate size congregation. The other model is that in which a

The Impact of the Environment on Children's Learning*

by
Mrs. Ann McGee
Assistant Professor of
Art Education
Southern Methodist University

"Sunday school is wearing a suit and tie or a frilly dress and having to be careful to keep it clean."

"Sunday school is having the teacher talk too much."

"Sunday school is having to memorize when you don't even understand."

"Sunday school is having the teacher say, 'It's all for your own good.'"

Religious education used to be a time to move away from life for a time to "cleanse ourselves" and "raise our level of thinking." Kids were talked at, dressed up, and generally turned off.

And then it began to dawn on the pedagogic family that kids were closer to life and learning outside the church or synagogue where they were involved than they were singing sweetly in a circle in Sunday school or Sab-

* Summaries, GRA Regional Conference, Dallas, Tex., June 2-4, 1972

bath school. In fact, as teachers began to worry about why kids didn't want to go to Sunday school, the teachers began to see all the barriers teachers and parents had put between kids and the kind of exciting, joyful discovery of the gift of life that they all wanted kids to experience.

Ritual without understanding is meaningless—as the above comments of children indicate. How can meaning for children be brought into the rituals that are part of the history of our faith? What does appeal to children and what does help them get involved in life and grow and yearn to learn about life? Certainly the environment cannot solve the problem alone, nor is the environment simply

pressions are theologically neutral, and I am convinced they largely are, then can we defend a type of worship that favors one to the exclusion of others?

As an example, most of our suburban congregations maintain a style of worship that is thoroughly Consciousness II. The service always proceeds from the top of the upper left-hand corner of a piece of paper (the bulletin) to the bottom of the right-hand page. Nothing unexpected ever happens; we never get off the track; and we always get to the end. We usually manage to do it in almost exactly sixty minutes, no more and no less. This is fine for Consciousness II; it thrives on security and comfort. But Consciousness I has a nostalgia for worship that had a bit of spontaneity—some foot-tapping music and an occasional "Amen." And Consciousness III demands spontaneity—though under different forms.

Two models have increasingly emerged in recent years. In one of these there is an attempt to have a service in which there is something for all the groups within the congregation, including children who are the most neglected group of all. This is an eclectic approach and works best in a small or moderate size congregation. The other model is that in which a

the physical surroundings. People and programs are other vital components of environment. New directions in religious education which might suggest a totally new kind of building and physical environment would include these kinds of areas:

1. Large open spaces conducive to open concept teaching.

2. Learning centers which would function within a large space so that small groups of youngsters could work together in an interested area and move to other learning centers as their individual interest dictated.

3. Media-discovery areas which could include sinks, material storage, functional floors, and smoke out in easy reach.

4. Display areas where the total religious community can share visual statements. These might be walls throughout the building plus modular display units which can be easily adjusted to exhibit all sizes of two- and three-dimensional work. Any hall areas can easily become excellent educational galleries and a vital part of celebrating God's gifts and offering up each person's own potential for service. By designing walls so that they can be used floor-to-ceiling for display, usually rather static areas of the church or synagogue can become filled with the inner vitality of life.

Continued on p. 28
A series of alternate services are provided so that people can choose that in which the forms of expression are those most natural to them. This is usually only possible in a large congregation where there are sufficient individuals to identify with each group and staff members to minister to them.

Architecturally, all this means much less rigidity and pre-determined forms of worship, and much more freedom and flexibility. As more and more congregations escape the rigidity of the fixed pew, we are gaining increasing possibilities for new types of worship to emerge. For some youth congregations, it may be time to discard chairs and provide for seating on movable carpeted platforms. We must also think of flexibility in vertical terms too. Today a wall is anything you project on it or hang or paint on it. You can change a wall even faster than you can move furniture. Our worship space is also defined by lighting and by sound.

This means that we must avoid buildings that tie knots in the future and work for buildings that are open-ended as far as the possibilities they provide for worship. Only then will they truly be people-oriented. Both architecture and liturgy must begin with people.
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JEWISH CEREMONIAL ART AND RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE
by Dr. Abram Kanof, Harry N. Abrams, Inc., New York, N.Y. $25.00
REVIEWED BY:
Harold Adler, AIA, GRA
Partner, Architects Group Practice
Alexandria, Va.

Jewish faith is founded upon abstinence from formal creed and doctrine; rather it is a matter of a daily search for the spirit of holiness, inspired by the same existential questions which beset men of all faiths and given special witness by the time calendar of weeks and seasons. To distinguish this uniquely Jewish bent, the philosopher Abraham Heschel speaks of the "architecture of time" which houses the divine into the activities of everyday life. The "function" of the cult objects was—and is—to serve mundane and purely secular purposes while steering a course toward the sublime. The Jew himself is described as one "with feet in the mud, and head in the stars."

In Dr. Kanof's book, example after example bear eloquent testimony to this underlying quest of spiritual lining for worldly experience. Vessels which deal with fire and light—not the light for utilitarian taskwork, but lights to illumine the soul by their reference to the forces of darkness and the God-given blessing of light. Vessels for food and drink—not to gratify the senses—but for thanksgiving to God, the Provider. Wine to celebrate the sweetness of life, bread to boast the pride of the seasons. Vessels for spice to quicken the love of the Sabbath, even at its very close. These are the "objects." The subjects with which they deal and the degree to which they communicate their message are the concerns of this art.

Jewish Ceremonial Art and Religious Observance presents first a general review of Jewish ceremonial art. The historical section cites a continuum of Jewish interest in the visual arts, from Exodus 35:31 to the present day. Dr. Kanof confirms his thesis of continuous involvement by recognizing individuals working throughout Jewish history in all fields of handicraft and visual arts—notably metalwork, textiles, calligraphy and ornamentation. There are chapters which identify, within the field of Jewish art, major areas of concern with form, style, motif and symbolism.

This effort to dispel the baseless notion of Jewish illiteracy in the visual arts will impress the layman with its clear sense of purpose and wealth of bibliography. However, the serious student of Jewish art will find Dr. Kanof's work in this area somewhat lacking in original research and deriving clearly from the liberally referenced professionals in the field—Roth, Schoenberger, Albright, Goodenough, Wischnitzer, Landsberger, Gutman, Yadin et al.

It is in the latter sections, which happily comprise the bulk of the book—where Dr. Kanof deals with the objects themselves, their forms and purposes—that his love and mastery of the subject are clearly revealed. Liberated from the pedagogy of scholarship (Kanof's doctorate is in the field of medicine; ceremonial objects are his labor of love), Dr. Kanof is free to expand and expound upon the objects of his delight: the candelabra, menorot, hanukia, mezuzot, spice boxes, winecups, mantles, curtains, crowns, breastplates, pointers and all the other implements of Jewish ritual life. Each and every article
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receives the full measure of the author's care and enthusiasm. This work is obviously the crowning achievement in Dr. Kanof's lifelong involvement with Jewish ceremonial art. It is a fitting catalogue to his own definitive collection and will long stand as a standard of reference in this field.

It should be noted here that the Doctors Kanof (Frances Pascher Kanof herself is a physician) are the benefactors of the Tober Pascher Workshop and School, housed in the Jewish Museum in New York City. The Kanof Gift acknowledges the sanctity of the Jewish home and seeks to encourage the practice of ritual by providing ceremonial objects of quality design and moderate price. Under the directorship of Ludwig Wolpert, the Workshop has exerted a healthy influence in replacing a prevailing, decadent taste for the barren, fake opulence of the European baroque with fresh, vigorous designs grounded in contemporary esthetic. The Wolpert creations have inspired young Jewish artisans and laymen everywhere to reach for new meanings and experience in Jewish ritual ceremony. (Until this reader saw his first Wolpert, he thought all Jewish objects had to look like "that"—i.e., the Czar's birthday cake; realizing that this was not necessarily so opened up a whole new world of interest and challenge.)

Jewish Ceremonial Art and Religious Observance is liberally illustrated with black-and-white photographic reproductions, of varying quality, most of them having been seen previously elsewhere. However, the stunning full-color prints tipped-in seem freshly original and provide continual surprise and delight for the eye as one reads through the book. I note with some irony that the publisher has seen fit to produce this book entirely in Japan, a soil surely foreign to both the subject and the object of this book. There, under the swift sure hand of the industrious Japanese, where the universal spirit of the bauhaus now hovers, a technical almost photo-mechanical competency has been transmuted into the pages. Perhaps this accounts for their icy, uniform perfection and, probably, the reasonable cost of the production, which made the whole enterprise possible. But somehow, something has been lost in the translation, and the resulting tone is somewhat discordant. But these comments are surely carping. They are intended only for purposes of feedback for those who care about these things. As for me, I feel great gratitude for this compilation of Dr. Kanof's. The scope of his interest, coupled with his cogent commentary, speak to a lifestyle of religious sensitivity increasingly rare these days. Jewish Ceremonial Art and Religious Observance, while documenting the long history of this "endangered species," does not end it. Happily, it opens the door to an intimation of tomorrow and a whole bright, new happy future. Amen, Dr. Kanof.

Continued on p. 31
largely because we were able to articulate our needs to the architect."

The structure embodies public areas—the church, chapels and meeting rooms—as well as the private living areas of the monastery itself. Dart's choice of materials and shaping of spaces creates a subtle visual separation of these. Quarry tile floors in the public areas contrast with carpeted floors in the private sections. In the latter areas, lower ceilings enhance the feeling of privacy.

The design expresses a feeling of restraint and moderation. There is a satisfying sense of simplicity throughout.

Main Line Unitarian Church

Architects: Chappelle & Crothers

A young congregation of Unitarians had purchased a large colonial style house as a place to hold their services and activities. Rapid growth of the congregation required expansion of their facilities. The building committee had no preconceived ideas about the way the additions were to be made or the architectural style. It was apparent, however, that they desired neither a colonial or traditionally ecclesiastical treatment. A contemporary design which would not conflict with the stone residence—which was to remain as the core—was developed.

There was agreement on the importance of consistency in the choice of materials and forms. Additions were related to the existing building by means of materials, scale and form. Stone was chosen as the exterior wall material, use of compatible roof slopes positioned so that they obviously turn the new elements back towards the original house; an existing porch bonded the new to the old.

The main entrance will face an open plaza which will contain the second phase of the project, scheduled to begin in 1973: 24 low-rise family living units and two twelve-story apartment towers with 96 living units for the elderly.

The entire project is planned to fit into the fabric of the existing community and to serve as a catalyst in a vitally needed neighborhood regeneration.

Calvary Baptist Urban Renewal Project
Paterson, N.J.

The Calvary Baptist Urban Renewal site is situated in a declining area one mile from Paterson’s central business district. The privately sponsored project will comprise a full city block. The clients—Calvary Baptist Church—wished to replace their deteriorating church facilities with a new complex adequate to sponsor a program of spiritual, educational, recreational and fellowship activities.

The proposed church and day care center (lower left-hand corner of photo) is the first phase of the project. The building will contain a sanctuary and fellowship hall with a Christian education and day care center. The adjacent facilities will include classrooms, a library, day care rooms and offices. A small chapel and a campanile will be later additions.

The main entrance will face an open plaza which will contain the second phase of the project, scheduled to begin in 1973: 24 low-rise family living units and two twelve-story apartment towers with 96 living units for the elderly.

The entire project is planned to fit into the fabric of the existing community and to serve as a catalyst in a vitally needed neighborhood regeneration.
Sound-discovery areas which facilitate the use of a wide variety of sound instruments, tape recorders, listening posts, record players, slide and film-strip projectors, and other learning equipment. Educators are learning that children can successfully assume the responsibility for using most audio-visual equipment. This makes possible working in a variety of experiences; assuming responsibility, helping others and the development of independence is thus encouraged.

5. Large movement areas for activities with learning tools—such as parachutes (which can become giant clouds as children study weather, or magic carpets, or pollution settling over a city), shape bags (which are people-sized pillow cases made of stretchable material that allows for free movement in imagination building), and space tapes (large elastic strips used in movement-tension games to encourage group interaction and discovery).

6. Special areas for learning activities—such as the growing of gardens and the raising of animals.

7. A quiet area to be used by small groups or individuals.

Other innovations which are being enthusiastically explored in many congregations and are proving to add both depth and enjoyment to the learning experience are:

- **Children as Teachers:** Just as in large families the older children assume some of the responsibility for raising the younger siblings, so in the schools across the nation educators are learning to tap this vital resource. It was found that not only was the teaching very effective for the child-as-learner, but that the child-as-teacher learned much more than he would have in a purely learning role. Sharing responsibility and decisions with the learner seems to be an important part of the secret of good teaching.

- **Multi-Aged Grouping:** It has long been recognized that each child is an unique individual who learns and grows at his own rate of speed. Yet children are continually grouped by age and taught as groups rather than as individuals. For these reasons, multi-aged groups are being used more and more with a three-year age span as the usual base. Again in this structure there are small interest groups, choices of activities, and children working independently.

- **Families Sharing Learning:** Efforts to keep parents informed on the latest ideas in learning and recognizing the importance of their role as educator in their child's life led from Discovery-Learning Mornings, where mothers came and shared learning with their children.
child, to 1) Daddies' Night, where dad was invited to come with his three-, or four- or five-year old to an evening of fun and learning together, to 2) Family Learning Evenings, where there were learning centers for every age group and a learning plan so that each age level had something valuable to contribute. More and more families are seeking help in the structuring of family learning situations where people learn more about themselves and others, their own role in the family, and that all individuals have valuable contributions to make to the lives and learning of others.

In planning for worship experiences for children—recognizing God's plan, His existence, His love, giving thanks, asking forgiveness, renewing the promise to serve God—all these take on more relevance to the theological meaning of the act when they take place within the context and environment of learning and living. Instead of going to a special place to pray, children are encouraged to give thanks or hear scripture within the experience of planting seeds or role-playing their problems. This approach relates directly to the attitude that religious faith should relate to all of life rather than be only spoken at intervals.

And finally, in planning for new structures, landscaping must always be considered. The building must "fit" the site; it must grow out of the environment or add harmoniously to it. Usually a sizable amount is spent on landscaping to help serve the purpose of blending, and frequently sculpture is something wanted but perhaps often lost in a compromise over funds and esthetic taste. How exciting it would be to see a children's play area combined with the landscaping plans for the building. The most beneficial play areas are not those with swing sets and seesaws, but are areas with multi-levels, surfaces of sand, pebbles, grass, etc., sculptural shapes that can with imagination suggest most any exciting adventure to a child—and water in fountains and pools. What if these goals were combined and the grounds surrounding the building were multipurpose, landscaped to encourage the safe play and imaginative growth of youngsters. What an exciting and rewarding environment to celebrate God's gifts of nature and youth and all of life!

The environment suggested here as most functional and conducive to new directions in religious education is one allowing for large, open, multipurpose areas well thought out to serve multi-age groups of children busy discovering together that learning is life and that life is the gift of God.
we fail to count the costs accurately! I will attempt to relate to you some of the reasons why the realities of our accomplishments are not completely in accord with the vision we had when we began to think about doing good by building homes.

1. It was said in the beginning that we could perform all these great works at no cost to ourselves; that all the front money—almost $200,000—would be returned when construction began. Such was not the case. We still have over $50,000 invested and additional investments may be required. Item. We failed to count the cost accurately.

2. It was said that enough money would be available from rents to pay both the costs of operating the project and the payments of principal and interest to those who loaned us such great sums of money, even $7,400,000. Since construction costs were so high, to build the project at all required that too large a share go into the building and too little set aside for operating costs in the future. Item. We failed to count the cost accurately.

3. It was thought by some, even said by some, that our good works would be so appreciated by the people who moved into the new dwellings that slow rent payments, vandalism, bad debts and high repair costs would be of little or no concern. A fallacious assumption. Item. No one loves a landlord, even—or perhaps especially—a church that is also landlord.

4. It was said that even persons not trained as builders could adequately develop, build and manage these good works called "low- and moderate-income apartments and houses," but in truth, many experts—each with his own ideas and goals, often in conflict with the ideas and goals of the sponsor and/or other professional experts—are involved and the sponsor, the owner, the doer of good is by and large powerless to mediate between them, or to enforce his own policy decisions when they disapprove.

5. Of all the costs which were not counted, the greatest of all, seemingly even now uncountable, are the costs of the miracles required to get these places of habitation for low- and moderate-income families built and rented. Let me now relate to you those costs which I have been able to determine and count.

The miracle of urban renewal—which provided the land: the average of the three prior years' assessment of the land we acquired was $244,000, or almost $1,000 per unit. Add to this the cost of demolishing the buildings thereon and the installation of new streets and utilities therein, plus the overhead of the Redevelopment Authority—and who can count such costs?

Assume for a moment that a family could afford $100 a month for housing. Add to this the $200-monthly cost of the miracles necessary to provide one apartment in our projects, and it would seem to be just as cheap to give the family a housing allowance of the same amount so that they could buy a home in Wellesley, or Needham, or some other place.

But more importantly, watch out for the day when Congressmen and taxpayers count the costs of all the subsidized housing in this country and realize that except for the land subsidy, it's going to go on for at least forty years—perhaps reduced, but also perhaps increased substantially. Now we are beginning to believe that a new and expensive miracle is needed, lest the whole enterprise turn sour. Watch for this new miracle—to be called an "operating subsidy." For in some instances it is already being performed, and of its increase there is no doubt.

Many other stories of wondrous acts and prophecies for the future
could I now utter, but my tale for today is told. To all of you: architects and church types, miracle workers and doers of good, I have only these concluding remarks. That there is a great and growing need for housing with low and moderate rents and purchase prices, there is no doubt. But that the present system—so dependent upon expensive miracles—will provide such housing in anything like the quantity and quality needed to meet the need, I think all of us have grave doubts. What the future holds in the way of methods for doing this kind of good—faster, better, cheaper, more efficiently—none of us knows. So we must go on doing as much good as we can with the tools we have at hand and the miracles now being performed, while at the same time we work and hope for better tools and even greater miracles.

To this audience, a special benediction: from that unquestioned and unquestionable source of wisdom—a fortune cookie—this admonition: "An architect who works with a non-profit sponsor is like unto the lawyer who defends himself, for it is written that he has a fool for a client." But as doers of good we offer no defense save that from another source, 1 Corinthians 4:10, where it is written: "We are fools for Christ's sake."

**Book Reviews, Continued from p. 26**

**CHRISTOPHER WREN**
by Kerry Downes,
The Penguin Press, $12.50

**REVIEWED BY:**
The Rev. James L. Doom
Board of National Ministries
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.
Atlanta, Ga.

Books about Wren tend to be biographies celebrating the drama of changes in the man's life and his accomplishments, or guidebooks describing in more or less detail his more important buildings. Kerry Downes strikes a new note. Other writers examine the buildings to draw conclusions about the mind of the architect. Kerry Downes delves into the mind of Wren in order to draw conclusions about his buildings.

It is a daring method. No one could sustain the method without full scholarship, sound judgment, and a real knowledge of Wren's place in the world of Baroque art. Downes, who has written *English Baroque Architecture,* and two books on Hawksmoor, is well prepared for the task he has chosen. He carries it off in clear, brief, positive style.

Downes assumes that his readers will know the narrative of Wren's life, and therefore does not reproduce it. Though he assumes their general familiarity with Wren's buildings, he supplies 35 photographs of his own showing perspectives or details which do not appear in the photographs illustrating other books about Wren. Each photograph, plan or drawing appears on the page at which it is needed to illuminate the text.

The book opens with a look at Wren as a hero of British art. That calls for an objective consideration of the scope of his achievement; an admission of his faults; and a weighing of his balance of rationality with intuition. Downes discovers the mind of the man by studying Wren's brief writings on the theory of architecture; the record of his design processes in the documents of his office; the structural and the visual effect of his buildings. He analyzes the library of Trinity College, Cambridge as a convincing epistle of this process. The function of the library is not merely to house scholars and books, but to augment the whole life of the college by enhancing indoor and outdoor spaces for study and discussion.

In Chapter 2 Downes takes up Wren's transition from mathematics and astronomy to architecture. Most authors treat this as an amazing break between two competent but inconsistent careers. Downes sees that it was an inevitable growth which, for Wren, was a natural transition when opportunity offered. Wren always preferred visual solutions for intellectual problems. "When in 1658 Pascal posed an arithmetical problem to the English philosophers Wren produced a geometrical figure for solving it." He enjoyed drafting. Wren shared with his fellows in the Royal Society in the search for universal truth underlying the physical world, encyclopaedic range of interests;
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reliance on experiment rather than tradition, and optimism that problems could be solved. To move from all of science in general to the particular science and art of architecture was for Wren a progress not a leap.

"It is essential, although perhaps initially not easy in an era in which arts and sciences have grown apart into 'two cultures,' to recognize that from childhood onwards Wren needed the coordination of both, the intellectual and the visual approach, the underlying mathematical rules and the felicitous accident, the ordained certainty and the free experiment, Reason and Fancy."

The book organizes discussion of all of Wren's palaces and public buildings into one chapter thus showing the continuity of characteristics as one man addressed himself to many different sites and functions, whether civil, military, or royal.

Perhaps the most helpful chapter is the fifth, "What Is Meant by Wren's Style." Downes distinguishes three ways in which we use the word style: those characteristics of a man's work which make it his own, those characteristics of a man's place or time which affect him and relate him to his place in history, and those characteristics of buildings which make them symbolic, conveying universal meaning apart from personal and historic influence. Downes deals with all three: "The robustness of Wren's designs springs from their originality and from the fact that he could not or would not limit himself to conventional solutions; he arrived at unconventional ones through knowledge and willful choice, not through ignorance of the canons of Antiquity. Although a great artist's style is consistent he does not repeat himself, because for him each work poses new artistic problems and thus requires new solutions; it may be said of most of his works that he had done nothing like this before."

In the last chapter Downes discusses the City Churches and St. Paul's Cathedral together, even in the same paragraphs. The reader must stay alert to know when a paragraph which opens dealing with the churches shifts to discussion of the Cathedral. Downes brings out more clearly than any other author the role of Dr. Robert Hooke as Wren's colleague in design of the churches, and attributes to Hooke the evident influence of Dutch Protestant churches on Wren's design.

In his discussion for the various designs for St. Paul's, Downes agrees with Margaret Whinney that Wren, frustrated by the clergy's nostalgia for medieval forms, fell back on an immature design he himself had abandoned to win the support of the clergy for a building far greater than they could conceive and promptly broke ground to build that nobler concept. He fits the chief criticisms leveled at St. Paul's squarely into its context in the Baroque. "Any definition of the character of St. Paul's ends in the illusionism and the ambiguity which are among the fundamentals of Baroque art: the making real of the imaginary and the extraction of two meanings or functions from one object."

One amusing detail: Readers who first meet Wren are often surprised to find how modern his interests were. He experimented successfully with the transfusion of blood. Downes supplies another instance: William III, England's last warrior king, was an asthmatic who hated damp, and was no lover of tenting as a life style. Yet he was forced to spend much time in the field lingering off the alliance of James II with Louis XIV. Wren's Office of the Works produced a portable house which could be transported on two wagons into the field for William. The problems of blood transfusion and prefabricated buildings are with us still. Wren's world was not so different from our own.

Kerry Downes comes to his final conclusion: "Wren is interesting because as an artist and an intellectual he is complex and sometimes paradoxical. If he is also great it is because his mind is deep, detailed, thorough, and not only complex but integrated."
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of the Regency-Hyatt lobby, conference participants renewed the structure of human community at the Celebration climaxing the creative resource team that architects, artists, and religious people united through wordless communication, and the warmth of shared experience. And in a meaningful ancient ritual, both Judaic and Christian, they symbolized the reality of their shared commitment by breaking bread together.

Nils M. Schweitzer, FAIA
Past President, GRA

Jargon — Tool/Crutch

In a jargon-happy age, every group tries to develop its own particular line of patter. At the Atlanta Conference of the Guild for Religious Architecture, which was an astounding success, jargoneese reared its ugly head like weeds in a flower garden. To help stamp out these weeds, or at least identify them for what they really are, Herman Hassinger, AIA, GRA, of Philadelphia, has compiled a list of some of the more popular jargon heard at that conference. To everyone in attendance, and particularly to the Rev. William Pinder, we hereby dedicate the William Pinder Memorial Jargon Speech Kit. This kit is applicable for architects and clergy-men whose meaningful dialogue will help them become better jargonists. Simply take one word from each column, reading left to right, in any random order. String groups of these words together with short connecting sentences, and you have 1,000 mind-boggling combinations which will enable you to lay down a smoke screen concealing the fact that you, too, have absolutely no idea what's going to happen next. Viz:

- creative resource
- team facilitator
- facilitator
- meaningful resource
- team facilitator
- meaningful resource
- team facilitator
- creative utilization experience
- process concerns
- specific design
- process concerns
- finalized output
- objective process
- input
- total objectives
- co-ordinated
- emerging energy
- strategic energy
- gathering lifestyle
- overview reaction celebration
stained glass
association
of america

Craftsmen of Merit

SGAA is a non-profit organization established to encourage the finest development of the ancient art of Stained Glass in contemporary America. One of our members will gladly consult with you on design problems and budget considerations.

Architectural Research Corp., Detroit, Mich.
Filbur H. Burnham Studios, Wakefield, Mass.
Garverd Art Studio, Calgary, Canada
Century Studios, San Francisco, Calif.
Church Art Glass, San Francisco, Calif.
Glass Studio, Fort Wayne, Ind.
Sommers Studios, Pinedale, Calif.
Urban Studios, New York, N.Y.
Dial Studios, New York, N.Y.
Kadel's Studios, Kansas City, Mo.
Vitreus & Vitraxs, St. Laurent, Que.
Fredrica Fields Studio, Greenwich, Conn.
Franklin Art Glass, Columbus, Ohio
Mil Frei, Inc., St. Louis, Mo.
W. W. Hiemer & Co., Clifton, N.J.
High Point Glass & Dec. Co., High Point, N.C.
O'Neely Stained Glass, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Mebre Stained Glass, Dallas, Texas
Henry Keck, Inc., Syracuse, N.Y.
R. A. Manning Co., Inc.
Lutheran Church in America
M. P. Möller, Inc.
Ossit Church Furniture Co., Inc.
Primer Metals Co.
Princeton Manufacturing Co.
Rambusch Co.
Roman Fountains, Inc.
Sauer Manufacturing Co.
Conrad Schmitt Studios
Schulmerich Carillons, Inc.
Stained Glass Association of America
Third International Congress
Tuohy Furniture Co.
I. T. Verdin Co.
Wicks Organ Co.
Willet Studios
Winterich's
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The Guild for Religious Architecture acknowledges with gratitude the support of the following exhibitors at the 1972 Atlanta Conference; their participation contributed greatly to the interest and success of the Conference.

ABINGDON PRESS
Nashville, Tenn.

BLENKO GLASS CO. INC.

BUCKINGHAM-VIRGINIA SLATE CORP.
Richmond, Va.

CARTER-MIOT ENGINEERING CO.
Columbia, S.C.

CAMPBELLSVILLE INDUSTRIES, INC.
Campbellsville, Ky.

COMMISSION ON CHURCH ARCHITECTURE
Lutheran Church in America
New York, N.Y.

CUSTOMBOOK, INC.
South Hackensack, N.J.

DEERING-MILLIKEN, INC.
Lagrange, Ga.

DIMENSIONAL PLASTIC CORP.
Hialeah, Fla.

ENDICOTT CHURCH FURNITURE CO.
Winona Lake, Ind.

FIBERGLASS SPECIALTIES, INC.
Henderson, Tex.

FOCAL POINT, INC.
Murrells, Ga.

DANIEL GLUCK METAL SCULPTURE
Lawndale, Cal.

HAMLIN MANUFACTURING CO.
Chicago, Ill.

J. G. FURNITURE CO. INC.
Quakertown, Pa.

KOPPERS CO. INC.
Atlanta, Ga.

LAWS STAINED GLASS STUDIOS, INC.
Statesville, N.C.

LEONIDS LINAUTS STUDIOS
Mehonta, Pa.

MAAS-ROWE CARILLONS
Los Angeles, Cal.

MATTHEWS BROTHERS CO. INC.
Bloomington, Ind.

N.H.C. STRUCTURES
Lafayette, Ind.

NEW HOLLAND CHURCH FURNITURE
New Holland, Pa.

S-K CHURCH FURNITURE CO.
Jacksonville, Tex.

SAUDER MANUFACTURING CO.
Archbold, Oh.

SHERWOOD CUT STONE CO. INC.
Atlanta, Ga.

STAINED GLASS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
St. Louis, Mo.

TRIMBLE HOUSE CORP.
Atlanta, Ga.

VAN BERGEN BELLFOUNDRIES, INC.
Greenwood, S.C.

THE I. T. VERDIN CO.
Cincinnati, Oh.

WICKS ORGAN CO.
Highland, Ill.

WINEGARBER CORP.
Lynchburg, Va.

JOHN W. WINTERICH & ASSOCIATES, INC.
Bedford Heights, Oh.

The following exhibitors received award certificates for excellence of product presentation:

Award of Merit
BUCKINGHAM-VIRGINIA SLATE CORP.

Honorable Mention
BLENKO GLASS CO. INC.
ENDICOTT CHURCH FURNITURE CO.
STAINED GLASS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA