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NOTES & COMMENTS

A Message from Eldon F. Wood, AIA, President, GRA

The 1976 National Interfaith Conference on Religion and Architecture convenes July 6 in Boston, Mass. at the Copley Plaza Hotel. Information regarding program, exhibits and registration is included in this issue of FAITH & FORM. It will be an occasion for celebration—participation—communication.

Boston is an auspicious choice for the Conference this Bicentennial year. In addition to being a spawning ground of the American Revolution, Boston’s architectural heritage is a rich reflection of 200 years of American taste and culture. The Conference program has been arranged to bring the city’s architectural setting into the total Conference experience. And the Boston Bicentennial Commission has done an outstanding job in arranging activities which will be meaningful and of interest to all age groups. The Conference hotel offers special rates for those who may wish to bring the family—come early—stay late.

Registrants will find many opportunities for learning and for participation in a Conference program designed to meet a variety of needs. Workshop topics reflect basic and current concerns. The architectural exhibit is the only national exhibit today focusing not only on spaces for the worshipping community—but on projects sponsored by the religious community as well. The arts exhibit is of equal importance wherein circumstances forced an emphasis on condemnation, castigation and demonstration. Now the time is ripe for the restoration of celebration—in Boston, July 6-8. Join us.

Bicentennial Exhibitions of Religious Architecture

As their contribution to the Bicentennial celebration, St. John’s Episcopal Church of Lafayette Square (Washington, D.C.) will present a retrospective exhibition of American religious architecture. Designed in 1816 by Benjamin Latrobe, one of our foremost Federal period architects, and nicknamed “the Church of the Presidents,” St. John’s own architectural and historic background provided the inspiration for this project. The exhibition, scheduled to open at the end of April, will survey the general progression of architectural styles in American religious buildings and will comprise approximately 70 representative religious structures dating from 1632 to the present day. By focusing on the architectural aspect of American religious life, the exhibition hopes to make Americans more aware of the living heritage inherent in the religious structures which surround them. A 64 page catalogue will be produced in conjunction with the exhibition. After May 1 it can be purchased from St. John’s Church, Lafayette Square, Washington, D.C. 20005.
WORSHIP, LITURGY & BUILDING*

Dr. Laurence H. Stookey
Asst. Professor of Preaching & Worship
Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C.

In designing buildings for worship it is not sufficient to remember the counsel that “form follows function.” For liturgical architecture the rule is: “Form follows function; and faith precedes both.”

Unfortunately, the relationship between faith as expressed in doctrine and faith as expressed in the functions of worship has often been overlooked. But the past quarter century has witnessed a renewal of interest in the theology of worship. This renewal is ecumenical and has important implications for liturgical architecture.

In a brief article it is impossible to outline the theology of worship of each denomination. But it is possible to consider together the views of Roman Catholics, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Anglican and Methodist bodies. For despite their great differences in the past regarding worship, all of these groups are sensing that they have a great deal in common.

This is not as surprising as it may appear at first if Reformation history is carefully considered. Luther and Calvin were the spiritual fathers of the four Protestant families involved. These two men were the liturgical conservatives of the Reformation. Unlike Zwingli and the Anabaptists (the radicals), Luther and Calvin retained sacraments, even though reducing the number from seven to two. Thus these Protestant groups share with Roman Catholics important assumptions about the nature of Christian worship.

Even stronger reasons for an emerging consensus among these denominations are to be found in recent theological developments. Through biblical studies the Hebrew roots which nourished the faith and worship of the early church have been rediscovered. Historical studies have affected the way both Protestants and Roman Catholics look at the Reformation and the eras which preceded it. As a result we are now in a situation quite unlike that of twenty-five years ago.

At one time Lutherans considered Luther to be normative with respect to worship. Presbyterians consulted only Calvinistic precedents. Anglicans and Methodists looked to the Book of Common Prayer as the rule. Roman Catholics steadfastly adhered to formulations set forth in 1570 following the Council of Trent. Everything was neat and orderly. If, for example, you had attended a service of the Lord’s Supper twenty-five years ago, without knowing the name of the church or looking at a service book, you could have discovered whether you were in a Roman, Presbyterian, Lutheran or Methodist congregation. Today this is not the case; and therefore neither is it true that denominations need distinctive architectural settings for their services.

The importance of this emerging ecumenical understanding of worship can hardly be overestimated. But the news of the change has not yet reached some local congregations which, when designing a building, may be quite content to perpetuate outdated patterns. Therefore it is important that the principal points of the faith be understood by those who determine architectural form, even if it is not understood by those who carry out liturgical functions in a local setting.

While it is necessary for an architect to determine the liturgical needs of a congregation, it may also be necessary for the architect to educate the congregation concerning new patterns of worship. To be sure, such education may be subtle. The architect may simply suggest that the congregation consult its denominational worship commission or a professor of liturgics in a denominational seminary. But this kind of direction is

*Extract from Dr. Stookey’s address at GRA Regional Conference, Duke University, October 1975.
necessary. Woe to that congregation which designs a building from the perspective of a denominational worship manual published fifteen years ago because it does not know that a new manual is already at the printers!

While details as to specific denominational rites cannot be provided here, certain trends can be described. Five central areas of faith which bear directly upon the functions and forms of liturgical space will be considered.

1. There is a new emphasis on preaching. Since Vatican II the Roman Church has taken preaching more seriously; a sermon or homily is now prescribed for at least the principal Mass each Sunday. While some Protestants attempted to pronounce preaching dead during the 1960s, the sermon refused to cooperate. Pastors who once preferred to stand in the center aisle and conduct group discussions or show slides are now back in their pulpits. Preaching aids are being published with renewed enthusiasm; both their authors and their purchasers are freely crossing denominational lines. Clearly, preaching is back. Therefore the role of the pulpit in architectural design must be examined carefully.

2. There is also a renewed understanding of and appreciation for the Lord's Supper (Mass, Eucharist, Holy Communion). The Supper is being celebrated more frequently among those who once observed it only two or three times a year. More importantly, the perception of what the Supper means has changed. Formerly both Roman and Protestants approached the Lord's Table with somber countenance. The Mass was considered to be a re-presentation (sic) of the sacrificial suffering and death of Christ. For many Protestants communion was virtually a funeral for Jesus, characterized by mournful hymns, hushed voices and black vestments.

In both quarters the Supper is now a much more joyous occasion - as it was in the ancient church. The keynote of the supper is thanksgiving to God for the resurrection and presence of Christ. This aspect of joy and celebration has implications for the importance and design of eucharistic space.

3. A renewed interest in Baptism and its relation to Confirmation is emerging. Except for Presbyterians, all of the denominations previously mentioned have published official or provisional liturgies for these rites within the past three years. These new services resemble one another far more than they resemble what preceded them in their respective denominations. Baptism is seen as having an integral relation to the biblical heritage as well as new importance in the life of the congregation. This should affect the size, design and placement of the font. (For example, the rather tired symbol of the baptismal shell might be replaced with symbols representing creation, the flood of Noah, the Exodus, and the resurrection of Jesus Christ. These motifs, central in the early church, were obscured for centuries but now are receiving new attention in contemporary liturgies.)

4. There is renewed stress upon the inter-relationship of preaching and the sacraments. The elements of worship are seen as necessary complements. Preaching is essentially a rational activity; the sacraments are essentially non-rational (though not irrational). Through both together the Word of God is most effectively proclaimed. On the one hand, God approaches us through the mind, and on the other hand, through the senses. Only a proper balance of sermon and sacraments allows for communication of the Gospel through the full range of human perception.

This complementary relationship of preaching and sacraments should be supported visually through the placement of the pulpit, table and font. The appropriate juxtaposition of these furnishings requires deliberate planning.

5. There is a recovery of the corporate nature of Christian worship. Often congregations have been looked upon as aggregates of individuals who gather to do what they could do almost as well in private. According to this view, public worship exists primarily for psychological and practical reasons: the worshipper gets a greater "lift" out of hearing 200 people sing; and it is impractical for the preacher to visit 75 or 100 families regularly and deliver sermons in each home. But this rationale for worship is now being judged insufficient.

There is a more basic reason for corporate worship. The Christian assembly is intended to be an organic whole, the company of the faithful bound up together forming what St. Paul called "the body of Christ." Public worship is qualitatively as well as quantitatively different from private worship. There is a crucial difference between a Christian congregation and an audience which gathers in a public place to hear a concert or a speaker. Furthermore, worship is not to be judged by asking the question, "What do I get out of it?" Instead, the central focus is upon what the believers put into worship as their grateful response to the saving activity of God. When apprehended this way, the corporate nature of worship has important implications for the three central liturgical activities already discussed.

When viewed as corporate in nature, preaching is not religious remarks addressed to individuals by a learned person; preaching is the Word of God coming through the preacher and addressing both preacher and congregation. The preacher also stands under the authority of the Gospel; and the congregation cannot respond to the sermon without taking into account the inter-relationship of its members.

The corporate nature of the Lord's Supper reveals that this rite is not an action of individuals who receive the elements of bread and wine each for his or her personal benefit. Rather, the communicants form the body of Christ, the Church, which together receive the body of Christ through the eucharistic elements. This gift is given of God in order that those who accept the sacrament may be strengthened for service to God's whole creation.

Nur is Baptism a rite which pertains only (or even primarily) to the individual receiving it. Baptism is the sign of God's action and speaks to us of his love which constitutes the church and incorporates us into the body of Christ. The baptismal service is a congregational occasion on which the people welcome new con't. page 25
Midway through the 1970s is a good time to look at what has happened to church architecture in recent years. Change occurs so gradually that it is only by a look backwards that we can see the distance we have come. Yet, when we look back over even so short a time as a decade, we find just how different the pace-setting church buildings of today are from those built around 1965. Recognition of these differences can give us perspective on where we are going now.

I must confess that I write this with some sense of personal involvement. My book, Protestant Worship and Church Architecture (1964) was used, for better or for worse, by a couple thousand building committees in the 1960s. Now out of print, I have no further stake in it. But it does help me compare those things which seemed to me so true and obvious when it was written in 1963 with what I can observe today. The book was written, of course, before the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy had been promulgated or anyone had heard the word “experimentation” applied to worship. Some still have not, but most Christian worship, both Catholic and Protestant, has undergone major changes in the last dozen years. What has happened architecturally is a good outward and visible sign of those changes.

I shall try to describe the differences, then, between the pace-setting church buildings of the mid-sixties and those of the mid-seventies. In either case, we are dealing with the minority of the churches actually built; most new churches, then as now, reflect a worship-as-usual attitude. People are still keeping the faith by mimicking the buildings built in New England from 1790 to 1830, as if to keep a golden age alive. And just as one assumes that gothic at

long last has been priced out of the market, one finds oil-rich communities in Texas or Oklahoma who had not heard. The pace-setting buildings, I would take it, are those most widely publicized in the architectural journals, in FAITH & FORM, and those granted awards at such meetings as the Guild for Religious Architecture conferences.

Since 1965 we have gone through a period of revulsion against church architecture in which many of us wondered whether a church concerned about mission had any reason to build. It must be said to the credit of many of the finest church architects that they were raising the question: “Who needs us?” just as vigorously as the clergy were debating the morality of building. We are past that phase, I think, and better off because it occurred. For it made us see that a building can be a tool in mission and that that is its only purpose. And it made us realize just what a powerful tool architecture can be, for good or evil. Several of the pioneering congregations that began by denying the usual pattern of building ended up doing just that. As we got more and more into experimentation, we realized how much the building sets the agenda and that good buildings could work with us just as much as bad ones could thwart us. Architecture, we learned, opens possibilities for us or takes them away. So we came out of this stage with a much healthier respect for architecture as a tool in mission than we had had earlier.

I would like to analyze five basic differences between the churches we were building in the 1960s and those we are building today. Perhaps this will help give us some guidance for the next few years.

One of the principal factors affecting church building in recent years has been neither theological nor aesthetic. It is simply a matter of economics. The 1960s saw the last flush of a booming era of church building.
For the first of that period, over a billion dollars per year was being spent in this country for church buildings. As the sixties progressed, that sum was reduced; but even more significant was that the number of projects was diminishing as inflation eroded the amount of building the sum represented. The increasing cost of money was another factor in postponing and diminishing building projects. Now that money has become even tighter and building costs even higher, the amount of new building of any type has dropped still further.

This may be more of a blessing than we had realized. One of the regrettable factors about churches built in the fifties and sixties was that they were so fine and expensive. As our needs in worship changed, we found that we had built terribly expensive buildings which fought any adaptation. How hard it is to change something built out of cut stone! Indeed, what a sense of permanence and unchanging liturgical life such an anachronistic building material suggests!

I am sure that many others have felt the same urge I sometimes have when worshiping in these expensive, cold and formal buildings. I want to get a can of spray paint and spray some bright red crosses and words of hope on elegant Georgian columns or over intricate gothic arches. Any sign of life would help. Some of these elegant, expensive churches make me crave the store-front political office where anything relevant or impish gets taped up on the peeling plaster walls. How much more life such places have!

Frankly, a lot of those buildings were so expensive that we are forever intimidated by them. The pastor worked hard to raise the money, the donors are still around, and the word is "hands off." Had we been poorer, had our hopes been more modest, we might be better served by these buildings today.

Economic circumstances have changed that and quite possibly to our advantage. God does work in mysterious ways! Many of the best churches built since World War II were those built in Europe where money was tight. There was no extra money for gilding the lily. Many of the new European churches are honest, direct, and straightforward. As a result, they often have an aesthetic quality that many of ours miss. One American architect has a slide show of a congregation that got more and more money and kept adding things to the interior of their church. He ends by showing the original slide and, without a word, the point is clear: they didn't know when to stop. Economics are teaching us to know when to stop. We are learning the discipline of poverty.

This means that in recent years we have had to concentrate on essentials. What is absolutely basic for our use? And what is not? We are forced to ask these questions again and again and to concentrate on utility, building only what we absolutely must have and use. The rest we can do without; we may be better off without it. Had the same economic factors been operative in the early sixties as today, we might be better served by what we built then than we now are.

\section*{II}

A second major change is closely related to the first. A change in construction methods has been forced upon us largely because of economic factors. Today we would not think (though some might dream) of building a traditional timber-framed barn when we can build a post barn with metal sheathing so much cheaper. The same thing applies to churches. When you have to look again and again at the building costs per square foot, you begin to accept some realities you never before contemplated. This too may be a blessing.

One of the best churches I have seen recently was built with the same tilt-slab construction as the supermarket next door and at a remarkably low cost. Other new churches are being built with construction methods we usually associate with warehouses—cement block walls, flat roofs and exposed steel trusses. Supermarkets and warehouses, buildings calculated to return the maximum yield for the minimum expense, these are going to be our models from here on in. And why not? The church should be every bit as concerned about making the most of available resources as any business firm is. The irony is that these building methods can produce churches whose utility is just as great or greater than elegant cut-stone structures. In the hands of a competent architect, I would argue, they can be buildings of equal beauty. The challenge of limited resources may enhance the beauty. At least you know when to stop, if you ever get started!

Construction methods that we have associated solely with secular building types are going to be used more and more for churches. Theologically it makes sense too. As Dean Joseph Matthews says: "He's a sneaky God." We find the holy in the midst of the ordinary; sacred and secular are kith and kin.

Many of the best new churches have shown a different sense of scale. We are more inclined now to look at a church as a social part of the townscape which fits in with its neighbors rather than as a monument which dominates them. For too long our ideal was the New England village church that provided a landmark for the surrounding countryside. We simply transplanted these churches to the city. I know of one ultra-elegant Georgian church in a southern city that has the words "night cometh" on the clock face of its tower. When high rise bachelor apartments surrounded it, those quaint words took on new and less theological meaning.

Recently we have developed a sense of church buildings built on a domestic scale. One of the best new churches in the Minneapolis area was deliberately scaled to the dimensions of the surrounding single-family residences. An irony of much historic preservation has been our tendency to preserve the great house but to ignore the shacks of slaves (in this country) or serfs (in Russia) that made the great house possible. Perhaps today we have finally realized that the church belongs in the village, gathered about the gates of the great house, and not on the broad lawns of the estate itself. A servant people does not need mansions. Churches are going to complement neighborhoods now rather than dominate them.
Writing as I am in an impoverished part of Vermont, where virtually all new building permits are issued for pre-fabs and mobile homes, this may well mean more and more use of standardized building components in churches too. But then we are only talking about extent. Ever since nails began to be made in factories instead of locally, we have had standardization to a certain degree. In my farmhouse no two nails are the same for they were made by hand before 1800. But in the village there are several houses that came intact out of the same factory. The larger the standardized component becomes, the greater the challenge to its use in a creative fashion.

Using a domestic scale as our point of reference is nothing new. One need not go back as far as the early church for point of contact. Dissenters' chapels in eighteenth-century England were deliberately built on domestic models to avoid destruction by establishment mobs. And many of the establishment's own churches in eighteenth-century Virginia, built at remote country crossroads where towers would have no use, are clearly domestic in appearance. The same was true of many meetinghouses erected in New England until about 1790. Perhaps most consistent were the Quaker meetinghouses which, except for the two doors (for men and women separately), almost always resembled dwelling houses.

As we move from a monumental scale to a domestic one, we discover some advantages we had missed before. As we look for "that full, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations" which the fathers of Vatican II tell us is "the right and duty" of Christian people "by reason of their baptism," we realize the advantages of intimacy in liturgical space. Much of what seems desirable to us in worship today can be enhanced by a smaller edifice and defeated by a vast monument. I once heard Pope Paul VI preach against triumphalism in the church but St. Peter's Basilica shouted him down.

The most endearing quality about so many small country churches is how intimately they involve the whole congregation present in the liturgical action. There are no dead spaces, no columns to hide behind; everyone is right out on the fifty-yard line. I think we shall see much more church building that is constructed on a more domestic scale where everyone feels a part of the family of God, gathered about the Lord's table. And the construction methods may well reflect those ancillary structures built to serve the neighborhood—the convenience grocery store, the service station, and the drive-in bank. Just because these structures are usually ugly is no reason to assume that they must be so. Indeed, the church could perform a social service by demonstrating that standardized building components can be used in creative and attractive ways.

III

Moving toward specifics, we notice a significant change in a third area, namely the exterior profile of new church buildings. The characteristic pace-setter church of the 1960s sported a high and dramatic roof line. Indeed, when one looks at the buildings most highly publicized through magazine articles and jury selections of the time, they almost look like a study in comparative roofs. By contrast, many of the most interesting churches built in the last few years have flat roofs and present a low profile.

The high and dramatic roof of the church of the 1960s is almost a trademark of that time. The A-frame and the parabolic curve were among the most noticeable. Del Ramey's Holy Cross Lutheran in Wichita, Kansas, built in 1953, was surely one of the earliest of these and their numbers multiplied throughout the sixties. Many other unique roof lines were explored and the buildings of Victor Lundy became models of poetic hovering roofs. Frequently these dramatic roofs were combined with skylights or clerestory windows to create interior light effects often focused on the altar or pulpit. Frequently the effect was that of baroque architecture but it was combined with a technical virtuosity that baroque architects would have envied. We must acknowledge the creativity that often went into the design of those soaring roofs of the 1960s and the variety and beauty that frequently resulted.
But it is significant that during the late 1960s such forward-looking architects as Uel Ramey and Edward Svik began building churches in which the roof was inconspicuous and the profile not particularly high. Such examples have proliferated in recent years.

Among the various emotive factors that people associate with the interior of a church, unusual height seems to be the most constant. One can get into quite an argument whether church interiors should be brightly colored or dark, well lighted or dim, roughly textured or smooth. People's power of association with what "looks like a church" will vary on these factors but almost all seem to agree with the demand for unusual height. It is interesting that exceptional height should be the last of these emotive factors to be questioned. Of course, buildings with low exterior profiles may still give the illusion of excessive height on the inside by focusing light downwards and the shadowy cross-crossing of trusses overhead may suggest dark recesses that can pass for height.

Still, we cannot resist raising some theological questions. Is the move away from high profile buildings simply a matter of economics and new construction methods? Or is it a deeper move in worship away from a stress on God as transcendent to a recovery of the sense of God's immanence? Certainly the economics of building today are tighter. But would we still want those tall structures even if we could afford them? The more restrained and modest buildings of our time show a move towards a simplicity that we previously failed to recognize as important. And it may reflect a deeper sense of the presence of Christ in the liturgical assembly itself and not just on the altar or in a tabernacle. The Quaker meetinghouse was often non-directional in reflecting a sole concern with the Spirit-filled congregation. Similarly, today's church may be more people-centered by making congregational space the only real liturgical space. Or it may be an unconscious recognition of the Spirit that blows where it wills! At any rate, separate and distinct chancels or sanctuaries, high and lifted up, seem to be increasingly relics of the past. The architectural features that tended to focus attention on such areas have been jettisoned in recent years.

Another reason for such change is that the liturgical usages of recent years are indeterminate themselves. Indeed, we may have just recently passed beyond experimentation by having incorporated it into our history so that by now innovation has almost become a standard part of worship for many congregations. This means that the interior ought to be indeterminate so that whatever needs to be done on each occasion can determine the arrangement and focus of the building, not unchanging steel and concrete.

I am not speaking especially of buildings designed to be multi-purpose which are often deliberately vague as to orientation and devoid of commitment to any special function. Such buildings have often, and with reason, been criticized as being good for everything and excellent for nothing. Spaces designed exclusively for worship usage have also moved to a non-directional approach.

Several factors are at work here. One of them is a deepened sense of the presence of Christ in the liturgical assembly itself and not just on the altar or in a tabernacle. The Quaker meetinghouse was often non-directional in reflecting a sole concern with the Spirit-filled congregation. Similarly, today's church may be more people-centered by making congregational space the only real liturgical space. Or it may be an unconscious recognition of the Spirit that blows where it wills! At any rate, separate and distinct chancels or sanctuaries, high and lifted up, seem to be increasingly relics of the past. The architectural features that tended to focus attention on such areas have been jettisoned in recent years.

Another reason for such change is that the liturgical usages of recent years are indeterminate themselves. Indeed, we may have just recently passed beyond experimentation by having incorporated it into our history so that by now innovation has almost become a standard part of worship for many congregations. This means that the interior ought to be indeterminate so that whatever needs to be done on each occasion can determine the arrangement and focus of the building, not unchanging steel and concrete.

IV

A fourth change, closely related to the exterior profile, has come about regarding the interior orientation of the building. The high roof lines of the 1960s usually focused attention on one spot of the interior, either by zooming downward dramatically or by soaring skyward spectacularly. The same purpose was accomplished by lighting too. But today's building is likely to be non-directional. There is not likely to be any obvious "holy place" nor even a definite architectural focus. If there is to be such a place, it must be created for the occasion by the arrangement of the people and furnishings, rather than being predetermined by the architect.

Several factors are at work here. One of them is a deepened sense of the presence of Christ in the liturgical assembly itself and not just on the altar or in a tabernacle. The Quaker meetinghouse was often non-directional in reflecting a sole concern with the Spirit-filled congregation. Similarly, today's church may be more people-centered by making congregational space the only real liturgical space. Or it may be an unconscious recognition of the Spirit that blows where it wills! At any rate, separate and distinct chancels or sanctuaries, high and lifted up, seem to be increasingly relics of the past. The architectural features that tended to focus attention on such areas have been jettisoned in recent years.

Another reason for such change is that the liturgical usages of recent years are indeterminate themselves. Indeed, we may have just recently passed beyond experimentation by having incorporated it into our history so that by now innovation has almost become a standard part of worship for many congregations. This means that the interior ought to be indeterminate so that whatever needs to be done on each occasion can determine the arrangement and focus of the building, not unchanging steel and concrete.
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Christ Church, United Methodist
Fort Lauderdale, Florida
Architects
Harold E. Wagoner, FAIA & Assoc.

CARTER-MIOT STEEPLES
Custom-made to the architect's design and specifications
Installed by Carter-Miot's experienced and skilled personnel
A variety of metals available — porcelain enamel — aluminum — copper
Assuring a superior quality of workmanship and material
Over 160 installations — 29 states—

Write for brochure:
Carter-Miot Engineering Co.
P.O. Box 212
Columbia, S.C. 29202
NEW PROJECTS OF INTEREST

Monastery of Saint Clare
Architects: Dagit/Saylor

In the ten years since Vatican II, abrupt change has been seen in religious attitudes. It is extremely rare that new monasteries are designed today and few architects have the opportunity of working in this area. The architects involved with the Monastery of Saint Clare stated that their early dialogue with the sisters revealed an awareness that monastic life consisted of two basic intertwined life styles, the Private and the Communal. Thus the placing of the cells in one single line produced also a processional way, binding private and communal through a linking corridor. The ramp allowed the corridor gallery to overlook the communal spaces while connecting everything symbolically to the chapel.

Since the chapel had to be divided into public and Community use, the garden was incorporated into the Community’s space as part of the chapel while the public gets a glimpse of it. Here the public and the Community come together to form a separate but together congregation. The architects feel that the building answers new questions about monastic life in the 20th Century. They departed from the ancient cloister form to satisfy the modern spirit but have preserved the tradition of monasticism and its unifying qualities. It is their belief that this attitude reafirms the spirit of Vatican II and its desire to create a more humanistic approach to religion—and a more human approach to humanity.
Peachtree Road United Methodist Church
New Fellowship Hall and Remodeling Project

Architect: Jack Durham Haynes
Atlanta, Ga.

Peachtree Road United Methodist Church had been a suburban church—and now found itself an urban church in ministry to a diverse community of people with varying life styles. An eight-year study, evaluation and long-range planning process demonstrated the need for enlarging and renovating the facilities.

The changes in its membership—more single adults, more retired people, more members without children—were becoming apparent and required differing concepts of mission. It was felt that the size of the congregation (4600 members) required a Fellowship Hall with a seating capacity of at least 500. Jack Durham Haynes, architect for the new Fellowship Hall and remodeling project, has written:

"I have never been convinced that building a larger hall solely for the purpose of serving more food to more people was really worth the money involved.

"However, as I thought more and more about the changes taking place in our church, its changing parish and changing mission, and the nature and purpose of Christian Fellowship, I began to realize that we weren't talking about just a bigger place in which to serve food to more people; we were talking about a new kind of place.

"I began to realize that what we need is a space not set aside for special uses but a space to which we will feel drawn and in which we feel drawn to each other; a space in the heart of the church buildings in which everyone experiences the feeling of having arrived in God's house—a space in which we all feel at home."
FUNCTION & BUILDINGS*

Dr. John H. Westerhoff III
Assoc. Prof. of Religion and Education
Duke University Divinity School, Durham, N.C.

My definition of a professor is important to this address: a professor is one who professes what he or she believes at the moment in order to stimulate others to think for themselves. With that in mind, I confess that I am likely to make numerous bold and undefended remarks. I do so for the purpose of discussion.

My theme is simply this: we shape our architecture and our architecture shapes us. Recall the debate prior to restoring the British House of Commons. Churchill feared that any new design which departed from the original intimate pattern where opponents faced each other across narrow aisles would radically affect English government. His instincts were more than likely correct. Change a people's space and in time you change their lives. Space affects our world view and values. In terms of faith, architecture is second only to ritual in its influence upon us. It is regrettable therefore that so many persons, for all intents and purpose, ignore the significance of architectural design. Congregations often ask architects to design buildings without being aware that they will be an expression of faith and an influence on those who live within them.

Consider learning space and our behavior as teachers. Most classrooms in universities once were (and are) designed by and for those who believe the best and only way to teach is through lectures. The lecture halls thus dictate a similar style of teaching to later generations of professors who might prefer — or be better at — other styles of teaching. When seats are anchored to the floor, small group discussions are difficult if not impossible. Place a teacher behind a lectern with students rigidly placed in long lines before them and a blackboard anchored behind them, and more than likely that teacher will lecture, even against his will and best instincts. That is why I choose to teach in the student lounge where there can be movement, community, discussion and involvement in the learning process.

More significant, consider the changes in the family which correspond historically to the design of homes. Prior to the late eighteenth century in England, few persons lived in homes with differentiated space. There was little privacy. Persons came and went at will. Beds and tables were set up and taken down according to the moods and appetites of the occupants. Families tended to be larger. There was greater interaction and dependence. Certain values — cooperation and community — were sustained and transmitted through the design of living space. By the close of the eighteenth century, living space had been altered. Rooms assumed names and specialized functions. There were living rooms, dining rooms, bedrooms (one per person), kitchens and bathrooms. New dominant values emerged at the same time — competition and individualism — and families became smaller and less intimate. Of course, these are broad generalizations, but that need not distract from my contention that space is terribly significant in its influence upon our understanding and way of life.

Let me further suggest a somewhat extreme hypothesis for examination. The development of differentiated living space seems to be related in some way to the separation of religion and life. As homes were built with halls dividing one specialized room from another, the church appears to have assumed an increasingly separate and distinct function in the culture. Similarly, we began to differentiate space within our churches. There were rooms for worship, education and fellowship, each modeled after its secular counterpart. Space for worship often continued to have a distinctive quality, but sometimes it assumed the character of a hall. Educational space was modeled after the public school. And space for fellowship looked like the typical grange or American Legion

*Edited excerpts from address by Dr. Westerhoff at GRA Regional Conference, Duke University, October 10-12, 1975.
In turn, worship, education, fellowship and service became separate aspects of our religious lives; church life became estranged from the rest of life, and the church began to mirror the secular culture.

Recall that there was a day when the cathedral was at the heart of the community and had no differentiated space. The functions of education, fellowship, worship and service were united in a single space. Today, some of the most relevant cathedrals in England have eliminated their pews and are using their naves for all sorts of church and community activities.

I am aware that it is difficult to get church people to consider "one room" churches, but it might be helpful to explore our past so as to understand better how outside influences, no longer relevant, often determined how church space was ordered and designed. In New England, pews were not placed in our churches so that people could sit to pray. They stood to pray. Seats (pews) were built in boxes so that a family could sit in a circle (some with their backs to the pulpit), huddled together around their "heater" to keep warm during the long, two-hour sermons on cold winter days. Educational plants with classrooms were built when church education began to model itself after the public schools. And so it goes. Today we need to reconsider our life as a community of faith and redesign our space to correspond to that faith and the special needs of life in our day.

Instead of mirroring the culture, the church needs to ask the radical question of what it means to be human in community. That is not an unique architectural problem. If we are asked to design a park in a city, we also need to ask what it means to be human in community. To do so is to consider that the city itself provides walls and fences which help persons experience what it means to live within boundaries. Perhaps a park in a city needs to be devoid of walls and fences so that persons can experience openness, freedom and interaction. However, in the plains of the Southwest that same park may need architecturally attractive walls and fences to help persons experience what it means to live within bounds. Modern culture estranges aspects of our lives and hence alienates us from ourselves, our neighbors, nature and God. The church therefore needs to consider designing space that can aid in unifying us with each other, with ourselves, with nature and with God.

Such an aim also places other responsibilities upon us. Perhaps, for example, churches should be engaged in building space which can be heated by solar energy and be designed so as to destroy as little of the natural environment as possible. In cities we may need to consider seriously the recycling of old factories and design them so that they are integral to every aspect of community life. In any case, we should consider the importance of building one room churches which unite all of our lives as the people of God. This does not mean building a parish hall with the hope that some day we can build a building for worship. Churches should always be designed as sacred space—rich in symbolism. This sacred space needs to be so designed that it can be used functionally in a variety of ways.

The church needs to become a meetinghouse for a community of faith. As such its design needs to take two factors into account: first, it should witness to the world the faith of those who gather within it; and second, it should provide an environment which aids persons in the growth and development of their faith. In one sense, the meetinghouse of the people of God can be best understood as a great living room which expresses the community's tradition and where the faithful gather to live their lives judged and inspired by their faith to the end that God's will will be done.

Past ages responded creatively to their understanding and needs. Consider the early Sunday school. Our first space designed specifically for religious education in Protestant churches in America dates back to 1871. Known as the Akron Plan, it united the principles of togetherness and separateness with the importance of time. To accomplish these ends, they created a one-room building that could be divided into small units at a moment's notice. In the front of the room was a platform on which the superintendent's desk was placed along with a lectern and a piano. Here lectures, music and drama were presented. To one side of the large room was a library, to the other a kitchen. Space on the lower level was open to house church suppers, parties, and productions of all sorts. Around the edges of this space and in the balcony were areas which could be closed off with partitions so that small groups could meet individually; partitions removed, the area was open to create a sense of oneness through shared activities. Later we modeled our educational space after the public schools with individual classrooms for each age group. Typically, each had chairs and a table, blackboard, bulletin boards and cabinets to hold curriculum resources and other educational materials. Many good educational programs were conducted in both architectural settings. But life continues to change. New challenges are before us. We cannot afford to perpetuate earlier designs.

For too long we have talked about the functions of church as being worship, education, fellowship and service. Such conceptualizations have influenced our designing churches into sanctuaries, educational plants, fellowship halls and offices. In such differentiated space we have had difficulty enabling persons to grow in faith and to live their lives as Christians. As a religious educator, I have been struggling with this problem for some time. I have concluded that we need to find new ways to understand our educational ministry. But I am painfully aware that this new understanding will necessitate a new understanding of space and new designs for churches. I should like to turn to that special problem.

For too long we have associated education with schooling. We have, therefore, designed church schools with self-contained classrooms. These classrooms are used one hour each week for educational activities. When we plan religious education, we think only of what will occur in this specialized space. By doing so we estrange our educational mission from other activities in the church's life. We further neglect all the ways and places in which persons learn what it means to be Christian in the church. My contention is that we...
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In considering the topic of "Faith and Buildings," we need to remember that what we are prone to call "churches," meaning buildings, is not what the word meant to early Christians. The word "church" referred to the people of faith gathered to remember Christ, to give thanks, and to celebrate their salvation through him.

In Syria, at Dura-Europus on the Euphrates, about forty years ago there was excavated a house, which according to archaeologists was the gathering place of the local Christian community dating from 200 A.D. or earlier. It differed from other like dwellings only in a small room with a baptistry - a large square bath under a surviving canopy of stone or baldiquin. By this time then the gathering place of worship included provision for induction into the Christian faith, but still in a domestic setting.

For many reasons, including lack of means and recurrent persecution, it is generally agreed that buildings for Christian assembly and worship were modest and probably obscure throughout the second and third centuries. In Rome, the catacombs, while principally places of Christian burial, were not without small sanctuaries for worship - perhaps for the eucharist. The eucharist, we know from the Epistles of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch (110 A.D.), was now integral to Christian worship. But on the whole, remnants of early Christian sanctuaries are rare and their identity disputed. It is evident that many, perhaps most, suffered demolition under the persecution of Diocletian between 303-305 A.D.

The first edict of 303 directed that church buildings throughout the Empire be demolished, the scriptures burned and the elders imprisoned.

The edict was vigorously prosecuted in Asia Minor, in Africa and in Italy and Spain. Eusebius of Caesarea - the great early Church historian - testifies to the destruction of church buildings, the burning of the holy scriptures in the marketplace that he himself witnessed.

It was not until the Edict of Milan (313 A.D.), issued jointly by Constantine and Maximinus, that Christianity was tolerated along with the civil religion of the Empire and surviving city-state cults and "the mysteries," including that of Mithra. Still it was not until Constantine became undisputed ruler of the Empire, in 323 and thereafter, that anything like Christian ecclesiastical architecture could or did become clearly visible and acquire the forms that were to predominate until after 16th century Reformation.

We might venture to say that almost coincident with the epoch-making Council of Nicea, in 325, did Christian worship come out as it were from "underground" and the birth of distinctively Christian ecclesiastical architecture take place. The liturgy of the churches, which had been in process of formulation for two centuries, was no longer under official proscription and popular suspicion, dispraise or attack. On the contrary, Christian worship was suddenly established as the religio of the Empire, and Constantine's concern was for housing this worship in a manner commensurate with its imperial standing and recognition. It is generally conceded that Constantine's fervor in this matter was sincere.

It may be admitted that his interest in church building and his extensive provision for it undoubtedly reflects his pagan heritage. To him nothing was plainer than that the now imperial worship of Jesus Christ called for the most evident visible manifestation of the "patron Deity" of the Empire. Constantine did not, I think,
transcend the concept of the role of the "civil religion" of the city states of the Pagan world. He universalized it, but in the name of Christ; a Christian ecclesiastical architecture rather suddenly began development on a majestic scale. Yet it took on form commensurate both with its imperial patronage and with its distinctive liturgy. The center and climax of worship was the sacrament of the altar. This was decisive for architectural format, structure and arrangement of the place of public worship.

If the ancient churches of Byzantium and of Catholic Europe remain overpowering in their sublimity and grandeur, the reason is clear. They stand for and are bridges between the divine and the human. They are the pre-eminent symbols in stone and wood of the way from God to man and vice versa. Nothing, therefore, is too good or too much; nothing need to be reserved in celebrating in stone, wood, alabaster, ivory, in mosaic, in fresco, or in fabrics and precious stones what is signified to believers as the very narthex of "the life of God in the soul of man."

A brief comment on faith and buildings as reflected in my own Protestant heritage. The span of centuries is far shorter; there is less to say and much of it is familiar. The three centuries - between 1550 to 1850 - are the period in which rather spontaneously the correlation between the Protestant faith and its building, quite naturally portrays itself. Among other things, it is before the sophisticated experimentation of 20th century functionalism and technological know-how have complicated the domain of ecclesiastical architecture. And there is another side of the matter. I want to stay clear of an era when Protestant churchmen have become somewhat vague as to their own theological and liturgical pedigree, and in addition to the lures of utility, are sometimes prone to various kinds of improvisation - often for aesthetic reasons primarily and often in unwitting disregard of their distinctive doctrinal tradition architecturally expressed. This was not the case with Calvinist 16th and 17th century Independents, most Baptists and the early Methodists.

If we look at the 17th and 18th centuries, we do find natural correlations between Reformed faith and church buildings which authenticate themselves. The Lutheran churches, about which I know least, combine an emphasis upon both sacramental worship and preaching and are structured accordingly. The Protestant Episcopal tradition had few changes to make in old England - and in America, on the whole, was content to perpetuate the several styles of English Gothic in which the liturgy of the Prayer Book had been bred in the 16th century. If, in late years, a cluster of parish houses have been added, this too was not without ancient precedent even if the modern additions were more regularly employed for parish educational and community purposes.

As I see it, the Reformed churches of the Calvinistic tradition most emphatically and perhaps authentically correlate the Reformed faith and church architecture. This is visible in the Presbyterian churches of Scotland of the period we are considering and in the Congregational churches of New England of the 18th century.

The Congregational meetinghouse in New England had a two-fold purpose. One was civil; the other, and the controlling one, was religious. This duality of function goes back to 17th century Puritan theocracy. Theocracy did not survive the mid-18th century. Nevertheless, the meetinghouse continued to symbolize the coordination of piety and civil order down to the establishment of the Republic, and indeed beyond.

In those meetinghouses one thing was made unmistakably clear by the centrality and loftiness of the pulpit. It was the sovereignty of the Word of God, recited from Scripture, and interpreted by the preached word often in sermons that could last two or more hours - to be followed by a further discourse in the afternoon. To endure this, each family was responsible for its own footwarmers in its own family box pews during the winter months. Meanwhile, the sacraments were duly administered every quarter for the elect. To all others the table was "fenced," and order was preserved by the ruling elder.

The early Methodist meetinghouse was not wholly dissimilar in England or in America. Here the Reformation stress upon the preached Word turned the building into something like an auditorium where the grace of God was channeled by the medium of the sermon and by "hymns and spiritual songs," and after 1784 the sacraments were duly administered in American Methodism. This called for a provision of a chancel and altar or "table or remembrance."

The chaste, honest simplicity of the Congregational meetinghouse made it a thing of beauty, and in its finest examples second to none in architectural integrity. As a symbol of piety it speaks both of intellectual rigor and doctrinal clarity. Yet it also speaks of a religious persuasion from which the elements of mystery and sublimity have much withdrawn and for which piety often become subscription to a refined confession of faith wrought out on the anvil of the 16th and 17th century controversy with a decadent Catholicism and a moribund papacy.

I believe it is clear that there is a close correlation between the nature of Christian faith and the building which is a vehicle of its nurture and expression. I would venture to say that taking function for granted as an inescapable norm for institutional church building today, nothing could more advance the integrity of modern ecclesiastical architecture than for churchmen to be able to give a clear-headed account of the faith and hope that is in them.

You may be disappointed perhaps that I have not carried this correlation of faith and its buildings into the recent past or present. There are many reasons. The most important is that my assignment was to discuss the Christian faith in relation to its architectural expressions. Plainly, it is easier to do so where this correlation has clearly identifiable expression. Another reason is that the problem of correlation intensifies in the increasingly multifarious formats of church architecture in American denominations, not just of the recent past.
need to expand our understanding of education to include all those deliberate, systematic and sustained ways by which persons and groups evolve, sustain and transmit their faith.

If we are to begin to think holistically about education, we need to consider multi-use space. As I said earlier, this space can be used for almost every activity within a church. (If it is necessary to provide special space for young children, I suggest it be enclosed in glass so that parents and children can visibly and audibly participate in the community's liturgy while interacting together in ways that will not disturb others.) I contend that this space, while sacred in character, needs to be contemporary in design. Each age must express its faith anew. Further, our churches need to be designed for the use of no more than one to two hundred persons. If a congregation is larger they can duplicate activities. It is not only difficult to experience community in large groups, but we have a responsibility not to create large structures for limited use in a day of limited resources.

There are signs that the church is moving in directions which make such design possible. A new appreciation of the arts is returning. A desire for community and intergenerational activity is surfacing. New forms of worship are emerging. New models of religious education are being developed. Religious education may or may not occur on Sundays. It will bring together children, youth and adults for common activities. Music, dance, drama and the plastic arts provide the dominant forms of expression. Integral to its life is celebration, the focus of its program is the Judeo-Christian story, and its primary concern is for opportunities to be religious together.

The following is an example of a small New England congregation. At a church meeting each year the people decide on a series of themes for their Sunday School. Last year they chose Moses and the Exodus, Advent-Christmas, Contemporary Christians and Life in the Early Church. The Sunday School meets intergen-
Further on “Reflections—San Antonio”

E. A. Sövik, FAIA
Sövik, Mathre, Sathrum, Quanbeck
Northfield, Minnesota

One would be a bit hesitant to enter a dialogue with some astronaut on a star so distant that an answer arrives six months after a question is asked. A letter of reaction to a writer in FAITH & FORM has about the same time delay, which is disconcerting; but I think Father McAlister’s “Reflections” in the Fall 1975 issue need a response—so I am going to venture one. And although much of what he said seems to me valuable, and I want to pay my respects to his concern and his goodwill, I am going to select for brevity’s sake some parts of his discussion that seem to me to be at fault for one reason or another.

Father McAlister warns us about tampering with myths. I agree that one needs to be cautious; but one must not be too timid. Each generation needs to reappropriate or repristinate myths. An unexamined myth is a dead one. History is change, and sometimes cyclical; what I think we are doing is attaching ourselves not to our grandfather’s myths, but to those that are much, much older.

Father McAlister notes that many congregations are not ready to accept multi-use space for worship. This is surely true, but not very relevant. Thirty years ago, equally few were ready to give up the historical styles. Nor is the comment that young people are dubious about multi-use space very relevant. Most young people are resistant to change—maybe more so than older people who have seen more of it.

The paragraph marked five needs a little more attention. Father McAlister says much of what I would like to say, but I would not use the words “secular” and “profane” interchangeably as he does. He says that a place of worship should have those qualities that “instill respect, reverence and ultimately a sense of the sacred.” I agree. But I would assert that these qualities can be, and ought to be, present not only in places of worship, but in all the work that religious designers do, whether for cultic purposes or non-cultic (secular) purposes. The whole earth is the Lord’s temple; it should be treated as a holy place. Architecture is profane (outside the temple) not when it is secular (non-cultic) but when it lacks the sense of the sacred.

In subsequent paragraphs, Father McAlister notes that people need certain qualities, among them the quality of permanence. He implies that a single-purpose use of a space provides this sense of permanence. It may, but this has nothing to do with architectural qualities. I think that the evidence shows that if a place is beautiful, its uses may change, but its “sacred” character remains. Consider St. Sophia or the Parthenon; their uses have changed, but their “sacred” character persists. It is associated with the architecture, not the uses of the place. At present they are both “secular” places, but they provide evidence that “secularity” and “sacredness” can co-exist.

It is necessary, of course, that architects pay attention to the clients for whom they work—and very close attention. But good art never has and never will result from polling a community to see what people like; it comes from the perceptions of good artists. I am not denigrating the research attempt to discover “where people are,” although a good artist probably has an intuitive sense of this. It is more important to discover where they ought to be.

And to use a phrase like “ought to be” implies that change is desirable. Father McAlister warns us vigorously against precipitous change, and I concur. But I rather like the fact that candles have appeared in dormitory rooms and that religious observance has in other ways escaped from the “sanctuary.” If we are trying to build the Kingdom of God, we need to change things in the churches as well as in the world. There was, after all, some truth in the accusation made against the early Christians that they were “turning the world upside down.”

I should like also to comment on the episodes from the life of Jesus that Father McAlister cites. I would interpret them quite differently. When Jesus went to the wilderness to pray rather than to the temple, he was a secularist—the encounter with God, he was implying is not necessarily in a cultic place. And surely one cannot infer from Jesus’ detaching himself from the throngs of people when he wanted to pray, that we ought to be building single-purpose places of worship. The room where the Last Supper was held may very well have been a restaurant; it was clearly not a cultic place, but a secular one.

Finally, I am much more sanguine about the hopes that Christians of all denominations—not excluding Roman Catholics—can accommodate themselves to multi-use structures than is Father McAlister. (Whether unsophisticated people want multi-use places or not, is not really the issue, of course. Whether this sort of structure is right or wrong, is the issue. If it is right, we should be doing our best to illuminate and persuade.) I recently saw a doctoral dissertation which studied the uses of 146 church buildings in Hong Kong, affiliated with a broad spectrum of Christian denominations. Among those whose worship spaces were also used for other purposes, the Episcopalians led, Roman Catholics and Methodists weren’t far behind, Lutherans were about in the middle; and unexpectedly, some of the so-called “free churches” were those who preserved their worship spaces most eagerly for single-purpose usage.
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Function and Building
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operationally for four blocks of time during the year. Each thematic unit is assigned to a group of families. They create and lead the Sunday School for that period. The first block of time runs from the first day of school through Thanksgiving. During the summer those who were interested prepared a dramatization of episodes in Moses' life. In the first week of Sunday School they presented their dramatization. During the next week interest groups were formed. There was an opportunity to make unleavened bread, to create poetry of modern parallels to Moses' experience, and there was an art group to illustrate the poetry. Other activities were taken from The Jewish Catalogue, one of the truly great resources for religious education and a good example of the sort of resources needed for the Sunday School of the future. There was even a group who used the dark, dirt-filled, junk-strewn basement of the church to create a simulation of the Israelites' faith during the darkness of the long exodus. Two weeks of such activity led to two weeks of planning a Seder, using Waskow's Freedom Seder as the basis for their celebration. At last they united for that special occasion. This was followed by two weeks of preparation for a special Thanksgiving celebration. Here was an opportunity to identify their Congregational Puritan history with the Exodus. The unit ended with a grand Thanksgiving celebration, at which five grains of corn were put at everyone's place; a child asked why, and the story of one year when that was all their forefathers and foremothers had to give thanks for was told. After a few weeks people were ready to begin their Advent-Christmas theme.

Of course it will take time before change is generally accepted. New architectural designs will be necessary to support the new programs. We must be careful not to design buildings which will lock us into programs that make this alternative future difficult. The architect has an unique opportunity to engage the church in re-thinking its life and faith by reminding us all that we not only shape our buildings; they shape
The opportunity to build is the opportunity of a community of faith to struggle with their faith and to design space that will enable them to become a faithful people. The future is open and you have been granted the God-given talents to serve in this most important endeavor. Be of good courage as you strive to shape a community's faith into forms which will enable them to function as a faithful people. And always remember that your responsibility is awesome—your task is great—and your calling is noble.

Notes & Comments
con't. from page 5

Bicentennial Exhibitions

200 Years of American Synagogue Architecture—The American Jewish experience reflects a striving towards ritual enhancement of its synagogues. Brandeis University, Rose Museum, Waltham, Mass.—Spring and Summer, 1976

Spertus Museum of Judaica, Chicago, Ill.—October '76 through January '77

Why GRA Regional Conferences?

During the past five years the GRA has held a series of Regional Conferences—often in co-sponsorship with religious groups—Perkins School of Theology at Southern Methodist University, the Divinity School at Duke University, etc. The Regional Conferences reflect the GRA's awareness of the changes taking place within the organized church today and the need for effective dialogue and communication between architects and clergymen. It is felt that smaller meetings can provide fuller participation among registrants and speakers—and that specific topics of perhaps regional interest lend themselves more readily to one or two-day meetings.

Faith, Function, Form—Environment's Influence upon Man—Church-sponsored Housing—Churches, Crises and Change—have been among the topics dealt with at GRA regional meet-

con't. page 24
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ings. Groups of architects, clergy­men and concerned lay persons have gathered to hear addresses from experts in specific areas and to participate in discussion of common interests and problems in an informal setting.

The GRA plans to continue its program of regional meetings, one being scheduled for the Washington, D.C. area under the joint sponsorship of GRA and Catholic University of America, November 12-14, 1976. The Guild invites FAITH & FORM readers—individuals or groups—to contact Guild office if they are interested in a regional meeting in their area. Write: Guild for Religious Architecture, 1777 Church St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Myron E. Schoen, Director, Commission on Synagogue Administration, UAHC, writes:

Have you designed a synagogue in the last decade? The Union of American Hebrew Congregations, which has maintained an Architects Advisory Panel for more than 25 years, is contemplating the publication of a book on significant synagogue buildings since 1965. It was the UAHC that published An American Synagogue for Today & Tomorrow in 1954 (edited by Peter Blake) and Contemporary Synagogue Art: Developments in the U.S. 1945-65 by Prof. Avram Kampf.

If you have designed a synagogue building in the last decade, please

Does Your Church Pay Enough Attention to its Fund-Raising?

The Church Fund-Raising Institute’s NEW MONTHLY NEWSLETTER can help any Church raise more money.

IT DOES NOT COST — IT PAYS!

Try it! The Church Fund-Raising Institute MONTHLY NEWSLETTER is published by internationally recognized church fund-raising professionals for use by large and small local congregations and religious institutions.

The MONTHLY NEWSLETTER is concise, practical, full of news about recent local church fund-raising successes. And it includes many helpful new technical ideas as well as some basic principles for learners.

Also ask about the 26 summer WEEKEND WORKSHOPS on “Annual Giving Programs for Local Churches” To be held at the Institute in Chicago.

Write or Phone: CHURCH FUND-RAISING INSTITUTE 222 North Wells Street Chicago, IL 60606 312/372-3630
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communicate with me at UAHC, 838 Fifth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10021. It would be helpful if you could send not only the name and address of the congregation but could also provide photos, slides and floor plans.

Worship, Liturgy, and Building
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members and at the same time give thanks for the grace which God has made known to all through this sacrament.

The fact that worship is corporate has important ramifications for the arrangement of congregational seating; it is imperative that worshippers be properly related to each other as well as to the liturgical center.

These five facets of Christian faith proclaimed in the functions of worship are not unfortunately adequately supported by most architectural forms now in existence. Any attempt to provide a set design for contemporary liturgy would be futile. Indeed, the current state of liturgy is so fluid that it defies fixed designs. But since different functions exist in worship, different forms are needed if a consistent statement of faith is to be made.

Because flexibility is so important, the cardinal rule for contemporary liturgical design is “Don’t nail anything down.” Violation of this rule can turn liturgy from a living thing into a corpse imprisoned within a coffin. And no matter how beautiful or well-proportioned the coffin may be, the liturgy confined within it is quite dead.

But consider the possibilities when flexibility does exist. The liturgical center itself can be adjusted both in size and location. Movable platforms allow a large space for liturgical drama, for example. On other kinds of occasions the platform may well be much smaller, with the congregation gathered in an arc of 1800 or less. (The complete church-in-the-round concept works better in theory than practice with respect to traditional liturgical functions.) In all cases, worshippers should be as close to the liturgical center as possible and should not be separated into isolated units.

Flexibility is intended to serve real liturgical needs, not to satisfy a yen for novelty. Rearrangement for its own sake soon wears thin. Those responsible for inventing new arrangements quickly exhaust the possibilities, and those who move the furnishings soon grow weary of shuffling things around when no real purpose is served. But the full proclamation of the Gospel requires a variety of worship services. Therefore flexibility of form is the servant of faith as well as the servant of function.

Church Architecture of the 1970’s
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Once one has such a space in which to plan worship, free and uncluttered by architectural focus, it is hard indeed to go back to a space where there is no freedom. And it is amazing how many imaginative possibilities in worship open up once one has nondirectional space. The most intriguing space I have ever worked in was an experimental theater where we were limited only by our own imagination. How hard it was to return from that to a directional church with a chance!

We have discovered something we never knew before, the importance of flexibility. Why should a building be always the same for every occasion? Christmas is not Good Friday, a wedding is not a funeral, a Sunday morning congregation is not a Sunday evening assemblage. Yet we have often been content with a building that was always the same. Today, a wall is anything we want to project on it. Flexibility is vertical as well as horizontal. We built towers of steel scaffolding in our chapel once to convince students of that; our freedom is not limited to the arrangement of the floor alone.

I feel that the most satisfactory building shape for worship, as we know it now, is what I call a “hollow cube.” I once convinced a student congregation to build such a worship space. I think they built it almost out of blind faith; now they can try experiments in worship that no other
Church Architecture of the 1970's
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A church in town can accommodate. "Hollow cube" may not be the best of terms but it does express the basic sense of directionless space capable of a variety of orientation, of a level floor, of nothing nailed down or predetermined. In many cases the vertical dimension may be less than the horizontal ones, certainly not greater than they.

A major change has occurred from the long history of church buildings with a very definite orientation either around a high altar or an equally high pulpit. We must remember, though, that until churches were filled up with pews, congregations remained mobile and essentially non-directional. The non-directional church building of today gives us both freedom and responsibility. For it is up to us to create the focus where it belongs for whatever occasion we are planning. The building interior, then, becomes a dynamic space where new centers of action can be created for whatever the occasion may be.

V

A fifth area of change is closely related, namely that of seating. We are finally realizing how much Christians lost when they sat down on the job in worship somewhere about the fourteenth century. The fluid and mobile congregation became an immobilized mass, wedged into a series of pews. And how we cherished those comfortable pews! I well remember the astonished disbelief I encountered when I first began questioning pews a dozen years ago, especially from one building committee that included a salesman from a pew company! Today, I suspect his firm also offers movable church seating; certainly its competitors do. A major breakthrough came when the St. Louis Episcopal Cathedral removed its pews in late 1969 or early 1970 and replaced them with movable seating. We could persuade people that if it could be done successfully in such a magnificent gothic structure, certainly it could be done elsewhere.

One sometimes wonders: if we were really on our feet for worship (as Christians were for most of our history) would we need chairs at all? One solution in a California student congregation was a series of freeform risers in the floor with carpeted treads. These were relatively permanent but focused on no particular spot. Younger people often feel more comfortable sitting on the floor in their own proximities; I doubt you could sell that to older people who would just as soon be comfortable and keep their own distance.

The great advantage of movable seating, of course, is flexibility. One can shape the service around the people who are there, not around a mass of pews that may be unoccupied. A church with pews for two hundred is half empty when a hundred people show up. But the same congregation in a space set up with a hundred chairs will prompt the response that so many people have come that we may have to bring in extra chairs. Which is primary, the people who are there or the vacant furniture? Movable chairs put the focus on actual people and secondly on the event. Perhaps the seating should focus on the font for some occasions, about a pulpit for others. We have these options and many more. With fixed seating we have no such choices.

Some manufacturers now make short movable pews which are attractive and heavy enough not to tip over. These may often be as satisfactory and cheaper than movable chairs. Unfortunately, as soon as we mention movable seating, most people think of the cheap metal chairs on which they have suffered for years. Good movable seating is not cheap. But if it gives us several buildings instead of one frozen space, it may be the biggest bargain we can get. Such seating ought to be attractive, capable of ganging (linking) comfortable, and stackable (there are times when we will want to get rid of seating altogether). At any rate, movable seating is both a cause and a reflection of the changes we have seen in worship in recent years. Without it, many of our experiments would have been impossible; with it, we have attempted things we never could have dreamed of with a nailed down congregation.
Yes, the church architecture of the 1970s is something quite different from that of the 1960s. But it will not stand still either. Those things that we find so true and obvious today will not all be so tomorrow. Anyone who builds today must shudder a bit at the danger of tying knots in the future. Certainly we cannot build with the bold confidence of those who built in the early 1960s. We have seen the Middle Ages in Catholic worship end overnight and Protestant worship thaw almost as quickly, all within a decade. We know now how risky it is to assume that our needs for worship space will remain unchanging so we have become much more reticent builders. Humility is not such a bad virtue in architecture or in life.

Perhaps change, then, is the greatest difference. Our church architecture has become open to change. Though it cannot guess the directions of future change, at least it has come to accept change as inevitable. And this is something that church architecture of past centuries never took seriously. This greater openness to new possibilities is the major accomplishment of church architecture in our times. For this we should all be grateful.

Faith & Building
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past but of the entire past century, indeed since the middle of the 19th century. And I am not sure that much of a correlation between faith and church architecture survives in the modern period. This is a doubt that is not relieved by a statement of Dr. James White (“Church Architecture of the 1970’s,” reprinted from Liturgy in this issue of FAITH & FORM): “I feel the most satisfactory building shape for worship, as we know it now, is what I call a ‘hollow cube’.” If indeed Christian worship has come to require this measure of vacuity, then I would think more suitable would be a hollow tube through which we might look to a recovered awareness of necessary correlation of the Christian tradition and its housing for worship.
The Guild for Religious Architecture is, we believe, justifiably proud of its record of service to the professional and religious communities. Organized in 1940 by a small group of architects and clergymen, the Guild began its program to improve the design and function of religious facilities. Primarily this effort was carried on through the National Conference, an annual meeting at which architects, religious leaders, craftsmen and artists traded ideas, compared notes, discussed common interests and problems, and nurtured each other through a common desire to serve the worshipping community. In 1965 the Guild became an affiliate of The American Institute of Architects to serve as the arm of the Institute in the area of religious design.

The Annual National Conference continues—broadened in scope and interfaith in structure. This year's conference will be held at Boston, July 6-8. Regional conferences over the past five years have further demonstrated the Guild’s interest in providing information, guidelines and assistance to groups wishing a one- or two-day meeting on a specific topic.

FAITH & FORM, journal of the Guild for Religious Architecture, has been a significant tool in the educational process which the Guild pursues. By reproducing speeches from annual and regional meetings, by featuring the architectural and arts award winners from the Annual Conferences, by attempting to provide the most current information available on trends in religious design as they reflect changes in liturgy, FAITH & FORM seeks to reach a broader audience than can be reached through meetings.

To continue its service—and to continue its program, the Guild for Religious Architecture needs the support of the professional and religious communities. It seeks your membership. You are cordially invited to join and to participate in a continuing and on-going effort. A membership application is attached.
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IN MEMORIAM — Donald H. Speck

There are no words to express our sorrow at the untimely death — at age 48 — of Donald H. Speck, Honorary Member of the GRA and President of the Interfaith Research Center. Those of us who worked with Don in planning the National Conferences knew him to be a man of unquestioned integrity, whose clear thinking and quiet speech illuminated our deliberations — and whose dry wit was a source of delight.

The Rev. Glenn S. Gothard attended the Memorial Service for him at the Northwoods Presbyterian Church, and the following is his comment:

At the August 10 Memorial Service for Donald H. Speck, all signals communicated one message.

The room for worship is the fruit of honest struggle to put into contemporary form our vision of reality. Walls and pews curve around a simple table and strong pulpit, with open Bible. Nothing suggests form our vision of reality. Walls and pews separating awareness of each other from one another, climaxed by participation in the Lord's Supper.

Persons present were friends of Donald Speck, but many were meeting his family for the first time. Yet no one felt like a stranger.

Persons who led the service exhibited a confidence rooted in having successfully faced the issues of life and death: Lawrence Bottoms, Moderator of the 114th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U.S.; John F. Anderson, Jr., Pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Dallas; and A. Milton Riviere, Pastor of Northwoods Church, Doraville, Ga. Pastor Riviere's sermon included an Essay on Death written by Don at the time of his mother's death and found by his family among his papers.

Two banners which hung on either side of the chancel had been designed by Don for use by the congregation during worship services. The cover for the printed memorial service, also his design, showed Bible, Bread, Cup, Flame and Cross. The cross, in contrasting color, was done with fingerprint lines.

Surrounded by all this solid testimony to creative work, reminding us of the life style of Donald Speck, we also felt the room filled with awareness of God and each other, climaxed by participation in the Lord's Supper.

After the benediction Don's family remained in the room and as we came to greet them, we felt a faith as solid as the walls of the building itself. We had come to share their grief. We left having been made freshly aware of things that cannot be shaken.

The Rev. Glenn S. Gothard
August 11, 1975

Design Competition for Eucharistic Congress

The 41st International Eucharistic Congress and the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects are co-sponsoring an architectural competition for design of altar stages for the city's two major sports stadiums.

The structures will make Veterans and John F. Kennedy stadiums suitable for liturgical worship. They will incorporate platforms, altars, audio-visual and lighting systems and movement patterns for celebration of Masses.

Veterans Stadium is a 7-tiered ocradal that seats 66,000. JFK is 2,350 feet long by 1,450 feet wide, encompassing an area of 61.5 acres. The stage design for JFK should accommodate up to 300,000 viewers both in the stadium and the surrounding site (parking areas).

Competitors must be registered architects in the United States. Architects not practicing within the jurisdiction of the Philadelphia chapter of the AIA must have associated with a Philadelphia firm in order to have entered the competition.

More than one million people will gather in Philadelphia, August 1-8, 1976 to participate in the Eucharistic Congress, a major spiritual assembly of world Catholics and other Christians.
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A great craft, but not a great mystery.
Stained glass can alter light, completely or partially. It can create a mood or sustain it. It is a great traditional craft that has kept pace with contemporary needs. In scores of ecclesiastical, multi-purpose and commercial buildings for over four decades...from the original design, to the manufacture, to the actual installation...Rambusch Stained Glass Studio has added its distinctive touch to the unique signature of the architect. Contact: William T. Weber

Stained glass can alter light, completely or partially. It can create a mood or sustain it. It is a great traditional craft that has kept pace with contemporary needs. In scores of ecclesiastical, multi-purpose and commercial buildings for over four decades...from the original design, to the manufacture, to the actual installation...Rambusch Stained Glass Studio has added its distinctive touch to the unique signature of the architect. Contact: William T. Weber
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NEW PROJECTS
OF INTEREST

Salanter/Akiba/Riverdale Academy
Riverdale, N.Y.

Architects: Caudill, Rowlett, Scott
Houston, Tex.

Located on the former estate of the late Arturo Toscanini in the Riverdale section of New York City, the S/A/R Academy is designed to provide a view of the Hudson River while retaining the flat portion of the site for playfields. The result is a vertically open design, which combines a feeling of unity for the entire school with a sense of individuality and variety in the classroom areas.

By stair-stepping down the natural contours of the sloping site, the architects developed an open plan for the academic block of the school. Instructional spaces on two sides of the building connect with a shared central core of administration and learning resource areas a half-level below the instructional spaces at every level of the building. For easy identification, each level is color-coded and further defined through the use of large, brightly-colored letters of the Hebrew alphabet.

Dr. Robert M. Finley, superintendent of the first open-plan school in the U.S., has said: “Too many buildings get in the way of a school’s program. This doesn’t happen at the Academy. The architect’s dynamic solution and use of land open a wide range of program possibilities. Rarely have I seen a building with such tremendous flexibility. It allows you to change any program any time. The measure of that is the fact that it simultaneously and successfully houses two different programs.”

The Academy has received a Bard Award for excellence in New York architecture. The Bard Awards were established 13 years ago by the City Club of New York in memory of Albert S. Bard, who crusaded for more than half a century to improve the quality of civic design and urban architecture.
ARCHITECTURAL EXHIBIT —
1975 San Antonio Conference

The jury for the architectural exhibit at the 1975 San Antonio Conference is pleased to report one Honor Award and seven Merit Awards. In addition, they cite two projects, not usually judged with churches and synagogues, for Honorable Mention Awards, and single out two others for their potential worthiness. The jury found their duties pleasant and were gratified with the quality of the entries in a time of low religious construction volume.

Robert L. Durham, FAIA, Chairman
Robert R. Inslee, AIA
Howard R. Meyer, FAIA
Downing A. Thomas, AIA

HONOR AWARD
Sacred Heart Church
Morrow County, Oh.

Architects:
Richard Fleischman Architects
Cleveland Heights, Oh.

The simplest, most modest church submitted. The plan is clear and beautifully proportioned. Each window and door is placed with masterly inevitability. The exterior forms are in fine balance, achieving great dignity. Materials are white exterior aluminum siding with aluminum doors and windows. The spaces provide for worship, religious education and administration — all well related.
The purpose of the Religious Arts Exhibit at the Annual National Interfaith Conferences on Religion and Architecture is to encourage excellence in all arts intended for religious purposes. We hope to offer a stimulating experience for all who are concerned with the use of art in sacred space; and to provide exposure for artists working in the field.

In addition to the entries accepted for exhibit at the San Antonio Conference, there was shown a running slide presentation representing a wide variety of work being done today for sacred space.

Lyle Novinski, Dallas, Tex.
Chairman, Religious Arts Exhibit Jury
Mrs. Sylvia Plotkin, Phoenix, Ariz.
Robert E. Rambusch, New York, N.Y.

Honor Award
"Joseph's Dream"
William Jeffers
Gail Morton Hanks
Dee McCandless of
Tres Manos (Wallhangings)
1601 Pearl
Austin, Tex. 78701
THE RESPONSE OF RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS TO URBAN HUMANISM*

by Rabbi Jack Bemporad
Temple Emanu-El
Dallas, Tex.

The response of religious institutions to urban humanism is, of course, an extraordinarily complex and diversified subject. The question posed is involved with four variables, all of which relate to the issue of religion:

1. The dynamics of change and the necessity to re-categorize our understanding of change and stability.
2. The nature of a consumer-oriented society.
3. The nature of technological process.
4. The interpenetration of these three variables and the effect they produce on the nature of our understanding of man.

If we’re going to talk about humanism, urban humanism, or any kind of humanism, we can only do that if we have some sense of what we mean as to the nature of man.

In his book Technology and Change, David Schoen claims that the basic problem is that most people, including most educated people, think that society is relatively static. However, he denies the validity of the static society and feels that if we embody a symbolism that makes us unprepared for the future when it arrives, we will be in great trouble. Schoen states that we’ve usually understood change in the past by imagining that we go from one stable state to another stable state, and that technology is the neutral instrument of that change, that is, of going from one state to another. Secondly, he says, we assume that whatever changes will take place, ultimately, will be for the good. Schoen says that both of these assumptions have to be challenged. Is there really such a thing as a stable framework and the priority of stability? He believes not and gives a number of examples.

An especially challenging one is the gap between training and doing. Men are less able to see their lives as a period of professional training, followed by steady practice of their trade or profession. On the contrary, what one finds — according to all the evidence — is that when people have been trained in something, they have to learn continuously; many of them have to go from one occupation or profession to another. Ten years or so after receiving their Ph.D’s in one subject, men in some fields find that the questions they’ve dealt with are more or less obsolete, and they have to re-learn from scratch. Schoen says that the times we live in should be marked “Subject to change without notice.” Without notice — why? Mainly because we react to change by what he calls selective inattention. Inasmuch as we don’t pay attention to change, suddenly we’re surprised when something happens.

Now because of the fact that the framework of stability has disappeared, according to Schoen, and therefore process has become primary and permanence has become secondary, there has been a gradual deterioration of reference points for personal identity and for a sense of self. For example, it is less and less possible to explain who I am in terms of the job I do, the profession I represent, the region of the country in which I live, the institution to which I belong, or the class or race from which I come. The individual asks how should I act when the foundations of my self and the roots of my action disappear.

Let me illustrate the kind of change we’ve had just since World War II. We’ve had four major revolutions in the last twenty-five years: the advent of the atomic age, the space age, the computer age, and most recently the age of biological engineering. All these are technological transformations that have seriously affected our lives. But in order for us to understand change, in order for us to understand technology, we have to ask how change and technology fit into the kind of society we live in.

That question leads me to my second variable — that we live primarily in a consumer-oriented society. When you lived in the Middle Ages and you needed ten tables, you would go to a tablemaker, who would say, “Well that makes ten tables I have to make.” He would proceed to make the prescribed ten tables. Then he would spend the rest of his time celebrating some religious holiday, or fishing, or doing nothing — because demand and supply were such that one sought to maintain a stable balance. Today, on the contrary, we have the creation of needs and the production of objects to meet the created needs. Nowadays we simply discover how to motivate people to want certain items and then we produce those items. Or we produce things and then convince people that they need them. Nothing is intrinsically wrong with a consumer-oriented society as long as one can distinguish between items of consumption and ethical values. The difficulty arises in a consumer-oriented society when the distinction between the consumption of perishable things and the consumption of values has been levelled so that there is no longer any sense of values transcending the process of consumption. Hannah Arendt has made, I think, the most profound statement on this subject in “The Crisis in Culture,” in her book of essays Between Past and Future. Referring to works of art, she says: “from a viewpoint of sheer durability, art works are clearly superior to all other things since they stay longer in the world than anything else. They are the worldliest of all things. Moreover,
they are the only things without any function in the life process of society. Strictly speaking, they are fabricated not for men but for the world which is meant to outlast the life span of mortals, the coming and going of the generations.”

She continues: “Cultural objects were first despised as useless by the Philistines, until the cultural Philistine seized upon them as a currency by which he bought a higher position in society, or acquired a higher degree of self esteem.” Cultural values are treated now like all other values — mainly exchange values. As in the past, value usually has an economic content. It is something you can buy; it has a certain price. Naturally, when one is dealing with a mass society, which also has a consumer society trying to convince this mass society to consume, then Hannah Arendt is correct. She says: “Mass society wants not culture but entertainment, and the wares offered by the entertainment industry are indeed consumed by society just like any other consumer goods. The products needed for entertainment serve the life process of society even though they may not be as necessary for this life as bread and meat. They serve as the phrase is ‘to while away time,’ and the vacant time which is whiled away is not leisure time. Strictly speaking, leisure time is that in which we are free from all cares and activities necessitated by the life process, and therefore free for the world and its culture. That’s what true leisure time would be. This vacant time is rather left-over time, which is still biological in nature, left over after labor and sleep have received their due. Vacant time which entertainment is supposed to fulfill. The entertainment industry is confronted with gargantuan appetites, and since its wares disappear in consumption, it must constantly offer new commodities. In this predicament, those who produce for the mass media ransack the entire range of past and present culture in the hope of finding suitable material. This material, moreover, cannot be offered as it is. It must be altered in order to become entertainment; it must be prepared to be consumed easily. Mass culture comes into being when mass society seizes upon cultural objects, and its danger is that the life process of society which, like all biological process, insatiably draws everything available into the cycle of metabolism, that is in the cycle of consumption, will literally consume the cultural objects, eat them up and destroy them. Of course, I am not referring to mass distribution,” she says, “when books or pictures and reproductions are thrown on the market cheaply to obtain group sale. This does not affect the nature of the objects in question, but their nature is affected when these objects themselves are changed, rewritten, condensed, digested, reduced to kitsch in reproduction, or in preparation for the movies — this does not mean that culture spreads to the masses but that culture is being destroyed in order to yield entertainment. The result of this is not disintegration but decay — and those who actively promote it are not the Tin Pan Alley composers but a special kind of intellectual, often well-read and well-informed, whose sole function is to organize, decimate and change cultural objects in order to persuade the masses that “Hamlet” can be as entertaining as “My Fair Lady.”

No value system transcends the purveying of goods. This is the real danger. Let me give you just one word of illustration from the reporting of news. It is obvious that many people depend upon television to find out what’s going on in the world. An article by Robert McNeil some years ago in Harper’s Magazine entitled “The News on TV and How It Is Made” is pertinent. In it McNeil said: “TV journalists are enmeshed in a system that looks upon news as another commodity, which sells or does not sell, attracts audiences or does not, which like other commodities can be shaped, reworked and manipulated or simply dropped. Reporters contributing to television news shows receive fees ranging from $25 to $150 for each item used on a program containing commercials. A man may spend three or four days quietly digging for facts to support a story, only to find himself receiving a fee of $50 if his story is used, or nothing if his story does not pan out. His colleague, meanwhile, may use the same amount of time rushing to snatch an interview here and putting together a few superficial facts there, may place ten separate pieces on the air and may as a result pocket $500. Obviously, the system discourages methodological pursuit of information. The object is to get each story on the air and move on to something else.”

In other words, in a consumer-oriented society where in fact man is seen as one large stomach and the key is to get the stomach larger and larger so that he can consume more, one can no longer make any distinction concerning the work of the objects of consumption. There is no level that transcends this process of consumption. Thus we have change that is geared to consumption. And if one asks whether it’s dangerous if we’re constantly consuming mindlessly, then technology comes in to save the day.

This leads to our third variable. The technologists tell us not to worry because technology is going to save us from this dilemma. How does technology save us? By trying to change the way you live! Or by trying to change the habits that you actually live by? No. Technology will come in and bail you out completely. Researchers say that you’ll never get people to drive carefully for two reasons: first, because they release their unconscious hostilities once they get behind the wheel, and second, because so many people are taking drugs that one can’t guarantee that the pill they’ve taken that morning won’t impair their driving skills. Therefore, because there’s no guarantee that they’re going to drive carefully, technology can still come up with a solution to the problem — namely a crash-proof car. Take another example. We all know that smoking is no good for us. Sometime back, a researcher at Columbia University invented a nicotine filter. Columbia immediately insisted upon having all the rights to it without even testing. Even though it turned out to be worthless, it did represent a technological way of resolving a social issue.

There’s really nothing wrong with that, and of course a great deal of technology is very important — certainly medical technology is. But the technological mentality that I am talking about is a very different thing.

Note what Alvin Weinberg, of the Atomic Energy Commission, has said. In an article called “Can Technology
Replaced Social Engineering?" — treating the subject of whether technology can convince people to change their lives, he says: "If I were to be asked who has given the world the more effective means of achieving peace, our great religious leaders who urged man to love their neighbors and thus avoid fights, or a weapons technology that simply presents man with no rational alternative to peace, I would vote for the weapons technology. The peace we get," he continues, "is at best terribly fragile. I can't deny that. Yet, as I shall explain, I think technology can help stabilize our imperfect and precarious peace."

Now we begin to wonder. Is technology really the solution to all our problems? It's one thing to have technology do the things it ought to do. It's another thing when technology makes claims that far out-reach anything that technology has a right to claim. Theodore Warden, director of the space stations and planetary systems at Douglas Space Center, was very concerned about unemployment. He said, "Unemployment connotes idle leisure. If our people feel unwanted, unneeded and frustrated, and they will feel that way if they don't have jobs, the conversion of this destructive leisure will be easy." He says that personality control drugs will be available. "Research into new pharmaceuticals promises to produce for us an array of drugs that we can use to tailor our moods and personalities." He gives some illustrations: "Wives of tomorrow might be able to drop into their husbands' morning cup of coffee an anti-grouch pill. Pills for euphoria or mystic contemplation might become commonplace. You take a certain pill when you go to church or synagogue. As we reach for a control mechanism, we leave behind freedom because we wish to be controlled more. Frightening but more powerful will be the artificial mood modifiers which range from mild stimulants to personality control and personality selection drugs."

Now a number of things about the technological mentality are, in my opinion, extraordinarily frightening. Let me elaborate. If one says that the means of resolving human problems is through technology, what happens is that such a resolution completely neglects the broader aspects of these problems and negates their full human context. To state, as Weinberg does, that technology can solve the problem of war and that the hydrogen bomb has done more for peace than all the religious leaders in history shows quite clearly where this mentality leads. The attempt to say that all questions should be solved through technological procedures leads us to a situation that may very well be irreversible, since we are not fully aware of all the implications and the effects that technological innovations produce both in our environment and in ourselves. It is this lack of understanding of the consequences of technological innovation which frightens me. Just think, we tested atom bombs extensively without having the foggiest notion that they led to such disastrous effects upon human beings as thyroid cancer. We dumped DDT everywhere and then we found that it threatened the world's ecological balance.

The problem with technology is its boomerang effects that are unforeseen. It's one thing to introduce a new development on a relatively small scale or to introduce it where you have controls, because one is not introducing it in a consumer society with its consumption-oriented values. But it's another thing to introduce it where you have no controls.

When confronted with the possibility of genetic manipulation, of transforming the very nature of human life, then problems really arise. The possibility — perhaps soon to be an actuality — that through genetic manipulation on individuals society can, let's say, produce engineers, or whatever it desires, is chilling. What I'm warning against in effect is that practice outruns theory in technology. Furthermore, we may get involved with irreversible changes, and finally, there is the danger of no over-all coordination of means. Technology functions in terms of the most efficient means, and if everyone is trying to follow the most efficient means, the result is the overwhelming problem of lack of coordination.

In an article, "What Man Can Make of Man," Carl H. Hertz asks: "Is man really ready to play God?" He says that one set of men, the biotechnicians, will intervene in the lives of other people, "determining the traits of other people's children, presenting parents with children not of their own procreation. The object of this programming, in whatever form it is carried out, may easily turn out to be the poor and the perilous, presumably 'inferior' stock. For any application of this knowledge will take place within the framework of the existing distribution of power and privilege. Conceivably, the privileged may desire to fabricate a class to exploit." He continues: "Specifically my question is not primarily whether genetic programming and other developments will come, but under what conditions and limitations and with what protection of human rights and prudent constraint of utopianism. How shall limits and directions be set? How does the creature — become creator — understand himself, his powers, and his responsibilities?"

Elting E. Morrison claims that technology tends to create its own environment and set of conditions. Even more simply, "as the mechanism increases in power and scale, the tendency is to fit men into the machinery rather than to fit the machinery into the contours of the human situation. We may be caught in the irony that at the very moment when we by our wit have developed the means to give us considerable control over our resistant natural environment, we finally have produced in the means themselves an artificial environment of such complication that we cannot control it."

How do these variables I have discussed affect the nature of man? Quite simply — there is no way of avoiding an internal transformation. The internal world of man, or the internal order of man is shaken by the transformation of the external world; the manipulation and transformation of the environment will reshape and null and annihilate man's internal existence. Man is not just the agent — he is also the object of the technological change. For this reason man is in such a precarious position. Never before has man had so much power to do — and yet never before has he felt so powerless. This is the dilemma of any kind of humanism in our time. What exacer-
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MERIT AWARD
University Presbyterian Church
El Paso, Tex.

Architects:
The Pierce Lacey Partnership,
Dallas, Tex.
Foster, Henry, Henry, Thorp, El Paso,
Tex.

This complex is distinguished by a
dynamic floor plan exploding from a
central worship space. The strength
of the form and texture of the native
rock masonry walls anchors the
diverse volumes into an unified mass
and echoes the mountain forms
beyond. The strong masonry again
masks some detailing problems. A
good strong central worship space
relates fundamentally with all other
spaces.

MERIT AWARD
St. Timothy Church
Centreville, Va.

Architects:
Lawrence Cook, Falls Church, Va.

A well-massed complex, carefully
planned and thoughtfully detailed
with a sensitive relationship between
the worship space and the ancillary
buildings. The jury had some
reservation about what may be
glare-producing skylights between
the structural elements. The entire
composition is a commendable
statement on both the interior and
exterior.
MERIT AWARD
Our Lady of Perpetual Help
Aurora, Oh.

Architects:
Richard Fleischman Architects
Shaker Heights, Oh.

A charming enclosure of exterior and interior spaces, fresh in spirit, simple in form. The plan provides for three major well-juxtaposed spaces: (1) nave to seat 500 having an intimate seating plan; (2) a triangular library-lounge which also serves as a narthex; and (3) a small triangular chapel plus supporting areas. Materials are exposed wood frame, brick and natural finished wood shingles.

MERIT AWARD
St. Stephen Lutheran Church
Bloomington, Minn.

Architects:
Bergsted, Wahlberg, Bergquist, Rohkohl
St. Paul, Minn.

Consultant:
Dr. Frank Kacmarcik
St. Paul, Minn.

An unusual decision to convert an existing fellowship hall into worship space has led to a solution of distinction. The flexible seating in an unsophisticated space is given distinction by the quality of the chancel furniture. The entire plan is commendable for its directness and simplicity.
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Architects: Cohen and Haft, Holtz, Kerxton, Karabekir & Associates
Silver Spring, Md.

A beautifully articulated plan with a marvelous hierarchy of serving functioning space consistent in detail throughout. An impressive central worship space.

MERIT AWARD
Peace Lutheran Church
Oxford, Miss.

Architects:
Hill/Armour Associated Architects,
Memphis, Tenn.

A very strong exterior expression providing a symbol in its community. An unique use of sanctuary space allows appropriate ultimate expansion. The central worship area allows its use as a theatre in the round or as a meeting hall. The site development is skillfully accomplished.

MERIT AWARD
B’Nai Israel Synagogue Complex
Rockville, Md.

Architects: Ford, Powell & Carson
San Antonio, Tex.

An unusually well-designed flexible worship and fellowship space. The crisp detailing in both buildings and chancel furniture adds quality to the environment created. The building with its roof parking has been skillfully and tastefully related to the site and to its community.
In April of 1975 there was gathered in San Antonio a group of about 150 persons who were in some way interested or involved in religion and architecture. This Annual National Interfaith Conference on Religion and Architecture was one of a long distinguished line of annual conferences held in many cities around the country and concerned with a great variety of currently popular themes. These themes have always been developed to give the architect, the artist and the liturgist a maximum opportunity to expand his thinking in the development of his particular role in religious building.

The architect, being of a vision-oriented profession, is encouraged to develop a visual symbolism for those needs and ideas presented by the liturgist. The success of such symbolic representation depends upon the sensitivity of the designer’s perception and his ability to translate the liturgical statement into a physical statement with such creativity that the liturgy will be reinforced by the liturgical setting.

The role of the liturgist (or whatever title should be assigned to the one who officially represents religion) is that of theological interpreter. Here is required a vision of the abstract and an understanding of spiritual experiences that allows proper symbolic representation that will extend such experiences to the greater involvements in life. To put it another way, the liturgist should seek to understand theological symbolism on a spiritual level and be able to translate this understanding to an intellectual level.

In order to fulfill any of these roles, it is necessary for the individual to subject himself occasionally to a brutalization of the thinking process wherein ideas and practices can be torn apart, analyzed and reassembled. The resulting reaction can be shattering at first, leading to complete confusion. Hopefully, there will follow a clearer, more objective understanding of one’s original premises. The conclusions of the Rev. Richard McAlister elsewhere in this issue typify one such reaction. Father McAlister’s convictions may not have been changed by the Conference but his exposure to the broader spectrum of ideas gave him a better understanding of just what it is that gives real substance to his convictions.

Father McAlister addresses another characteristic of the annual conference, namely, the interfaith make-up of the program and the participants. This diversity could also lead to complete confusion but this is actually what provides the greatest strength. No one really expects unanimity from such an interfaith representation, and so there is a demand for both sincerity and understanding.

To be agreed with constantly may satisfy some but this condition has never existed at a national conference where the variety of differences have been legion. There have been ego trips entitled “don’t build any more religious buildings until —” which have been great for shock and notoriety, and may have even added some tempering sanity to both theology and design. Reactions to such radical statements have led to backlashs of all kinds, wherein the justified need for churches and synagogues and temples has been strongly debated and defended. Some have gone so far as to say that religious buildings are not only necessary but the more monumental the better.

Then along came 1975 and San Antonio with the theme of “Urban Humanism.” In other years at other places urbanism denoted violence, social injustice and racial strife, leading to much self-flagellation but not very many workable solutions. San Antonio was different. Here urbanism was beautiful. Here people had used their natural and human resources to alter the tide of undesirable urban development. There are few monuments as such (except the Alamo which is another story entirely), because most of those places of great historical significance are being utilized for some beneficial purpose. A former convent is being restored by and for a group involved in teaching and performing a variety of handicraft skills. An abandoned, baronial brewery will be a combination museum and an arts and crafts merchandising center. San Jose Mission is a museum but it also houses a working congregation, and a river once scheduled to be filled and paved is now the very essence of the city’s character. The human resources of San Antonio are also obvious in the vast array of national origins and religions in the population make-up. To the early inhabitants — Indians, Spaniards, Chicanos, Frenchmen and “Americans” — have been added Scandinavians, Jews, Germans and other Central Europeans, each adding his special contribution to the formation of a great urban identity.

If the city overwhelmed the Conference, no one really cared because this was a “soft” conference. The material was useful but not controversial. The exhibits, while good, had no surprises. The speakers were outstanding but there were no bombshells. Yet for real impact, few speakers have excelled the straightforward presentation at the closing banquet. O’Neil Ford is a resident of San Antonio, an architect of international stature and a man capable of matching the style of his delivery to the message itself. Intermixed with a slide show covering everything from automobiles to the fabric of a Mexican village was a sim—
and identity must take on a new meaning or become meaningless. That's where the whole issue of urban humanism comes in.

Victor Ferkiss in his book *Technological Man* has summed it up: "Other men can change your society, your economy, and your physical environment. Eventually, they will be able to force you to live in a world with neither trees nor oceans, if they choose. Running and hiding becomes increasingly difficult. They can make you love them so that you need not go to the stake. They can alter your identity by controlling how you are brought up and what your experiences are. They can even program your children genetically in advance of birth — but perhaps more disturbing is the fact that you can do all these things yourself. You can change your appearance or even your sex, your mood and your memory. You can even decide what you want your children to look like, but if you can be whatever you want to be, how will you distinguish the real you from the chosen you?" Who is it that is doing the choosing? That's the problem with any kind of humanism. So we're thrown back on the spiritual character of man, as opposed to the high-grade, animalistic, consuming, technology-oriented character of man. And therefore I believe that the real task of man — and thus the real task of religious institutions — is to give man a sense of self, a sense of his own integrity in the midst of a society that fragmentizes him.

The task of religious institutions is to help man go through these stages of transformation — to help orient goals and ends in terms of ethical norms. It seems to me that the real task of religion today is to make some sense of what these ethical norms are and to orient men's lives so that they are aware of these norms. A religious institution has to be a place for spiritual repair in a world that is basically fragmentizing and dehumanizing. Increasingly we will find that since technology requires a knowledge explosion — not knowledge in the sense of wisdom but knowledge in the sense of know-how, in the sense of knowing effective means — our parishioners are wont to be technologically educated in a way that far transcends anything that we've had or experienced in the past. So it seems to me that the task of religion in our day must be to embody spiritual forms in such a way as to help the individual to cope with these variables through some kind of integrity, some kind of goal orientation, some kind of ethical norms. This seems to be the challenge of today.
Boston: A Living Laboratory
(Preservation News, August 1975)

“What is Boston? Ask a ‘proper Bostonian’ and you will be told that Boston means a sense of tradition, of style, not found in other cities. An educator will tell you of the city’s world-renowned schools, colleges and universities. An architect will tell you about its buildings — from the designs of Charles Bulfinch and H. H. Richardson to Walter Gropius and I. M. Pei. A historian will talk about the seeds of the American Revolution sown there 200 years ago. And an author will tell you how much he hopes for increased sales if his next book or play is ‘banned in Boston.’ Indeed Boston is all of these things and more. But for preservationists it is a living laboratory where new programs and ideas are constantly being tried.”

The 1976 National Interfaith Conference on Religion and Architecture, to be held in Boston, July 6-8 at the Copley Plaza Hotel will attempt to provide a perspective on the changing tradition in religious design over a 200-year period. Plenary and workshop sessions will concern themselves with various aspects of restoration and renewal of religious facilities. Included in the Conference program will be a tour of significant examples of historic and contemporary design.
RESTORATION AND PRESERVATION*
by
Mrs. Mary Ann Beinecke
President,
Hoosuck Community
Resources Corporation

I am an active Preservationist. But what is Preservation? There is virtually no common understanding about Preservation. We all have a sense that we mean the same thing, but believe me it is no common sense. I have rarely heard anything like common sense when Preservation is bruited about. It has a mystique, seeming to belong to the privileged few who are in the know. The entire subject is fraught with "no-nos."

Preservation cannot succeed in any relevant manner until the majority of the citizens of this country understand that Preservation is a viable alternative to other action. We must reach a common understanding of what Preservation means; we must show it to be meaningful — to be relevant — to be understood by more than a handful of people.

Preservation that is elitist will increasingly lose the sense of priority because it remains outside the mainstream of concern. A sense of urgency is essential to process and communication is essential to a sense of urgency. Communication implies "with" rather than communication "to." I continue to believe that the real problem is just that — lack of communication — and even when dialogue takes place, few people really listen and there exists a basic lack of comprehension and agreement as to the meaning of words. I can illustrate my point by discussing a quotation from a National Trust publication, Historic Preservation:

"Preservation leaders have told us to be activists. We tie ourselves to trees or buildings so they will not be torn down. We picket in front of threatened structures. We write letters to our Congressmen and other government officials. We petition in court to save a park from being replaced by an interstate highway. In a world becoming increasingly indifferent to history and historical landmarks and sites, we must be activists if we are to put across the importance of preservation. In most cases, preservation will not come about if we sit back in our rocking chairs and merely hope that a building will be saved from the wrecker. The preservationist must get out of the rocking chair and fight for the building."

Getting in or out of rocking chairs is not the point; getting out of a rocking chair to save a building may not help. Might it be better to stay in the rocking chair and think? What does it mean to be an activist? I had always thought of an activist as one who actually did something in contrast to one who talked about it. It appears, however, that it signifies a person who works to effect social change through citizen involvement.

Conservation, Preservation, Restoration, Rehabilitation, Reproduction, Reconstruction, Renewal, Re-use, ReCycle are words closely related. Without reference to a dictionary, I am going to tell you what these words mean to me. In doing so, it will probably become immediately obvious that we have a semantic difficulty.

CONSERVATION — To treat so it can continue to exist, to save for future use, to ration.

PRESERVATION — To keep in cotton batting, store in the attic, pickle, maintain in its present condition, to seal off from contact.

RESTORATION — To fix up. Put back to its original shape, appearance and condition — good health and spirits — active.

REHABILITATION — To help, to support, to prop up, change, repair to service once more.

REPRODUCTION — An imitation, a new something, a copy, not as good as the original.

RECONSTRUCTION — To build again, to remember.

RENEWAL — Another chance, clean up, start over, a new look.

RE-USE — Same old thing, gradually wearing out.

RE-CYCLE — Conservation of energy and resources. A new product from old ingredients.

"The preservationist must get out of the rocking chair and fight for the building." How do we define saving buildings? Is it really Historic Preservation we are concerned about? Local history? Architectural history? Ethnic history? Contemporary history?

Why should we knock ourselves out to save some old building, which no longer has an economic use, while we simultaneously ignore and allow the ugly and the cheap, the throwaway, the neon in the new? Should we not be as concerned and informed about the proposed design for the new hotel as we are with the earlier design for the old railroad station? Were the citizens who allowed the latter better informed about aesthetic matters and material skills than we?

Restoration is like a good spring cleaning — good for the soul. In North Adams, Mass. we are about to begin restoration of the exterior of The Windsor Mill. The architects are arguing about whether the brick exterior should be restored to appear as new, or whether the patina of age should be left. The decision of the architects now is to wash it because it is thought that the local citizenry will be disappointed if the appearance is not greatly altered. In doing so, the surface protection will be reduced. It will be less conserved, more restored and not preserved. How objects and buildings are saved in the first place and brought to the attention of experts is, I think, preservation. Preservation, then, is a matter of judgment. Judgment as to whether an object has been designed and made in a manner fitting and proper to its use and material requires education. It requires comparison. The more Sung Chinese vases I see, the easier it is going to be for me to select the one to preserve as most representative not necessarily of Sung vases but as most representative of the best of Sung vases.

I am not terribly concerned about getting out of a rocking chair and fighting for a building. I've done that and it doesn't necessarily work. I do believe in getting out and fighting for

* Summary of statement presented at San Antonio Conference on Religion and Architecture, April 1975
a whole, for a community in which balance may once more be restored, fragmentation mended and total environmental education and planning implemented by professionals. I do think we should be activists in the sense of working together for social change. If we cannot adjust ourselves to new ways that are old ways, human ways, we will be doomed to fail. I do not think the world is growing increasingly indifferent to history and the landmarks of history. I see just the reverse.

For too many years the landmark attitude has been out of context and unrelated to the needs of the community. Needs unquestionably change, or at the least are redefined. We can assist in a redefinition of need. If we want preservation to become an accepted part of the ongoing flow, we have to get it on the agenda.

However, if each of us were to take responsibility for maintaining and preserving all that former generations built and used — whether we need it or not — we are going to have precious little time left in which to create anything ourselves. If, however, we concern ourselves with change, with building new ways for today and tomorrow, we will find not only a usefulness but a need for the old — for now and for the immediate future. What we seem to have lost is a sense of continuum.

Old cities made sense. They grew in response to human needs in relation to the geography. There is an organic logic in their framework and a meaningful link between buildings, neighborhoods, streets and nature. They were built at a time when the automobile was not a way of life, and automobile and the economy is forcing the closing of a multitude of A&P's. The challenge for tomorrow might well be "How do we adapt shopping centers and schools to use?"

I am terribly excited over the opportunities I see right now on the horizon. Something magical is happening. It has to do with worship, with people together, with concern, with commitment, with striving, with beauty, with hands-on, with materials, with work. The truth can be seen in that our young were the first to perceive this vision. It will last. Some of us who are fortunate indeed are swept up into it. That's what Restoration is — it's Resurrection. From the old will come the new. But it must be new. It is the creation that is the process that sweeps all before it.
Nature permanently expresses her unfading beauty and dignity in Buckingham Slate®. The rich individuality of natural cleft texture blends the architectural design honestly with its environment. It affords the architect the perfect material to give feeling and meaning to religious architecture. On the practical side, Buckingham Slate® has fine grained density, hardness and soundness. For interior flooring, exterior paving or paneling it offers maintenance-free durability. Write for information or see our catalogs in Sweet's architectural files.
IS THERE A TRUE ROLE FOR ART IN THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY?

by

Rabbi Albert Plotkin
Temple Beth Israel
Phoenix, Ariz.

The topic for this afternoon's discussion: "Is There a True Role for Art in the Religious Community?" is both provocative and challenging. I view art as the handmaiden of religion. As philosophy was the handmaiden of theology, so art serves as the handmaiden of religious tradition. Art is the heritage of all mankind for it is innate in every human being. It arises originally from purely practical purposes in the formation of tools and other objects, and stems also from a desire for communication. The question of Jewish art has always presented a problem. What first comes to mind in dealing with this question is the admonition given at Mt. Sinai: "You shall not make for yourself any statue or picture." Now one can understand the meaning of this text in two ways: either as a prohibition of all representative art in general, or as a prohibition only of specifically idolatrous art.

Even though Jewish law had an aversion to figurative art, artistic expression, far from being prohibited, was actually encouraged. It was created either for educational purposes or for what is known as Hiddur mitzvah, that is the adornment of the implements of ritual. There was always a role for art in Judaism. The art of embellishing biblical ritual, legal or even secular books was one of the most important ways a Jew could express his devotion to the written word.

Although biblical Judaism had the second commandment regarding graven images, there was never any prohibition of artistic expression. No fear of idolatry can be detected in the detailed instructions given by Moses on how to build the tabernacle and its ritual implements, including specific details of how to adorn the Ark with two winged cherubim, between whom God dwelt. This evidence would indicate that from the very earliest time, regardless of the ancient law prohibiting idol worship, the Jew's need for artistic expression was acknowledged.

The existence of a mid-third century synagogue in Dura Europos on the Euphrates which had its entire wall covered with frescoes of biblical stories is vitally important. The paintings which do not show the correct biblical sequence, portray episodes from the lives of the patriarchs, the prophets and the kings. Although these pictures are significant for their symbolic value, they also indicate that pictorial art was very much alive and was part of the experience of the Jewish people. In many synagogues today there is a renaissance of Jewish art evidenced in the art exhibits and the building of Judaica museums.

"This is my God and I will beautify Him." It is thus that rabbinic tradition rendered the verse in Exodus 15:2, a rendering that required that all the objects Jews use in the performance of religious duties shall be aesthetically pleasing so that they may truly worship God in the beauty of holiness.

The rabbis interpreted these verses later in the Midrash in this form: "Adorn thyself before Him in the performance of the commandments. Make before Him a goodly booth, and a goodly palm branch, and a goodly ram's horn, a shofar, and a goodly fringe for your garments, and a beautiful cover for the Torah and bind it up with beautiful wrappings." Jewish ceremonial objects revolved around religious worship both in the synagogue and the home. Their history and their forms are as different as Judaism is in its very basic teachings. Certain ceremonial objects were introduced by different leaders at different times and in different cultures.

Today there is an urgent need for skilled craftsmen both among Jews and non-Jews to create new ideas for ceremonial art. The tragedy is that we have been inundated with cheap tinny ceremonial objects made in Japan which have no artistic value and which degrade the spiritual value of many of our ceremonial objects. We need a new kind of perception of ceremonial art by those who have the knowledge, understanding and wisdom to create the kind of ceremonial art which will inspire the future of our tradition.

The ceremonial art of the Jewish people testifies to the diversity of Judaism, for not only did the form and decoration of the ceremonial objects vary from country to country, and from century to century, but with special objects used for different purposes. It revealed the flexibility and the adaptability of Judaism which introduced new objects as a way of life. Art in the Jewish tradition has a role to play today to introduce new objects and to bring them into the community and into the homes of Jewish people. There is a need growing out of the dominant cultural environment to create ceremonial objects which will enhance the aesthetic beauty of home and synagogue. Today there are fewer artisans than in the past, and we need to cultivate a whole school of those who are interested in obtaining a background and knowledge of the Jewish tradition. For all its diversity, Jewish ceremonial art displays an essential unity — the striving of the Jew at all times to fulfill his religious obligations to God in the "beauty of holiness." Today, we need artisans to create the aura of the beauty of holiness, dedicated artisans who, through knowledge, understanding and great aesthetic skill can create the atmosphere from which there can and must grow a new era of creative development.

Synagogue has always been the heart and center of the life and spirit...
of the Jewish people since the tragic days of the destruction of the First Temple. The divine command given to Moses: “Make Me a sanctuary that I may dwell among them,” (Exodus 25:8), was a serious injunction to Moses. The commentaries state that Moses was shocked by this command and felt terribly inadequate to the monumental task. He did not have the skill nor training nor artistic sensitivity to carry it through. He therefore called upon the architect Bezalel. It was Bezalel who became the model for Talmudic sages. They ascribed to him the spiritual and artistic qualities for which all future architects would strive in order to achieve the ideal sanctuary.

In the building of synagogues today, architects face a challenge: what is the role of art for the religious community. It is necessary that the architect as artist has a firm understanding of what he is creating. The synagogue has been a house of prayer, study and assembly. Does the architect/artist seek a unity of these components when he begins to design? Is he creating a monument to himself or is he creating something which truly speaks of the function of the synagogue and its spiritual intent? Is it essential to evoke the sacred, the awesome, the greatness of Israel's concept of God? Is it essential to express the concept of an ideal historic community and its closeness and intimacy? Is it necessary to invite a restful and mysterious element which evokes a spirit of retreat and contemplation?

The problem of the architect in many ways stems from a failure to understand the problems. The absence of a clear conception of the synagogue function forces the architect to concentrate on the congregation's desire for physical comfort, but he fails to understand the historic, the spiritual as well as the moral force which goes into the making of the specific atmosphere of the synagogue. The creation of such an atmosphere is either left to chance or is so vague that it comes through in the artist's misconception of what a synagogue should and must be in terms of its function and its purpose.”

Last year my colleague and classmate, Dr. Eugene Mihaly, a noted and distinguished Jewish scholar, dealt with this question in his paper on the architect as a liturgist. In his paper he emphasized the necessity of bringing poetry, art, drama and the music of the synagogue — its space, light and sound — into an intrinsic unity. He also pointed out that the very design of the religious structure of the sanctuary, of the Ark, of the Eternal Light, of the Menorah were, in a sense, acts of prayer in themselves. He also suggested that the very silence of the Talmud on synagogue architecture stemmed from the fact that the individual Jew was considered the central vehicle of Judaism, and that the concept “God stands in the midst of the congregation,” as well as the prophetic distinct of composing buildings (Jeremiah 7:4), suggests the design of a synagogue “which will not overwhelm nor draw primarily attention to itself,” but will create instead an atmosphere which intensifies the worshipper's awareness that he is truly in the temple of his Maker. Dr. Mihaly makes this challenge: “We would ask the architect that he design a structure which would enhance the feeling that the synagogue is of the past, yet of the present and future; that one is removed within the synagogue, yet deeply involved in the world, its problems and its tasks; that one is part of a group without losing the sense of individuality; that one stands in God's presence, but with the dignity of one who is worthy of His concern and of one who is created in His image; that the Jew is of the total community, yet bears special witness.” Thus, there are polarities which do exist and which are part of our tradition, but they are not resolved in prayer, and they may not be resolved in the creative insights and development of the artist himself. The most important task of the religious architect is not only to school himself in the tradition of that which he is creating, but likewise to create in his design a symbol of the problem of Jewish worship which begins with praise and ends with petition. The sanctuary has come to mean to the Jew not only a submission to God's will, but a challenge and a commitment to go forth and do his tasks in the world.

Thus, today the synagogue as a house of prayer, study and assembly must in a sense all be coordinated in one room. This goal is difficult to achieve, and is perhaps a serious challenge to many architects who are commissioned to design and build a synagogue. Knowledge of Jewish sources, understanding of their scope and ideals, all have to be blended into one unified whole. Discourse and study have always been an integral part of Jewish worship. The Jew never prayed without study, and there was never study without prayer. Prayer led to study and study led to prayer. At the same time, the synagogue was also a place of assembly and of social gathering.

There are three parts to the historic development of Judaism: creation, revelation and redemption. The sanctuary in a sense fulfills these three historic symbols: the Eternal Light is the symbol of creation for God said, “Let there be light.” The Ark where the Scrolls of the Law are kept is the symbol of revelation for it was the Ark that carried the tablets of the Law which Moses brought down from Mt. Sinai. The pulpit, or what is called the bimah, from which we read the Law and deliver the sermon is the symbol of redemption for it is from these platforms that the ideal of the new redemption is brought to the congregation. The architect must somehow communicate the feeling of creation, revelation and redemption. In so doing, he is fulfilling a great tradition.

At the same, the architect must make his artistic design functional. He must be in contact with the entire staff of the synagogue to understand their problems and needs. His design must encompass beauty, function and practicality. In my own congregation my predecessor, the late Rabbi A. L. Krohn, worked carefully with the architect to design a building that would have the Jewish spiritual imprint of tradition, but would at the same time fit into the functional needs of building a sanctuary in the desert. It was vitally important to have a large open temple patio and court. This has served as an outdoor sanctuary for many of the congregation's holidays and festivals. In the fall Jews remember the festival of Tabernacles, Succot, with the building of a booth. In our patio we all gather with our families to sit
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San Antonio was my first experience of the National Conference on Religion and Architecture. Not only did I find it interesting, but I found it most helpful to my own work and growth as a designer. In recent months I have been doing intensive graduate study on the nature of the worship environment, dealing with its theological, psychological and environmental aspects. San Antonio clarified many of my own ideas and set in proper focus the nature of the problem. My desire to share these thoughts is with the hope that you in turn will reflect more intently upon those qualities which make a good worship environment. I wish first to state some conclusions which seem valid to me from my study, reading and discussions at San Antonio. I shall then deal in some detail about a few of these conclusions.

1. It is the theological perspective which ought to determine the nature and the characteristics of the worship environment, and conversely it is the ritual of worship, in the environment, which manifests the theological beliefs of a worshiping community. Since we come from a diversity of theological backgrounds, it is important that we recognize that not all worship solutions will be valid for each faith group without doing some harm to the very faith of the people involved. Unless we are keenly aware of the interaction between theological perspective, ritual and environment, our worship designs could easily have harmful implications for the very faith of a people.

2. The attempt to demythologize religion and religious architecture under the guise of deepening one's faith is more likely to weaken the faith rather than help it. The myth expresses a faith value. Tampering with the myth, whether to destroy it totally or to replace it with a new mythical symbol, tends to weaken the faith value it expresses.

3. Many ministers and architects at the Conference acknowledged that their congregations were not ready to accept multi-use space for worship, nor were their people prepared to give up the distinction between sacred and profane space.

4. Young people, from my own experience, are not satisfied with multi-use space for worship. While they may not be enamored of the traditional church space, neither are they receptive to the modern alternative. For their personal communing with the divine, they express the need for a place "set apart." While worship itself is a community activity, and not a time for purely personal prayer, the need expressed by the young must be provided for.

5. Those architects who are sincere in a call for the use of secular space for sacred action demand an architecture which is authentic, of high quality and the like. In effect, the qualities which they ask for in their architecture are those very qualities which instill respect, reverence and ultimately, a sense of the sacred. It really seems impossible to escape from the sacred qualities. One may denigrate the formal distinction between sacred and profane space, but in practice one uses the qualities of the sacred.

6. The many qualities which make up the so-called "sacred space" are really psychological qualities common to man and necessary for a fully developed life. If you deny these qualities to the worship environment, they will reappear in other areas of life; one cannot go against the nature of man.

7. People who insist upon sacred space for worship may not be defending sacred space so much as the human quality of permanence. When a space is set aside for worship, a sense of permanence is experienced. This sense of stability is as important in worship as it is in other areas of life.

8. The church is the people who make it up. What the church, the people, believe, feel, and want, is therefore important. A pastor or architect cannot validly design a worship environment unless serious reflection is given to the needs and wants of the people, even though these may be contrary to what the pastor or the architect wants. The people are not a client to be sold a bill of goods. They are the very embodiment of the life of God in the community, and as such must be respected and listened to.

Although these are not gratuitous statements on my part — for they do come from much study and reflection — much more specific study will have to be done in these areas before we can have valid judgments that will guide us in designing worship environments. And this is precisely our problem. There is much theorizing about worship environments, but little evaluation of existing structures to verify these theories. Much is written about doing away with the distinction between sacred and profane space, but what studies do we have that verify the lack of such a distinction? What is the relationship between the sacred and the normal psychological needs of man? If there is a genuine relationship, then one would need be cautious in dismissing the distinction. How much longer can we argue for multi-use space for worship without doing some serious evaluation of the effect of this space upon the spiritual well being of people? One phase of my graduate studies at the Art Center College of Design in Los Angeles is a model test designed to evaluate the perceptual response variables of people in their choice of worship environments. The test deals with the non-verbal responses of people. We hope that a pattern of choice will evolve from the test which will give us further insight into the subconscious needs and wants of people as regards the worship envi-
environment. Such a study will help us see the relationship between the psychological needs of man and his liturgical needs. It may even show that some present-day theory is in conflict with the way people really are. In any case, much more study needs to be done. Robert Sommer, a psychologist at the University of California, Davis, in his book *Personal Space*, argues that for every building built, a fee should be allocated to evaluate the building one year after its completion. This would reveal its good and strong points, and would be of value to architects in future building. The same procedure would be of tremendous value for buildings for worship. My observations in this article should show that some current theories of worship and its environment are at least questionable and need further study.

The Guild for Religious Architecture acknowledges its ecumenical nature and fully realizes the various theological bases present. It would seem superfluous, therefore, to ask that this diversity of theological perspectives be kept in mind when we discuss the worship situation. Yet it seems to me that such a distinction is terribly important to a congregation and its architect when they decide to build. The plans ultimately chosen should reflect the theological perspectives of that congregation and should not be the reflections of other congregations holding a different theological viewpoint. Otherwise the building will become a source of divisiveness in the community for whom it was designed and will manifest the confusion in the faith concept which binds the community together. We know, for example, that those religions which have strong sacramental systems and which depend heavily upon symbolism to express their faith, will necessarily see their worship environment quite differently from those religions which are personalist, non-sacramental, and limited in symbolic expression.

There is a great cry today to de-mythologize religion and religious architecture in order to humanize it. Such an effort can have the salutary effect of cleansing the faith of many unnecessary accretions over the years, but the humanization process can just as easily weaken the spiritual dimension of religion. The famed dictum, *lex orandi, lex credendi* (as the church prays, so does it believe) should be kept in mind. Ritual and symbols are the language through which diverse peoples are united in a communion of faith to express their common belief in God and to praise Him. When you tamper with this language, you tamper with the beliefs expressed by this special language. When the building for worship involves a changing of the ritual ex-
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pression of belief, then it has truly affected the belief itself. Consequently, it is necessary that the architect fully appreciate the theological perspective of the community for whom he designs. We might note that in the Roman Catholic Church the emphasis upon public worship and the de-emphasis of devotion to the Blessed Sacrament has had an obvious effect upon the depth of belief in the Real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament. This has come about in America because many churches which had the Blessed Sacrament centered in the church, have now relegated the Sacrament to a side altar or to a private chapel. Those entering the church today are not always sure where the Sacrament is, and they become confused. They do not know whether they should genuflect out of reverence, or presume that it is elsewhere. Younger people coming to worship where the Sacrament has been placed in a private chapel are not aware that the private chapel is there, and they are not as inclined to make private visits, nor sense a need to, such as their parents had. We see, therefore, that a change in the customary place for reservation of the Eucharist has caused confusion among Catholics, young and old, and it can affect actual belief in the Real Presence.

The Spring ’75 issue of FAITH & FORM carries an article by Peter Smith on Post Religious churches. He offers a different theological perspective. He says, "By now it should be clear that I take my stand with prophets like Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who believe that Christ came to admit the post religious age. . . . Christ was the ultimate secular man . . . in his life style there was no division between the sacred and the secular. . . . It follows that a community which claims to follow Christ should express itself through architecture which is as secular and as sacred as schools and shopping centers." "A church style implies a stylized outlook, which is incompatible with an emergency faith, living to optimize the passing minute." "The Church . . . needs symbols, but it needs new ones; many of the traditional symbols have become case-hardened, no longer conveying the mind to a reality above and beyond themselves." Peter Smith has used his understanding of Bonhoeffer to evolve his own architectural ideology. I would not advocate Smith’s architectural ideology should I wish to build a worship environment for Roman Catholics. Moreover, I question the validity of his statements. The pilgrim church, living the constant uncertainty of this moment of life, sounds too much like the party line of those who ad...
vocate the notion that the confusion of modern life and its uncertainty are the norm, and that one should not seek a more stable existence. I see this more as an expression of despair in a difficult situation and the rationalizing of one's way out of a situation instead of facing it. What proof do we have that the symbols of faith are dead? A gratuitous statement does not make it so. And if the symbol is passe', what is the faith value which the symbol expressed? If we are to create new symbols, they should be expressive of the faith value of the old symbol. How do we go about making new symbols? Rituals and symbols to be effective have to transcend the fads of the moment. Remember the early 60's and all the new ideas that seemed to be the salvation of religion. Many of them are already passe'. It was during those times that vigil lights were almost viciously removed from our churches as having no value. It was not long, however, until candles appeared in college dorms and communes. The young had discovered the mystical value of candlelight. But the church was still very busily discarding this ancient symbol as being of no value. We really must be cautious about removing symbols. I agree that some may well have served their usefulness, but when do we know that they have?

What is this secularity of Christ of which Peter Smith speaks? Just how secular was Christ? Our Lord asserted that he preached, not himself, but his heavenly Father. That is hardly a secular statement. Christ did not seek human glory or comfort but only the glory of his heavenly Father. That is hardly being secular. The argument that Christ made no distinction between sacred and profane is highly questionable. I agree that Christ used the ordinary things of life, but if we take the dictionary definition of sacred as that which is "set apart," then Christ, in practice, did make a distinction between the sacred and the profane. Before Christ entered his public life, he went into the desert to fast and pray. He set himself apart. At the time of the Last Supper, the Passover meal, he ordered his disciples to go to an upper room and prepare things. He did not eat among the people, nor in a restaurant, but in an upper room, a place set apart. At Gethsemane, Christ did not pray among the sleeping apostles, but as St. Luke tells us, "He withdrew himself from them about a stone's throw." He once again set himself apart. In all these important prayer moments of Christ's life, he did set himself apart from others. Given our definition of sacred, it seems evident that Christ lived the distinction between sacred and profane, although he may not have spoken of the distinction. How do we interpret the words of Peter, "You are a royal and holy priesthood, a People set apart'? It should be apparent that different theological perspectives will affect how we build.

One last thought in this regard. Peter Smith, in the aforementioned article, discusses the sanctuary, the sacred zone, and the balchino. He says: "Not only do these devices conspire to establish the myth of locational holiness, they also confer 'ex officio' sacrality on all who are permitted to perform liturgical acts within the 'high place.' So the hierarchical element in the ecclesiastical structure is discreetly reinforced." For Smith the hierarchical character of religion is not to be encouraged. A building designed to blur the hierarchical nature of worship would be offensive to the religious sensibilities of many. Conrad Antonsen, O.P., Roman Catholic liturgist at Dominican College in San Rafael, Cal., argues that the basis of ritual worship is to be found in the 24th chapter of Exodus with Moses at Mt. Sinai. He says that the hierarchical nature of worship is seen as one of its essential characteristics and it is a constant in Roman Catholic worship from the earliest times. A Roman Catholic worship environment, therefore, which is designed to exclude this hierarchical character strikes at its very concept of worship and belief. It is important that an architect called upon to design worship environments for those of a different faith really understand and be sympathetic to the beliefs of those for whom he works. He is not asked to believe those beliefs, but he is asked to respect them and not to offer a design which will contradict what that particular community believes.
difficult aspiration is by saying that one's task is to know oneself — that is, the task to know oneself is to be committed to the task of knowing oneself without end.

The first thing religion has to do is to confront the issues of whether man really is an animal or not. And here may I say that we have to say No. We have to say that the Freudians, the Skinnerians, the Ardreyans with their territorial imperative are all basically wrong. Man is not an animal to be manipulated. Man is a spiritual being, a symbolic being, and if man is genuinely made in God's image, then he cannot simply act like an animal. Here is the crux: The evil man perpetrates is a corruption of something that transcends animality. Animals don't create a hydrogen bomb that can destroy the world. As Arthur Koestler has pointed out: "What makes man fight is not the biological urge to defend his personal acreage or farmland or meadows, but his loyalty to symbols and slogans derived from tribal lore, divine commandments or political ideologies. In other words, wars are not fought for territory but for words." And so the critical issue that religion has to face in our time is the corruption of the best, the politizing of values. You go from Eugene Debs to Hoffa, from Marx to Kruschev, from Jef ferson and the Declaration of Independence to Nixon and the Watergate tapes. Values are constantly transformed and corrupted. And this is the critical issue of our times. It is not enough merely to say yes, let's stand for spirituality. We have to be very clear as to the nature of man so that he can stand for spirituality.

Now we're talking about religious institutions. I think the hardest thing for a person to do today is to pray. And if he's going to pray, he's going to have to have a place that shall be a continuous reminder that man is more than flesh and bone, more than a thing to be abused, to be manipulated — but a being made in the image of God — that is, a sacred entity.

It seems to me that a religious house of worship is needed to instill in us a sense of awe and reverence, a sense of absolute worth without which all is devalued and has its price. It is here also that man can renew his deepest and profoundest search for God and the things of the spirit that nourish and sustain. And this is what presents us with our task. We're discussing the role of religious architecture and religious institutions at a time of uncertainty, confusion and doubt. This fact in itself, in my opinion, is an act of faith, a belief that religion can be meaningful and that the past may throw some light — however dim — on the present and the future.

Only by engaging in love do we become more loving; in justice, more just; in education, more learned. And though we do not know fully what wisdom or love or God is, still by searching for wisdom we become wiser, by sharing love, more loving, and by seeking God, more Godly. I think that if I were to take a verse from the Bible which characterizes our age, I would take the verse from the prophet Amos, eighth chapter, eleventh verse which says: "There will be a hunger and a thirst but not a hunger for bread, a thirst for water, but a hunger and a thirst for the word of God." And that's where we are today.

Plotkin — Cont. from p. 22

Carter-Miot — Cont. from p. 16

around the Succah, and the weather, climate and design make possible the enjoyment of a wonderful festival spirit. Every religious institution should encourage and nurture the creative talents of its membership — through art displays, the development of Judaica museums and libraries. In addition to individual efforts, there is strength in unity when a number of congregations join together in an art festival. Our Temple belongs to the North Phoenix Corporate Ministry, made up of six Protestant congregations, one Roman Catholic church and two synagogues, one Reform and the other Conservative. For the past three years we have all combined our efforts to produce a truly beautiful art festival of religious tradition. Each congregation encourages its members to submit works of art which have religious feeling and motivation. This has created an ecumenical understanding of the arts. The Catholic begins to appreciate what the Jewish artist is doing and the Protestant understands better his Catholic neighbor. Each festival has had a theme, and the theme has inspired the creative achievement.

The role that art can play in the synagogue needs intelligent investigation and discussion on the part of the artists and art historians on the one hand, and rabbis and interested lay people on the other. Out of this confrontation may emerge a deeper understanding of art — an understanding that will not only enrich our faith, but may in addition enhance our sense of beauty, awe and spirituality.

Wood — Cont. from p. 15
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The chair—simply the best linking/stacking chair in the world.

DESIGN FURNISHING CONTRACTS LIMITED

Calthorpe Manor Banbury Oxon England
Telephone Banbury 50551/4
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A complete service for church interiors, both new and remodeling
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