

ARCHITECTURE/FINE ARTS
LIBRARY

ARCH/ART PAMPHLET FILE

PROCEEDINGS

CONFERENCE

ON CHURCH ARCHITECTURE

FOR THE PRAIRIE REGION

SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE
UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

February 20th & 21st, 1964

~~ARCHITECTURE LIBRARY~~

ARCHITECTURE/FINE ARTS
LIBRARY

ARCH/ART PAMPHLET FILE

Arch
NA
5246
P7
C6
1964

PURPOSE

To bring together those concerned with church worship and its relationship to the building needs of their church in our community.

To foster greater appreciation of the essentials of church architecture and planning.

To promote good design in church architecture and the allied arts.

To bring into focus the state of church architecture in the Canadian Prairie Region.

FOR WHOM

For every person interested in any phase of church planning and building - architects, clergy, congregational building committees, and other related or interested groups.

REGISTRATION

Registration forms were sent out prior to February 15th, 1964 for pre-registration.

Costs: \$10.00 (\$4.00 for students) which included full participation including lunch and dinner.

DISPLAYS & EXHIBITS

There were displays of architectural drawings, models and photographs in the conference area. There were exhibits by suppliers of building materials and methods, and of ecclesiastical furnishings and appointments.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

General Chairman: Ernest J. Smith, M.Arch., F.R.A.I.C.
Smith Carter Searle Associates, Architects
1190 Waverley Street, Winnipeg 19, Manitoba

United Church

Dr. Fred J. Douglas
United Church of Canada
120 Maryland Street
Winnipeg 10, Manitoba

Mr. Henry Gibson
Henry E. Gibson & Co. Limited
760 Erin Street
Winnipeg 10, Manitoba

Roman Catholic

The Very Rev. Monsignor
Norman J. Chartrand,
Archdiocese of Winnipeg,
353 St. Mary's Avenue
Winnipeg 1, Manitoba

Mr. J. Sumner
Green Blankstein Russell Assoc.,
222 Osborne Street N.
Winnipeg 1, Manitoba

Planning Committee - cont'd

Anglican

The Rev. P. Niblock
St. Georges Anglican Church
TRANSCONA, Manitoba

Mr. E. Claydon
154 Victoria Crescent
ST. VITAL, Manitoba

Mennonite

Mr. R. Janssen
Conference of Mennonites in Canada
600 University Blvd.,
TUXEDO, Manitoba

Winnipeg Builders Exchange

Mr. J. Schellenberg
Semmler Construction Co. Ltd.
1140 Winnipeg Avenue
WINNIPEG 3, Manitoba

M.A.A.

Mr. V. Sobkowich
Zunich & Sobkowich
Marion & Tache
ST. BONIFACE 6, Manitoba

Mr. E. Klassen
Monarch Machinery Co. Ltd.,
889 Erin Street
WINNIPEG, Manitoba

Prof. Radoslav Zuk
School of Architecture
University of Manitoba

CONFERENCE ON CHURCH ARCHITECTURE
February 20 & 21st, 1964

OPENING REMARKS - Ernest J. Smith, M. Arch., F.R.A.I.C.

Honoured guests, members of the clergy, ladies and gentlemen... On behalf of the Committee responsible for arranging this Conference on Church Architecture, I would like to welcome the delegates and general public here this evening. We will hear tonight the opening key address of our conference by an eminent writer, world traveller and architect ... Mr. G.E. Kidder Smith from New York.

I would like to take this opportunity of thanking Dean Russell for the use of the facilities here and also to the joint lectureship fund of M.A.A. and S.A.S. for cooperating in bringing in our guest speaker G. E. Kidder Smith, F.A.I.A.

Church building today plays a significant part in the total construction industry of our country. Great numbers of churches and other religious buildings have been built in recent years and will be built in the future as our communities continue to grow. How successful the design of our contemporary churches has been is a matter of considerable controversy among church men and leading architects. We see our new churches in all shapes and sizes - some are miniature gothic cathedrals, some are triumphs of structural gymnastics and ingenuity - others are lavishly theatrical, while many have all the wall-to-wall comforts of a suburban split-level. Dean Samuel H. Miller, of Harvard Divinity School in the 1962 National Conference on Church Architecture in the United States, said - and I quote - "Religion and Architecture are both derived today from a culture of swarming contradiction and under such conditions I do not wonder that both Religion and Architecture fly off on lunatic tangents" These are perhaps strong and not altogether fair words. Nevertheless I believe that any one of us who has been involved in the building or designing of a church must admit that the statement of what is required and how to solve the requirement is far from "loud and clear".

Significant changes in theological and liturgical thinking have taken place in recent decades, as have great changes in architectural thinking and building technology. The church is faced with the essential requirement of a radical analysis of their own function in the modern world, and the architect is faced with interpreting this analysis in terms of a building of religious significance in today's society.

It is the purpose of our Conference to attempt to bring into focus the state of our church architecture today, to foster a greater appreciation of the essentials of good church planning and design, and to try to re-define the purpose and design approach for our future religious building.

To set the stage for our deliberations, our speaker tonight will review, analyze and criticize examples in recent

European church building.

I will call now on Dean John Russell to introduce to you, Mr. G.E. Kidder Smith.

Dean John Russell

Mr. Chairman, friends ... Seldom do I have the opportunity to introduce a lecturer with more confidence and personal pleasure than I have tonight. There is no doubt as to the wisdom of the committee in charge of this conference on Church Architecture in their selection of Mr. Kidder Smith as the keynote speaker. Mr. Smith is a Fellow of the American Institute of Architects ... he graduated from Princeton University. In addition to teaching in M.I.T. in Yale, he has given numerous lectures in schools of architecture and in museums both on this continent and in Europe. In fact he is not unknown to Winnipeg audiences, for this is after all his fourth visit to the campus. His world renowned books have covered contemporary architecture in some 23 countries and, as some of you no doubt know, he has been working on, and has just completed, a book on new churches of Europe which will be published this summer.

Mr. Smith is a master architectural photographer. An American Institute of Architects recognized this fact last spring in awarding him its very special architectural photography medal. It has been truly said that photographs speak for themselves. However, when one adds to these visual delights the penetrating appraisals which he delivers with such clarity, the result is bound to be a memorable occasion.

It is very evident that he is eminently qualified to speak to us tonight on this subject of "Church Building Today" for he is a member of the National Council of Churches in the United States. He was asked to write the article on religious architecture for the new edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica and recently he helped to organize an exhibition of churches and temple architecture which is presently touring in the United States.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce Mr. Kidder Smith.

G. E. KIDDER SMITH, F.A.I.A.

Jack Russell always surpasses his own self and it is with great humility as I stand before you and also with very particular pleasure....

Mr. Smith, Dean Russell, ladies and gentlemen, fellow architects ... Maurice Chevalier in a recent interview in the New Yorker, said "I like now and then to go into a church when it is empty but I am not used to praying with crowds." Peter Hammond, a distinguished Anglican cleric, and a disciple in

the new liturgy, wrote in his recent book about church architecture that a church is essentially a place for doing (a word which you underline), a corporate action (which you also underline), and which all are participants in each, has his appropriate function to perform. It is not a sort of jewelled cave in which a solitary individual may find some worship experience. Whether we agree with Maurice Chevalier in his solitary worship or Peter Hammond in his activated togetherness, there are diametrically opposed points of view underscored, a dilemma of church building in our time.

More of these antiphonal attitudes are echoed by all those responsible for religious architecture - the clergy, the congregation, let alone us poor architects. The clergy, both Protestant and Roman, are almost totally unaware of the significant development in today's religious architecture, and their seminaries, strangely enough, seemingly require the idea of teaching. Moreover, the equally important development achieved in changes in liturgical emphases and directions delude far too many members of the cloth.

The congregations who put up the money for the new churches, all of course composed of self-styled experts, are generally rent between the conservative older members, those with most potential of money and therefore influence, and the younger members who want the fabric of the church to stand for something completely contemporary. When the former carries the day we get warmed over gothic or pan-fried colonial, and we do, when youth prevails, the jute box school is apt to materialize as a survey of virtually any suburb will attest. We architects, leaping with delight at the comparative freedom of expression inherent in the church as opposed to a factory, a school or an arts building, become too often transformed, indeed transfixed, by vision of architectural grails, enduring monuments to the almighty posterity and ourselves. We hurl our suppressed energies, emotions, pent up from wrestling with plumbing codes and wiring diagrams, into rhapsodies of a nave whose power we are convinced will bring tears of joy even from an atheist eye.

Well then, about ignorance, reaction and opportunism, we are in the turmoil, and it is turmoil, of new building materials and the uncertain impact of the liturgical revival - we can understand why mid-twentieth century religious architects appall this condition. Until recently some old stone, wood and brick sufficed for every building site, but now steel and reinforced concrete and plastic are expanding our creative need. These can be used brilliantly as I hope will show shortly and can be distorted into exhibitionism as they so are.

The new liturgy of the liturgical revival referred to above is no mere order of service or rite, but more to the very shape, the plan of the nave itself, of its goal of bringing the clergy and the congregation in to intimate contact

with one another and of making them joint participators in their service. It can of course profoundly affect church design. The church is then the architect's most difficult building type and, if it is to survive properly, it needs more discerning clergymen, congregations, and by golly, architects. We honestly cannot retreat into the so-called historic stars for, if we do, we admit to bankruptcy and religious architecture and perhaps even religion itself.

Atavism is of course only a phenomena of the last 150 to 200 years or so, and before that time all religious buildings and basically all architecture were one of continual progress and creativity. This looking backward is obviously only a product of the last 400 - 450 years. If it had not been the case, it is clear enough today that we would be worshipping in adaptation of 4th and 5th century law basilicas as they form the prototype of most early christian construction of being able to accommodate a large group, or congregation, and easily roofed in wood.

Thus, if our resolute Christian ancestors had been as rearward looking as we today are still inclined to be in many instances and, if they had reflected over the past, the history of architecture would indeed have been a sterile one for there would have been no Byzantine, Romanesque, Gothic renaissance, baroque church building, let alone those minor delights such as Greek highland churches, the fantastic Norwegian and even the beloved New England meeting houses of appropriate white panelling.

More, it is credit to point out that the churches of these great periods were often radically different from one another, and so when people complain that contemporary churches do not look like churches, frankly I am not quite certain what they think a church should resemble. Interestingly enough the Gothic architects or master builders, as they were called, would give anything for our steel or reinforced concrete, for these men pushed their stones so far in an attempt to minimize structure and maximize glass, and remember that this was 600 or 700 years ago. Often desire outran performance in several churches. That's because of their inspiring daring. Incidentally, the Italians are considered our favourite church form of the Gothic though outlandish and indeed uncouth, having named it for a tribe of barbarians.

While on the subject of Gothic, we might also bear in mind that, by today's standards, these glorious churches are far more successful as monuments to God and also monuments to the community than a setting for worship, for they tend to crush the individual and rend him more respected than a participant.

Now, if we cannot with honesty look backward in our church architecture and if the paths of the future seem confused, as you will find invariably they are, what can we do? What course

can we follow that will insure a finer and more fitting expression for the church in our time? Having had the good fortune to examine virtually every significant post-war church in Europe, plus a great many in the United States, I feel that the lessons of the continent can help us mightily, for Europe developed a contemporary church approach. Auguste Perry's church at Lerand, just east of Paris, can be generally considered as the Metisse example, and Europe has certainly taken the church to its greatest height. Whatever the time, present or past, there is today one sad and shocking lacuna in this European determination to make the church an integral part of the 20th century, particularly as regards architecture, and that unhappily is the Church of England. As an Episcopalian in the States I would say that there are no more than two post-war churches in all of England of some 1400 have been built that made international notice.

The U.K., mind you not Canada and the U.S., is apparently content to remain in the backward of our culture and it is little wonder that Aldous Huxley, in an article last month in Punch, wrote that there is about one in ten Englishmen attend as a church-goer and in this regard it might also be mentioned that the Roman Catholics have been the brilliant leaders on the continent, have in the U.S.A. at least, have yet to produce one fine church. There are several excellent Catholic Abbeys and a few fine schools, and semi-private chapels, but I think no parish church of top quality has yet appeared. It can well be argued that the failure 2000 years ago of conservative Judaism to renew and reform, coinciding of course with the dramatic appearance of Christ, led to the establishment of a radically new religion. And some 700 years ago failure of the Roman Church to renew and reform gave birth to Protestantism.

Today, too many people, whatever their faith, are just not interested, and hence they stay home. Conversely, many who are determined in the church, and are not finding satisfactory answers in an established faith, are turning more and more to the fundamentalist sects. However, we must bear this in mind that progress and up-to-dateness through volition, though both necessary and commendable, must be accompanied by ability and knowledge. It is not enough to want to be up to date; up-to-dateness is commendable but, as I say, it has to be more than that.

In the States, and I think in Canada, there are so many churches frantically determined to proclaim their own boldness. Now much of today's religious architecture seems paradoxically capable of bringing out the worst in man. Let us now see what Europe has, having dispensed with a few, theological self, accomplished in this difficult field, and the twelve churches to be examined have been chosen to show as wide a range as possible in architectural philosophy, writing and construction. Simply by chance the first seven are Protestant and the last

five are Roman Catholic. Notice that almost all of them possess a general simplicity with no fleshiness, no coddled luxury, and these both are far too apparent attributes of the churches in the United States; would exhibit an unflinching directness of material. There is no shilly shallying about concrete, for instance, but a very powerful disguised use of it. Would push the altar well forward so that the minister or priest can face the congregation; would often place the choir in the back, and have windows behind the altar or within direct vision of the congregation.

The Conference on Church Architecture for the Prairie Region opened on Friday, February 21st, 1964, with registration at 8:30 a.m. and a viewing of displays and exhibits. At 9:20 a.m. Mr. Ernest J. Smith, Chairman, introduced Dr. Blake Wood who conducted morning devotions.

Following devotions Mr. Smith introduced a panel "Building a Place for Worship" with Chairman, G.E. Kidder Smith, and members of the panel: Rev. Victor H. Fiddes of Montreal, a member of the United Church Committee on Architecture; Monsignor Norman J. Chartrand, Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Winnipeg; Professor R. Zuk, representing the architects of the city, and Mr. G. Leslie Russell of the firm of Green, Blankstein & Russell; Mr. Herbert G. Ingram, a member of the United Church Committee on Architecture of the Presbytery of Winnipeg.

G.E. KIDDER SMITH, F.A.I.A. - CHAIRMAN

Architect, writer, world traveller, born in Birmingham, Alabama, and received Master of Fine Arts Degree in Architecture from Princeton University in 1938.

Mr. Smith has worked in several New York Architects' offices - received several fellowships for study and research in foreign countries. Author of well-known books - "Italy Builds" ... "Sweden Builds" ... "The New Architecture of Europe" and a recently finished book called ... "The New Churches of Europe".

G. E. Kidder Smith, F.A.I.E.

Ladies and gentlemen, we shall attempt the impossible this morning. We are going to deal with architecture, which is an ill-defined art; we are going to deal with the Church, which is even more ill-defined. The nature of the discussions, first by the five panelists and then, after a coffee break, an opportunity for general discussion from the floor. The nature of it will of course be on a high philosophical basis as opposed to the more concrete seminar which will take place this afternoon. We hope that we can stimulate your discussion and

that you will come away from this panel sparkled and enriched. The first of the panelists is Monsignor Norman J. Chartrand.

THE VERY REV. MSGR. NORMAN J. CHARTRAND, C.S., B.A., S.T.L.

Monsignor Chartrand born in Portage la Prairie, Manitoba, and had his public and high school training there. A graduate of Notre Dame College, Wilcox, Sask. He holds a degree of Bachelor of Arts and the degree of Licentiate in Sacred Theology.

Monsignor Chartrand was ordained to Priesthood in St. John's Church, Portage la Prairie, in 1950. After serving as Assistant at St. Augustine's Parish in Brandon, and Chaplain of St. Michele's Academy in Brandon, he was appointed Assistant in St. Mary's Cathedral in Winnipeg. He is now Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Winnipeg. He lectures in medical ethics at the Misericordia General Hospital and serves on a number of charitable and welfare organizations in the Winnipeg area.

Monsignor N.J. Chartrand ... Your Grace, ladies and gentlemen ...

With the rise and spread of the Gospel, Christian architecture was born. This architecture was clearly something new and had its own unmistakable characteristics, and yet it was not alien to its environment, it was not unaware of, or out of harmony with, the artistic sense of its time.

The new architecture took the living reality of the age-old Hellenistic tradition and fused into it a new spirit. In the sphere of function, it adapted the structural forms of this tradition to serve new purposes. The Civil Basilica had been used as a centre for Court proceedings, games, public meetings, gossiping. The new Christian Basilica retained the same architectonic structure. Various changes were made in it to change its purposes, until finally there was a building, with an altar, which despite its having its own specific function, was completely at home amid the civil buildings which surrounded it, and which together with it, made up the city. It was vibrant with an utterly new spirit; it was vital with the Christian spirit of the community.

The spirit in liturgical functionality proper to the Paleochristian Basilica remain today and they must remain with us in the future. But they must live; they must not crystalize into set forms that die, while geographical, historical, topographical and ethnic factors change. The movements of history, the contacts among the nations, the rise of new ideals and aspirations, the adoption of new points of view, bring about in individual minds and in society new attitudes and new tastes.

The Christian spirit is profoundly human, precisely because it is brought into contact with the Creator for the gift of Grace, and because it is human, it is also universal;

and hence, without deforming itself, and without losing its genuineness and sincerity, it harmonises with all that is good and beautiful in values. This spirit is not limited in space or time. Every civilization, every part of the world, every age, insofar as it is truly and worthily human, is Christian by nature and finds the Gospel open to its special interests and needs.

Throughout history, Christian architecture has remained faithful to the requirements of the congregation and it has embodied in its structural lines the perennial but variable Christian spirit. Accordingly its history is one of a wonderful succession of different styles. In deeds, its history is the most interesting and best illustrated in Western architecture. It is unnecessary to say that through a succession of styles of expression, the liturgical function of the Church has remained unimpaired.

The Church is the house of a community, the centre for the reunions of a society, the meeting place of a congregation. From the beginning, Christianity rejected the structure of the pagan temple, not from any fear of contamination, for in the vigor of its youthful vitality, Christianity confronted the institutions, the social usages, the very philosophy of paganism, precisely in order to dominate them and to permeate them with its own spirit. "All things are yours", St. Paul had written, "and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's". It was rather because of pagan worship which was essentially individualistic and needed only a cell where the individual worshiper could offer sacrifices and burn incense, that the pagan temple structure was unacceptable. Christian worship, however, is essentially communal; in it, the family of God, united to its Divine Head, offers to God its song of praise, its thanksgiving, its expiation, its pleading.

The congregation that gathers in the church is the family of God which comes together to meet its Father. This is not a private meeting. It is not the completely personal and individual encounter with God which takes place, but rather it is a collective meeting, such as takes place at a reunion; better still, it is like the meeting of the members of a family around the table.

The faithful come together to hear the Word of God; to listen to His letters, the Sacred Scriptures, the letters of a loving Father to the children who are far away from Him; and to listen to His living Word spoken by His ministers; to offer Him sacrifice, to receive the Sacraments. They come together to speak to God, with the greetings of His children. And since those who come together are many, their words must be harmonised and united in song; simple, syllabic song, perhaps, the true song nevertheless.

The architecture of the Church is aware of these requirements. It is also aware that the congregation which

assembles is hierarchically differentiated and that its focus is the Bishop, the Minister, the Priest: in these is Christ, Christ is Head of the Church, God incarnate, made our Brother to reveal to us His Father and to give us His Father as our own. Through the Manhood of Christ we approach God; through this Manhood there flows to us the Divine Life of Grace.

This characteristically human passage from the visible to the spiritual, from the temporal to the Eternal, from the Creator, has always been interpreted by Christian Art in its rich symbollogy, which has determined even the plan of the church (it is usually cruciform) and its orientation (it often faces the East). All, in the House of God, speaks of Him. All speaks of Him and of the heavenly Jerusalem where He awaits us at the end of our wanderings along the path of life.

This escatological sense of Christianity has inspired designs of stupendous nobility; towering masses veering to the sky, the magic colour amazes us in its richness. Architecture, more than any other forms of Art, touches the sublime when it takes heavy stone - stone which naturally clings to the earth - and raises it aloft to the pure heights of the air to sing our hopes and desires of Heaven. Throughout its history, architecture has striven to meet not only the needs of the external ceremonies of liturgical functions, but also, and indeed primarily, the needs of the essential character of the Christian community and its religious spirit. Furthermore, architecture reached its most solemn heights precisely when the work of building was undertaken not by an individual but by the Christian community and when the social spirit bound individuals together in close unity.

It is easy, however, but dangerous, to mistake these forms in which the tastes of another age sincerely express the prayer of the mind of the times, for what is required in our day by the religious spirit of the liturgy. To make this mistake would be to forget that best and profoundest tradition manifest the perennial vitality of liturgical worship. True tradition allows the liturgy to express itself in the language proper to every age with that wonderful variability which is so evident a sign of its unending youth. Thank you.

HERBERT G. INGRAM

Born and educated in Edmonton, Alberta. Mr. Ingram is engaged at present as a Project Manager for planning and designing store interiors for the Hudson's Bay Company. He is very active in church activities and has served on building committees for church projects.

Mr. Ingram is a member of the Property & Architectural Committee of the Winnipeg Presbytery and Conference Committee of The United Church of Canada.

Herbert G. Ingram - cont'd

Laymen are the congregations of worshippers. You might say they are the Church, they pay all the bills, raise the money, pay the clergy, and they pay the architect. Although as I understand they don't do too well at paying architects some times. Having friends and associates among the clergy and architects, I don't want to hurt anybody's feelings. My position is one that is fortunate in that I can speak from on-the-fence as it were, having worked with building committees and architects and clergy I have a point of view that makes it easier to understand the reasoning.

Now you might think that laymen, as such, are merely one of the people, and I am afraid this is an attitude too often adopted by the laity of our church. The laymen of the church form the building committees, they raise the money for church building, and the laymen in general provide the principle witness to the Christian gospel, and therefore a layman must become better informed. We hope that this is one of the things that will happen at this Conference.

I see that laymen have a responsibility toward building a House of Worship in several areas. First of all, the laymen, as well as clergy and architects, must have an understanding of the theology and liturgy of their House of Worship. They must understand just what the House of Worship is for. What are the elements involved in a House of Worship? The theological aspects: the particular church concerns itself with the sacrifice and atonement or the social teachings of Christ, or the attitude of man towards God, or the teaching and preaching mission of the church for the communion, confessional and mass. It is most important that the laymen begin to understand more about these things.

The second thing in understanding about theology and liturgy is the form of worship. What are the local customs of the church? What should be the focal point in the particular form of worship? The next thing is the service. Who conducts what, and when, and how do you handle choirs? And then there is the part of the worship concerned with the baptism, what particular significance is placed on it in the particular theology and liturgy of your church?

Then there are some general aspects that will naturally fall into place. Laymen must understand more of the requirements of the House of Worship. Now, to be truly significant, I think you are already getting this impression from a previous panelist. A church should be built from the inside out. If a church is to perform what it is to do, that is, if it is to have a proper function, and that the human needs are clearly stated in terms of activities and space, there would be no problem with the outside. If building committees would devote a lot of their energy to the study of these things and present their architects with clear, concise, terms of reference, the House of Worship will end up being and looking like a House

of worship. I feel that building committees must set out the theological principles to be followed and the relationship of the other activities to be carried out in the house of worship.

Among laymen today, as well as professionals, there is a great concern over the meaningless, the trite, the downright dishonesty and sham of much of our church architecture. In a recent meeting of a concerned group of architects and churchmen in the United States, the following statement was issued: "We do not begin with the architect or the architecture, we begin with what we believe about God and our reasonable response to the building in our time and place." Laymen have a responsibility toward financing, coordinating, and public relations activities of the church. These are the more practical and philosophical approaches and it will be dealt with this afternoon. Suffice to say, there is a very important part to putting your philosophy in planning into physical form.

Another responsibility that laymen have, particularly on church building committees, is the selection of an architect. And if there were just some magic formula that could be achieved to do this, I am sure that we laymen would be very happy to learn it. It is a problem that besets every building committee and I am sure the afternoon panel will give some guidance.

Now, just a few things in passing that I feel that laymen are not responsible for. Church committees are not responsible to design a house of worship. When building committees start in to draw plans and pictures of what they think a house of worship should look like, they are getting out of their field and are putting immediate obstacles in the way of creating a thing of beauty. Given an intelligent set of references, the architect is presented with a challenge to design so as to retain those insights in the function of the church, and the nature of its worship. Building committees of laymen should concern themselves with stating the theology, liturgy, and human requirements and let the architect look after the aesthetics.

Another thing that laymen should not be responsible for and that is getting plans ready before you even have the financial drive. This is a pet peeve of mine and I am sure we are going to get a lot of interesting comments on that later but I think once you set a dollar limit on your church you have limited the architect in creating something that you are after.

To sum up, the responsibilities of laymen in building a house of worship are to understand the theology and liturgy of the church, to understand the requirements of function and use, to understand financing, coordinating, and public relations, and to understand and do the best in selecting an architect.

Thank you.

Chairman of the National Committee on Church Architecture of the United Church of Canada, and author of the book - "Architectural Requirements of Protestant Worship" Recently written on "Building for Worship" in the Church and Manse publication prepared by the United Church Committee on Church Architecture.

Rev. Fiddes is minister at - Queen Mary Road United Church, Montreal.

The Rev. Victory H. Fiddes: Mr. Chairman, your Grace, friends ...

The subject of this conference is Building a Place for Worship. I am going to project myself on a limb and give at the outset a definition of worship which will serve as a kind of skeleton whose bones you might pick. Now, some years ago, a joint statement was issued by the committee on Church Architecture and the committee on Worship of the United Church of Canada, and this is what we said: "Worshipping is the rendering unto the Lord by His people in word and action, the glory to His name."

A building erected for worship should be functional, adequately fulfilling the requirements, theological, practical, and aesthetic of the liturgy. Now this concept of function, you see, goes far beyond the arid concept of a building, the machine for worshipping. The function is three-fold and note the sequence that first it is theological, the architect must be theologically informed. It is not up to the architect to supply the theological framework, and I am not going to enter into this debate as to whether an atheist can be a good designer, but whether he be an atheist or christian, but he must be instructed by the theologian, and I am not promising that he will get instructions from a theologian here but you ought to ask for that and you ought to receive it. The building of a church is no subjective excursion for individuals, something in which he expresses his own peculiar and subjective ideas out on artistic binge.

The second function serves the classical needs of the worshipping congregation. Now this is the architect's function almost entirely. He has to tell a congregation where the sun rises and where it sets and some of them don't seem to know that. Surely we can expect an architect to design a building that is acoustically adequate. Now here there are subtle requirements. The requirements of speech are not quite the same as the requirements of music but this is a field in which the architects, one of these many practical requirements, that belong to you.

Third, to do it in such a way as to satisfy the aesthetic and emotional requirements ... now I don't know quite what I mean here by saying the aesthetic requirements ... but I think this has something to do with rendering unto the Lord the glory

to His name and perhaps the Mennonite friends that are here today have a contribution at this stage and a particularly helpful one. Here the architects employ the artist if the artist will submit to his terms of reference. And I would like to think that the artists are eager for a liaison here. Now the artists, like the architects, require freedom, but freedom is not licensed. And if the artist has passion in his soul let him use it within the terms of reference and let theology and architecture submit and let's analyze this definition. Worshipping is the rendering unto the Lord by His people. The worship is corporate, undertaken by the people of God, the new Israel, the people are necessary. Worship does not transpire without a congregation. Here we have to distinguish between private worship and public worship. Today we are talking about public worship, I assume.

From here I go on to architectural design. Some implications of this increasingly I find the recessed channel an abomination. In fact what about this whole concept of sanctuary. Remember the New Testament emphasis on the congregation as a holy priesthood, may we speak of the entire area of the church in which the people worship as the sanctuary. As I stand in the Protestant and Reformed tradition I find that this whole concept of sanctuary needs careful analysis. I do not hold to the concept of diety in the building. Worship is the rendering unto the Lord by his people in word and action. Now this word is written in Scripture and its exposition is through preaching. This is part of the action. Here we need to recover the Lutheran emphasis and it is being recovered in all branches of the Church. "So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it." This is action. The preaching of the word is the word, and this is not something thrown out at the congregation, or to a congregation, it involves interplay and participation in, it involves intellectual and emotional response on the part of the people and it leads to self-dedication. But there is interplay here. Therefore, the architect locates the pulpit in such a way that it receives the prominence that it deserves as an integral part of this action in word and sacrament.

Now I am going to use a personal illustration. I am the minister of a church which is an architectural gem, if you regard coptic Gothic as classical. The pulpit is put where it has to be in that church, but where is it? I can't see the choir court, the floor is level, therefore the people at the front have to crane their necks to see. And the roof of the church is designed in such a way that sounds reverberate through pillars; you can't speak normal naturally; it is not a functional form.

Now further implications of this ministry of the word in our joint statement, we had difficulty reaching a conclusion

about the business of the lectern. What is a lectern? Where does it fall? Why does a minister parade around, if what he has to say can't be said from the holy table or pulpit? Should it be said at all? And the members on a committee of worship appear to be afflicted with chancelitis and they were horrified at the suggestion that we should eliminate the lectern, and I open this for debate.

Now the other function is sacramental, the way Christians believe that the last supper is the way which we literally renew ourselves in Christ, that this sacrament epitomizes the whole function of worship which is to renew in Christ and, Monsignor, we of the United Church of Canada find ourselves embarrassed at this point because in recent years we have elevated the holy table to a central place where it belongs but we don't know how to furnish it and use it, and I would like to ask myself and the United Church men, is our worship really patterned after the action of the last supper?

Now have we really got down to business and worship? If we can cover the whole table at Christmas with pine boughs and leave them there until the leaves fall off, is our holy table really functional? In the church to which I referred, with a modest evening congregation - and that is an understatement - I had suggested to the Session that, when daylight saving time comes, we would accommodate the evening congregation in the chancel where the choir thinks it belongs. Why not have the congregation seated there with the service conducted from the holy table with the minister in the midst of his people where he belongs. If we are going to retain the recessed chancel, let us make it functional, or let's get rid of it.

Now, the Baptismal Fount, the design and location should be such that its function is not obscure in relation to other aspects of this ministry of word and sacrament. The fount should be permanent and accessible, and in our tradition it should suggest, I feel I should be there for the congregation to witness, but it should also suggest the initiatory aspect of baptism, and I have some ideas here concerning the placing of the fount.

Now, some of the architectural implications, and I suppose I should stop at this point and let the architects tell us how to do it. The ministers say that this is what we should do but I am going to go on for just another minute here. After this matter of building the church around the altar of which we have heard so much, the minister and people are caught up in this action, but a few years ago when I had the privilege and opportunity of getting to actually build my own church, I gave the architect these terms and I paraphrase it: I want the church designed so that all members of the congregation, including the choir, can see and hear and sympathetically share the entire action whether it be a

pulpit, holy table, or fount. The fount, in addition to being related to the word, should be so located that it suggests its initiatory aspect. We ended up with a box with a bulge, but let me say there is all the difference in the world with a box that is closed with a box that is open, and I think the people are entirely happy with the results although they were exceedingly critical when they first saw the model and the elevation.

Two or three further comments. This work should be done creatively and imaginatively. In John Osborne's play "Look back in Anger" Jimmy Potter says of some of the gentry of England, they are a romantic lot, they spend their time mostly looking forward to the past. The other day a person commented to me that there must be an arch in the church to get a sense of awe. And this reminds me of a number of gimmicks made on automobiles when they first came out. I think they put a little gadget by the dash where the buggy whip used to be for a sense of security. They looked forward to the past.

In a church there shouldn't be deliberate striving, the atmosphere should be derived from, as Prof. Zuk was saying, architectural fabric expressing the nature of the liturgy. Now, unless the architect can justify on theological and liturgical grounds his flight of fancy, he has no business engaging in it. I favor the unbroken wall, the use of white-wash, a lot less direct light, and the subtle use of light only where it is needed which means a little bit of it, but done well.

Thank you.

G. LESLIE RUSSELL

Mr. Russell was born and educated in Winnipeg, receiving his Bachelor or Architecture Degree from the University of Manitoba. He is a partner of the firm of Green Blankstein Russell Associates, whose firm has won several notable architectural design competitions.

Mr. G. Leslie Russell: Mr. Chairman, your Grace, ladies and gentlemen ...

Monsignor Chartrand, in his address, has pointed out very clearly one thing that ties in to what I have to say. That is, that when we build a church we are doing something more than building another building. We must look at this process of building in a more philosophical way.

We are seeking to create an environment for worship; we are seeking to image the thoughts, the words, the actions of man in his relationship with God.

To some, perhaps, the environment is not important, but, to many who go to church seeking a closer relationship with

God, it is. The environment surely can be measured by its success or failure in helping the worshipper in his search for God.

Throughout the ages many have tried to create this environment, some with success, some with failure. The how of creating this environment is of course the difficult thing, the thing man has been searching for.

It is obvious, surely, that in seeking to create this environment man should avoid dragging in the faults to which he is prone. It is dishonest, for example, to use imitations, plaster made to look like stone, or wood made to look like marble.

It is obvious that while the church may be grand, while it may be a great Cathedral, it should not be ostentatious, it should not be seeking self-glorification. It is obvious that the church should not be built according to a fashion, A-frames this year, parabolic arches next. It may be that the church must be built of simple, humble materials, but they should be the best materials of their kind, and the workmanship should be the very best of which the workers are capable.

Above all, the success or failure of the church will depend on the spirit of those who create it. Monsignor Chartrand said that the best of the churches have been built by the people working together, and I for one agree with this very much. I don't think that a church is something that should be designed by an architect working in an ivory tower. Rather the design should result from the working together of the architect with a devoted building committee.

The approach to the building of a church surely must also come out of a belief in God, and a belief in the need to worship God. I cannot imagine, for instance, an atheist designing a good church, no matter how clever a man he might be.

This School of Architecture was founded in 1913 by Arthur A. Stoughton, who was for many years its only professor. I remember him telling his students, as I was one of them, a story, or perhaps a parable, of the medieval stone-cutter. This man was carving the crockets on one of the pinnacles that was to go on the top of the church tower. He was doing his work with great care and attention to detail and someone said to him, "Why do you take so much care, no one is going to see it when it is up there so high".

The stone-cutter's reply epitomizes what our approach to church building should be. "Ah, he said, "but God will see it".

Born in Western Ukraine; high school and music studies in Austria; graduated in Architecture from McGill University; spent one year in Europe on a Pilkington scholarship. Graduate work at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology gaining Master in Architecture Degree. Winner in four architectural competitions.

At present Mr. Zuk is Assistant Professor in Architecture at the University of Manitoba School of Architecture; private practice - mainly Church Architecture.

Professor Zuk: Mr. Chairman, your Grace, ladies and gentlemen ...

I would like the Conference thought on one aspect of religious architecture and this is its symbolic meaning. If one were to ask the simple question, what does a church building look like, one would generally receive two types of answer. One would come from the majority of our population, the laymen, and would suggest that it should have a steeple, it should have pointed windows, a dome, or perhaps the more modern ones would say, a steeply pitched roof, or patio colored glass. These of course are all architectural symbols. The other type of answer would not be at all that specific, it would state rather nebulously that the church should be a simple building expressing its function that the shape will depend on many factors, size, location, and so on. This answer would come from the majority of architects and would suggest a humble searching approach to religious design.

However, the answer given in the form of most church buildings today does not seem to reflect the same attitude. These buildings appear as superficial symbols of the misinterpreted meaning of religion, or just odd-shaped shouting for attention. This, and the laymen's preconceived ideas, would suggest very strongly that everyone is seeking consciously or sub-consciously a symbolic meaning in architectural form. Architectural symbolism can be of several kinds. We have the literal symbolism, the cross for the shape of a plan of the church, or the religious symbol, the fish for a prophet of the church. Then we may have the stylistic symbolis, gothic symbolizing the Anglican religion, and onion-shaped dome the Ukrainian Catholic.

Thirdly, there is object symbolism, or I would like to call it the gimmick of symbolism, a spire, a dome, pointed windows, a bell tower supposed to indicate the church.

Fourthly, I find that there is the very subtle kind of symbolism, the only possible one I contend of the architectural fabric expressing the nature of the liturgy, the nature of religious life, the power of experience. Religion in the true sense is a way of life, a philosophy guiding men, thought and action. The most important human idea and activity, the church I feel should express this ideal in physical terms.

It should be a visual statement of the noblest and most worth while human pursuit. It should inspire and give confidence. In some religions it is even more; it is literally a house of God; and I say that this is an important thought to realize. Therefore, it is not a machine for praying in, as some pioneers of modern architecture may have expressed it. There is no intention here to underestimate the importance of the proper functioning of the performance of prayer, liturgy or preaching. This is of primary importance in a church building and should always receive priority.

However, the purpose of this discussion is to emphasize the need for architectural faces which men express on the exterior will also create a proper visual symbol of religion itself. If religion is taken seriously, or rather what it should mean to man, then it becomes clear that a religious building should remain the most important among all the building types. Today it can not compete in size with office buildings or warehouses, but it can compete with its specific architectural character which can make it the most noble and notable of all structures. But besides being noble and indicative of spirituality, it can and should clearly illumine the service.

Difference in liturgy of the many religions should be reflected in the exterior masses of the building. Honest expression of liturgy can result in the finest architectural statement. Then there is good reason, I feel, why Roman Catholic churches serving French speaking Canadians, should be somewhat different from an English speaking Catholic church. A specific ethnic temperament would react better to certain form arrangements, certain proportions, and certain rhythm would be more meaningful to the congregation. Also it stands to reason that a building for Central Winnipeg should be different from the same type of building for Los Angeles. Different climate, topography, material, labor conditions, would make the transplantation of architectural form into a false and artificial statement. And such an unnatural condition contrary to the idea of honesty and truth should be apparent in all church architecture.

We must show recognition of the exalted nature of the house of worship, expression of the particular form of liturgy, expression of the particular characteristics of the congregation and recognition of the special conditions of the country, hence the area where the building is to stand. To achieve this the ultimate is expected from the architect. It must not just speak of the spirit of worship, and here I would like to say that he could be an atheist, but if he understands the nature of spiritual life it might be alright. He must be fully acquainted with the liturgy. He must be a master of form. He must be sensitive to the nature of the congregation, to its condition, and to the environment, the client, that is the clergy and the building committee must assist him in this

challenging task explaining the requirements rather than telling him what to do. The proper expression of a religious building should not be obtained by formal structural gymnastics, as we mentioned last night, literal symbolism by fastening a tower or cross to an otherwise undistinguished building. The specific liturgy will not be obvious if a dozen or more illuminations can be housed under the rather trite symbol of the modern trademark of modern architecture, the A-frame ... A barn-like structure does not become a truly Ukrainian church by the placing of an onion-shaped dome on it or English Anglican Church by putting pointed windows in its walls. A church using unusual material in architectural gimmicks out of context with its environment will become grotesque. The only way to achieve a proper symbolic expression of a church building is through sensitive arrangements of architectural spaces and the resulting masses.

The proper use of the building materials is the architect's job. This is an immense task of artistic insight and knowledge and an architect should not undertake the task lightly nor should the layman presume to dictate a design. It would be a crime, or perhaps on this occasion, we can call it a sin, to expect the architect to produce a design in a few weeks time. Great architecture can not be produced over night and church architecture must be greater, and the saving of money or effort has never paid off in quality. An architect succeeds no less if he uses church architecture for self-glorification or quick profit-making. Less materialism and more spirituality on the part of all concerned might bring some hope for the return of significant architecture.

FRIDAY P.M. PANEL

"Site Planning"
 "Planning the Church and Education Unit"
 "Church Building Finance"

The Rev. John E. Page, S.J. - Chairman

Rev. John E. Page was born in Winnipeg. Early education included eight years at St. Ignasius Parochial School, Grade IX at Robert H. Smith, and the last two years of high school at St. Paul's. He received a Bachelor of Science in Engineering and Master of Science in Town Planning at the University of Manitoba. He entered the Jesuits in 1948, taught at St. Paul's College, Winnipeg, and was ordained to the Priesthood in 1961. He is at present now doing post-graduate work in Town Planning at the University of Pennsylvania.

Rev. John E. Page:

This morning, ladies and gentlemen, I began to grow a bit anxious as the second session of the morning wore on, and

problems of finance, choice of architect, developing of relations between the client and architect, and there was such promising discussion which moved out on the floor, and I said, perhaps we won't have to come together this afternoon, but we have a panel gathered here this afternoon who will try to cast some light on what may be called rightly or wrongly the more practical aspects of church building. We are aware that here we have men and women from a large metropolitan area, like Winnipeg, but also from smaller centres of the prairies, and even if we may not avert to this distinction during the course of our first presentation, I trust that those of you in the audience who wish to make sure that we touch upon the particular problems of the small town church building problem, will make sure that we cover this when we come together after the coffee break, so we will proceed now and have a presentation from each of the panel members.

We will have some discussion afterwards until the coffee break time, then we will reconvene, trusting you will have stirred up with your several minds many, many questions that you will want to present to us. We want a lively discussion. We know there are no pat answers to any of these questions, you may go away with only big fat questions, but I think it is important to go away with some of the confusion and the question that you do go away with will be closer to the real problems you have in your own area.

So now we are going to begin with Dr. Douglas who will set the stage for the general problem of the siting problem, the total church in the community, and will give just a passing reference to the matter of finance.

DR. F. J. DOUGLAS

Dr. Douglas is a Manitoban and a graduate of United College. He is Director of Church Extension for the United Church in the Conference of Manitoba, and Executive Secretary of the Inner-City Council of the Winnipeg Presbytery of the United Church. He received his Doctor of Divinity Degree from United College. He is a member of the Winnipeg Presbytery Architecture Committee.

Dr. F. J. Douglas

Speaking in terms of the panel, I want first to lay out a definition which might rise out from my comment this morning. Church building not only houses worship and a related life of the religious community, it becomes a symbol to the secular community of what the church is, and what it believes. Architecture rises out of the faith and common life of the church and it accentuates the religious apprehensions of the worshippers and reinforces their belief. A church can either express that opinion, it can suggest that we escape from the world, or that we live in the world, but not of it, or it may suggest that, through the Church, we confront the world. The

building, it seems to me, through its architecture, expresses some of the philosophy that we have in our minds.

Looking over census of our churches, we find that the spiritual birth rate in the community is keeping up with the birth rate as shown in the census figures. Church membership is growing faster in some areas than is the population. Buildings are demanded that will house not only the worshipping section of the congregation, but the whole family throughout the entire week. A much larger proportion of the building budget must be used for educational, recreational, and social facilities, and we must begin to plan so that, architecturally, we are developing a type of building that will be useful now and, in the years ahead. I believe in the visibility of the church. I believe that whether or not a person ever enters into a building, that the church standing in a community gives visible witness to the presence of God, and the family of God, as they confront the world. I believe that we ought to be able to identify the church building by its architecture, that it ought to represent the force of religion in the community.

I am disturbed somewhat by the fact that, as we look at new churches, and plans for new churches, that architects seem to feel that it is a mortal sin to ever copy anything that has been done by anyone else. Every building must be new, it must be different, it must be something that they show new design, and I doubt very much that there are enough good ideas to go around. Sometimes in our building we are finding that it is impossible to look at a new church building and tell what it is. I like to be able to recognize the church as I go along community streets and know that it is a church. I like to be able to tell that it isn't a fire hall or warehouse, even without seeing the cross, which has been used sometimes as a symbol, and one of the symbols that we are inclined to recognize.

I think sometimes we have failed to understand in the church what it is that the church ought to be doing in the community. We have built in down town areas vain monuments to middle class ecclesiastical pride and sometimes forgotten the fact that these buildings stand here not only to serve the gathered community, as the people decide to come to that church, but also have the responsibility to the community in which they live.

An architect I think must recognize that, if religious education requirements and space needs of the group are made known to him, he must go back a further step, he must recognize the religious need, he must be able to see what the reason for this church building is, the purpose must be discovered. It must be discovered by the minister and by the congregation. The architects can not be the theologian for the church anymore than the minister in the church can be the architect. Architects must be prepared to say "no" to the

ARCHITECTURE LIBRARY

church until the church is prepared to say "yes" to its responsibility of rethinking its faith and life and work. The architect's insistence on the church fulfilling its responsibility may be that he will be a catalyst in the church's reassessment of itself and the rediscovery of the source of its life.

Comparisons I suppose are easily made, but there was a time when we used to think of spending every building dollar in relationship to adult worship. I think this has changed and I believe more and more we are spending our building dollar today in relation to a seven day a week program of purposeful activity that will take in every age group. We need to plan for indoor and outdoor recreational and fellowship facilities, we need to give greater attention to the details of educational facilities.

There are four things I think need to be said in regard to what this building, Christian Education building, or Fellowship Hall, must have. I think it must have flexibility. I think we must be able to use it for many different purposes. It ought to be healthy and safe and comfortable. It ought to be designed to further the learning program of children and adults. It ought to be so designed that it permits great flexibility and it ought to be attractive.

Flexibility is, I think, one of the places where we have failed too often in our fellowship buildings. In many of our buildings it is quite impossible to have a group of boisterous youths carrying on activity and a quiet meeting being carried on at the same time. We have need for several rooms that can be sound-proofed, areas where people may go and have opportunity of carrying on quiet discussions. And in the programming of the church, very often what we do, we find we have to program so that each age group or each specific group will receive an hour and a half, or two hours, of the church's time, and the other time is not available to them.

We ought to have some facilities in the church where people may drop in; they may come and be part of the fellowship on very informal basis. Programming of events ties in very closely with the kind of building that we are going to have. We have to decide what it is that we want in our fellowship hall, in our Christian Education hall, and then we need to design this and put it into bricks and mortar.

The question of church sites is most important, particularly in the urban area. We believe that, as far as the United Church is concerned, every time a new community (with six or seven-thousand people) is created, we need to make a survey in that community to see whether there is a need for a church of our denomination. Surveys I think come first. We must know who the people are, what the potential is in the area before we begin to build. We need to recognize, and I would agree with the panel this morning, the suggestion that there be a number of small churches, we would recognize the fact

that there should be a church approximately a mile from an existing church of the same denomination.

In a new community we believe that the church ought to be placed on an inner corner of the mile circumference so that three quarters of the people are coming from an area outside towards the centre of the city, because people's natural transportation will be past that area. This in turn gives visibility again to the church.

Making use of surveys that are done by school boards; by shopping centres, because they know where the best area is, often this gives us the fringe benefit if we can be associated within a block or so of a shopping centre in respect to parking restrictions. We believe too that we ought to be aware of what the other denominations are doing in the community in regard to sites. Churches ought not to be placed three or four on each corner, they ought to spread around a bit. We ought to be three or four blocks from a church of another denomination. There will be many people in our community that have no strong denominational ties and we ought to be able to trust churches of other denominations to serve them equally as they trust us to serve them if we are living close beside them.

In regard to finance, there are many things I would like to say. I think we need to recognize the fact that we can not build a church without finance. This is the responsibility of the local community. It is the responsibility of the denominational offices to give assistance and help as the people make their plans for church building. It is their responsibility some times to raise the sights of the community so that they will be prepared to do something more than what they see for the immediate group that they have around about them.

M. P. MICHENER

Mr. Michener was born in Winnipeg and educated in parochial schools in Winnipeg; received his degree of Bachelor in Architecture from the University of Manitoba. He is principal in the firm of Libling, Michener & Associates, Architects, and has been involved in the design of religious buildings since entering practice. His firm won a Massey Medal Award for Architecture in 1960 for their Chapel of St. Louis le Roi in St. Boniface.

Mr. M.P. Michener: Mr. Chairman, your Grace, ladies and gentlemen ...

This afternoon Dr. Douglas has set forth some of the objectives for which we should strive in building a Christian church. He has spoken, as he should, as a clergyman. This morning the speakers spoke from the vantage of their various backgrounds of the developing theology in the twentieth

century as it relates to church building. As an architect, I would like to address myself to the challenge extended by Mr. Kidder Smith last evening. His remarks, repeated again this morning by our Conference Chairman, Mr. E. J. Smith, were that one is hard pressed to choose a great example of contemporary parish church architecture in North America. I regret that I must agree with the general validity of this proposition, and I hope that my remarks here this afternoon and those of the other panelists, may assist us in understanding the cause of this situation and suggest ways of changing it.

Firstly, let us reaffirm the importance of church architecture in giving witness to Christ. As church architects, we are involved in a great apostolic work. We must find ways of interpreting architecturally the Christian message. We must design artistically significant churches which, because of their spiritual qualities, will cause men to worship God and inspire men to praise God. We must order the functional, the spatial, the structural and technological elements of our churches in a way that transcends the purely material elements with which we work. This is as great a challenge to architects today as it has been in previous Christian ages.

Secondly, I believe it is true that in North America we possess architectural talent equal to that of Europe. We have material resources unparalleled in history. We are widely regarded for our organizational abilities and our capacities to get things done. We possess a rich culture, which is a blending of many cultures from the old world. If these things are true, as I believe, how is it that we have failed to realize the greatness that should be ours in church architecture? I suggest that it is because we have failed to organize the resources at our disposal. To achieve the great architecture which we desire, how are we to organize our church building processes so that good, and sometimes even great church buildings result?

I wish to outline generally several improvements in the way we are doing things at the present time which will assist us in achieving this end. I would like to do this with special reference to site planning, planning the church and Christian education unit and building finance. I can do no more than introduce these subjects in the time available, which the chairman has allotted as five minutes. I hope my remarks will stimulate my fellow panelists, and you delegates, to further comments on these subjects.

Let us look first at planning the site and particularly the choosing of the site. I submit that most sites are chosen without benefit of architectural advice. They are chosen by men of good will but incomplete knowledge deciding a matter of vital importance to the success of the church. Generally these men understand the importance of public and private transportation, the size of the lot required for a certain sized church, and the relationship which should exist between

the church and the community. Often, however, they are unaware of the visual aspect, or the physical impact of the proposed church in the community, or what exterior character may best express the aspirations of the congregation. I believe our city planners are not meeting the needs of the church in the provision of suitable sites. In Winnipeg we are allowed to build churches on any piece of land reserved for single family housing. I am not convinced that a site for a three bedroom split level home is really significant enough for a place of community Christian worship. I do not believe that a church at a major intersection is a complimentary building to the gas station across the street. I do believe that the involvement of the architect in the process of choosing a site will add a knowledge now missing from the choice of our building sites. Mr. Chairman, we must get the architect into the decision making process of the choice of site, so that we can once again find the kind of sites which Mr. Kidder Smith showed us in many of his slides last evening.

I would like to consider now, certain aspects of the way we organize for planning the church building and Christian Education unit. As Dr. Douglas has pointed out, the first thing is a committee is formed. As with sites there seems to be a real fear on the part of many church organizations to discuss the project at this time with an architect. Much work is done at this time at the committee level. A program is formed, a great deal of discussion takes place on finance, and when the church committee feels they have things pretty well organized, they then call in the architect. In short, many decisions which bear importantly upon the final design have already been made without reference to architectural advice. The architect is not a theologian, nor is he a liturgist, but he has knowledge of how these various disciplines bear upon the physical problems of church building. He is aware of the problems of finance, and he can advise on the matter of how much money you require to achieve your goal. I would suggest that rather than putting the choice of the architect eighteenth on Dr. Douglas' list, that the architect become involved much earlier. I think he has much to contribute whether as another member of the committee, or as the professional who will actually be doing the design. I think there is a real inter-action that should take place between the architect and the committee.

Now that we have an architect on the committee, how should we proceed. The size of the committee should be as large as is practical, and should represent many diverse points of view within the congregation. The building of a church is not solely the function of the pastor and the architect. It is the function of as many people in the parish as wish to participate because it is a really vital and important way for the parishoners to deepen their understanding of their faith. Now to suggest that as many people as possible

should be involved in the programming of the church, I do not wish to imply that the final decision making should remain with a large and diverse group. A select committee should be formed, which is sufficiently small to assess the suggestions of the larger committee and to provide priorities in the design program. Many bad designs result from confused programming or from the assigning of unimportant functions to places of design importance.

Lest my remarks be considered as critical only of the layman and the kind of organization which he sets up for church building purposes, I would now like to address a few remarks to my fellow architects. If we are to judge from many of the church buildings which we see in North America, we must conclude that there is a misunderstanding of the functional aspects of the church and how they relate to the exterior form. Many architects seem to approach the design of a church as an opportunity to indulge in personal whimsy. I submit this does not represent a deep understanding of what the church really is and what it is required to do. I think before we embark upon personal design expression we must have a deeper understanding of the functions and purposes of the church than appears evident in many church buildings that we now see.

Turning to building finance, I believe there must be absolute clarity in the establishment of budget limitations. There should be no doubt in the architect's mind as to how much money is available. There should also be no doubt in the building committee's mind how much building they are likely to get for the money available. It is here in the realm of finance, that the really hard decisions must be made. In establishing budgets for various portions of the job we are required to make value judgements. We must say that it is more important to spend money here than there. We say we must have a paved parking lot, but we can get along with a less expensive finish in the sanctuary. When we are making these decisions, we are proclaiming to society what a Christian congregation considers of importance. It has been my experience that we always have sufficient money for cloak rooms, adequate toilet facilities and usually money for a soundly built chancel or nave. There seldom seems to be enough money for appropriate works of art, specially designed interior fittings, or appropriate landscaping. In regard to works of art, I would suggest that church finance committees consider budgeting one percent of the total value of the church, that is \$1,000 on a \$100,000 project for a specially commissioned work of art. The painter, the sculptor and ceramicist have a contribution to church building far beyond the actual dollar cost. Landscaping which is used as an integral part of the architectural design, and not as a decorative frill, can tie the church building into the general community and provide a living witness or part of the glory of God's creation. Provisions for these things should be made at the outset of budget preparation. We should not simply hope that sufficient funds will be available after the "more important" things are

provided.

If we choose our sites more intelligently, if we organize our resources appropriately, I believe we can look forward here in North America, to the kind of churches which Kidder Smith showed us last evening, the kind which will truly give praise to God.

REV. C. H. FERGUSON

Rev. Ferguson is a member of the National Committee on Church Architecture, United Church of Canada; Secretary of the Board of Christian Education of the United Church. Reverend Ferguson has come to us directly from the Purdue Consultation for Building of the Church Teaching Ministry. Rev. Ferguson resides in Toronto.

Rev. C.H. Ferguson -

The purpose of church architecture from the Christian education point of view is to provide systematic opportunities for persons at each stage from the smaller child to the older person, to be confronted with the Christian gospel and the Christian community, which is, first of all, the Church. This will take into account three concerns. First of all, the message itself, the content that there is a message to impart of what God has done and how He has revealed himself and how He meets man. Secondly, that of process where we are concerned about how learning really takes place, the ability to appropriate certain parts of truth at certain ages and stages, and then the setting in which this really takes place, and in what situations does learning happen. This takes us into a questioning of the nature of the church. As the teaching and the worshipping fellowship, a place where Christian nurture is very vital, I would like to submit that these two are not separate but one. Learning often takes place in worship and worship becomes more meaningful as education renews it and supports it.

Then we are reminded that a Church is set in the world, often in conflict with it, and Christians must bear witness for the Gospel. We will think of our responsibility from the standpoint of a place where people are gathered and from where they go out into the world with a mission. In determining the actual goals for Christian education we should be reminded that they are not fixed once and for all but as we continually study they keep expanding and they become deeper. I think we will come to the place where, in the very deepest sense, we will realize that it is not man that is the real educator, that it is God, and our responsibility is to help create and stimulate a kind of environment in which God, through the Holy Spirit, really does enter into the life of man.

There are some questions which we must ask as we plan to build for Christian education. We are asked, what is our philosophy for learning. Are we thinking of something that is knowledge on the one hand that somehow can be poured as it were from a jug into minds and lives of other individuals, something that can happen by a lecture method that because I say the word of perfect truth, therefore you are informed people, and the miracle has taken place. Or, if it is something that is only appropriated as the members of a group along with the teacher or leader, really search out for themselves, using all the resources available to them, searching out the meaning of the Gospel for their lives. These are some of the questions that must be answered before we are able to enter into a good relationship with an architect, and be able to give him the kind of thing that we ask him to express in design and in form.

I would like to say just a few words about some of the trends that we have seen in the building for Christian Education. Some of us lived long enough to remember, or maybe not when these first buildings were built, but to enter into sizeable churches where they had Christian education buildings and what they called the Acron style. Usually at the rear of the place of public worship, that it was with a platform at one end or the other, where the Superintendent of the Sunday School, or whatever person he might be, he was a platform person. And then all around were little box stalls as it were that could be closed when the time came for some quiet participation in groups, but all focusing upon this one person. Sometimes these classrooms were in the gallery. Now this may have had some real thought in it when it was created. There was a sense of unity working together but, at the same time, it had overlooked some of the processing by which learning takes place in smaller groups and was best suited for the lecture type of procedure.

Well, from there we gradually, watching the public school, realized we must grade our groups more carefully and therefore we will take this group of this age and this of the next, and we will treat them separately. Again we will then perhaps have our own worship service as a group and then we will go into our little cubicles or corners. Sometimes I am afraid, when we got separated this way, we felt we had to do, or almost copy, the kind of thing that was done in the regular church service, or service of public worship, and mix some of our real purposes here.

The same went on to a further type of development. About ten years or so ago some of us have been hearing about what we call the unit kind of room. This of course is something that would apply to a larger church but, at the same time, let us not overlook the fact that in some of the smaller churches, this is really less being able to share the kind of privileges that some of us have to grow up in small churches where we were not swamped by big groups, where we had a

chance really to participate more freely than we did in the big crowd. But this might be a room that would hold from 20 to 30 pupils of approximately the same grade, at least maybe 6, 7 and 8; or 8, 9 and 10; 9, 10 and 11's, and so on, with perhaps two to four teachers approximately the same ratio of teacher to pupil as a teen teaching relationship. I don't just mean sharing skills and relieving one and another of responsibilities but people cooperating in preparation and in activity sharing together, supporting one another, sharing in the observing of what is going on between themselves and the pupils, and with a total concern for the purpose of each session.

Now this has some advantage as over against a large assembly as, from the time the first child arrives until they are ready to have an opening worship, instead of not sitting still and being scolded for not doing it, each can enter into some kind of activity immediately prepared for him, research type, some assignment that is to be used in the work of the day and an involvement on a different level, not just for busyness sake but activity that is creative.

Well, this kind of room also lends itself very well to mid-week programming; in addition to the club size of room there may need to be some kind of larger room for some kinds of recreation. But I think today we are beginning to say that recreation that is fitted within a program - and I am all for it - but not building a building in order to have a basketball team upon which there are five or six persons to be able to compete against some other church somewhere else, or some other group in the community, but keeping it within the context of a Christian learning program.

Now of the books that are perhaps still our standard books; that is the ones put out following the Chicago Conference in 1954 by Dr. Atkinson and entitled "Building and Equipping for Christian Education". I am sorry there doesn't happen to be one here, I assumed there would be one here. But that book in the revised form of a year ago is still the basic book.

Well, as they have just said, I have just come from a Conference at Perdue in which it was really a consultation on church architecture and Christian Education. We were reviewing the situation today as against what had taken place ten years ago; this book that I was speaking about is the product of that thinking. There are three or four things that we would perhaps sum up as saying are chief concerns of today.

Basically we think this size is a preferable situation where you can have it. This doesn't mean that you can't do a job, if you haven't got it, because some of the rest of us would never be here, if we hadn't come through situations which were a lot less perfect than the ones we might be dreaming about. But then it doesn't mean that we can't be looking forward to setting it up where it is possible. Then maybe

on the other hand we are thinking of more flexibility today. We are thinking of combining groups in some different way. Churches have gone to extremes in putting boys in one group and girls in another, contrary to what we do in our public schools and other forms of education. And then they haven't got enough to have a sizeable group to do the same type of thing in Christian Education. We should ask ourselves, are we justified in doing this thing? Wouldn't grouping be wiser on another pattern?

We are concerned that there be a closer relationship between the public worship service and the educational program. We have tended to say, let's have it all in an hour Sunday morning. Well we can't come twice so we come and we delegate the junior members to other areas for Christian Education while the rest worship, and variations of this type of thing. I think we were quite agreed there that the day of family worship in the church must be coming back, that it is too basic a relationship to deal with lightly, and that perhaps we need to rethink about our youth, of a building, so few hours for the investment we put in it, that there is no one particular hour on Sunday sacrosanct that we may use part of the building at one time and part at another.

I know this will be objected to, it doesn't fit our comfortable way of life. But really if it is Christian education, it is not education for comfort to be satisfied, it is educating us into the kind of life that was willing to take hardships in order to get ahold of what was real and true in the Gospel.

Well there is another concern that is renewed today on adult level education, that unless adults come in to a face to face relationship, a two-way communication, if you will, about the meaning of the Gospel, that we are not going to be able to do the kind of work we ought to. And I am willing, and at the point to say that, if we are building a sanctuary, and I am not quite prepared to say that we necessarily build the Christian Education building first, we may have to compromise both ways. But if we are building a sanctuary for a place for public worship, I am ready to ask ourselves, might we better not put in pews for a few years until we are able to have the other facilities as well so that we can turn around and have some of this kind of dialogue that may be needed in order to grow.

Well, there are a lot of things we could mention about keeping our minds open for some of the new mechanical facilities and tools that may be used in teaching just to keep flexibility. I know that there will be a chance to talk further about it but we are thinking in terms of being able to provide systematic opportunity to encounter people at the various stages of their lives with the implications of the Christian Gospel.

Thank you.

Born near Canora, Saskatchewan; early education in Saskatchewan and University training at the University of Manitoba, obtaining his B.S.A. Master of Science degrees at the University of Manitoba. Dr. Kondra obtained his Ph.D. Degree in Genetics at the University of Minnesota. At present Dr. Kondra is Associate Professor of Animal Science at the University of Manitoba. He has served as Chairman of Church Building Committees.

Dr. P.A. Kondra: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen

I know that I am badly outnumbered on the panel as a layman. I am pleased to have the opportunity to express a few thoughts as a layman but not necessarily about laymen.

In designing their church building, many religious sects and ethnic groups face a difficult task when deciding to what extent they should incorporate the traditional characteristic features of their church in Canadian churches. This problem is not simple to resolve when, on the one hand these traditional features of the building are related to church liturgy and have spiritual significance. On the other hand, some of these traditional features of design consume a high percentage of the cost of the church structure yet they may contribute little if any to the functional needs of the parish and to the present day approach of Christian education.

Some attempt to resolve this problem by utilizing imitations of certain traditional features as for instance, the use of a non-functional closed-in and windowless dome, instead of the traditional open naturally lighted and highly decorative dome of the Orthodox church of Byzantine Rite. The new structure loses its traditional effect, though it may make the building somewhat more adapted to the severe climate in Canada.

In some instances we see the other extreme where not only do they forget completely about the traditional features, but the new church structure cannot even be distinguished from a supermarket or a bowling alley.

The first step to the solution of this problem is a thorough study of the Architect of traditional design and the liturgical needs of a specific church, as well as a thorough knowledge of all the present day needs of the parish. This should be enhanced by the fullest cooperation and participation of the parish laymen who have also done a great deal of homework on the liturgical functions of the church building so that their needs would be provided for in the new structure. The architect alone, especially without the assistance of a well informed lay committee, cannot design a church to meet the various needs of a particular parish.

I feel that the church buildings in Canada should, firstly, be identifiable as churches, and I don't mean only by placing

a cross on what appears like a curling rink, and secondly, they should have the traditional elements represented symbolically so that the church building may be identified as belonging to a specific denomination. The emphasis should be placed on coordination of the architectural features with its functional requirements as a place of worship and to fulfill the needs of Christian education of the parish.

Closely allied is another problem arising out of the fact that it seems to be an accepted objective of most architects and parishes to build a structure which is radically different from any existing structures to attract attention. This is where we are losing our true perspective of the function of the church building. It should not be the novelty of design that attracts the parishioners but rather its usefulness as a place of worship and for teaching Christian principles. There is too little being done to date in using landscape, rather than the structure alone, to make the church attractive. The beauty of nature can provide a much more suitable aesthetic transition from the town or city surroundings into a place of worship.

Lastly, we have hardly scratched the surface in studying the psychologic relationship of various designs, particularly interior designs, to the spiritual uplifting of the individual.

ETIENNE GABOURY, B.A.

Mr. Gaboury was born in Swan Lake, Manitoba. His early education was gained in St. Gerard and Bruxelles Convent. Received degree of Bachelor of Arts from St. Boniface College. Received his Bachelor of Architecture Degree from the University of Manitoba. Mr. Gaboury has his own architectural practice. He has recently been appointed on the eleven-man architectural advisory committee of the Canadian World Fair.

Mr. E. Gaboury

The church building as a focal point in the urban community is gradually being replaced by the supermarket, the shopping centre and the arena. Our heterogeneous society has, by necessity, relegated the place of the church building to a minor civic importance. The cleavage between spiritual and temporal is becoming definite. The church is reduced to its purely religious functions and it is being pushed back to become the fabric of the residential area.

The fact is that the church cannot compete with other community and civic functions, and therefore, the relationship of the church to other community facilities will become increasingly tenuous. Unless the church or a group of churches

can be designed at the initial stage of a development scheme, the probability of having the church integrated to the civic center is very remote. As for the grouping of churches together to form a religious center, the difficulty in establishing continuity and removing competition of form has made these attempts very unsuccessful.

The growth, the establishment, and the financing of the parish has by necessity forced upon the parish a selection of economical and therefore usually residential property.

The church is gradually finding its new place less in the urban building composite than in the placid human scale of the residential district. There is, in any case, a closer affinity to the home than there is to the theatre of the super-market. "Art Sacre" has a very interesting conclusion in "L'Eglise dans la Cité". I quote: "Finally the onslaught and the proliferation of large buildings introduces an entirely new consideration in the relationship of the church to the city. The character of the House of God cannot be expressed except perhaps in an exceptional case by its impressive dimensions. The situation is reversed, the large office buildings and super-structure totally dominate the church by their mass. Will the church then be crushed and humiliated? On the contrary, this is a unique occasion to display the true image of itself, freed of the bonds of riches and worldly possessions. This enables us to rediscover the principle which has never been forgotten in Japan: "There exists the monumentality of the horizontal which is no less noble than the vertical. This, as a result, will permit it to become more discreet, more humble, truly more evangelical without, nevertheless relinquishing its spiritual grandeur".

Architecture is the intellectual and emotional expression of the relationship of matter to function and space, it is giving matter a spiritual value. Hence, any work of art is to some degree sacred, even if the subject is more profane. As for the church, sacredness is only a matter of degree.

The church is essentially the same as any other building. It must be evaluated by the same basic principle of architectural design and composition. It will be distinguished from other buildings only by its function, the main function being that of a place of gathering to worship God.

The evolution of church design has not come about only through the evolution of architectural principles at the turn of the century, nor was this evolution the direct result of the industrial revolution and the advent of steel and ferro-concrete. I fear that the architectural movement alone would not have been able to rid us of the bad eclectic church architecture that was so profusely built during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and is still being advocated by so many today. The economical and social pressures have been the biggest boosters of liturgical architecture.

E. Gaboury - cont'd

The committee and the minister should clearly establish the terms of reference and the program of their particular condition. This should be discussed at the initial stage with the Architect so that he can become fully conversant with the problems and may assist in the proper development of the program. He should be given the opportunity of becoming personally involved as though he was a member of the parish: There should be complete faith in the architect and, if not, we should choose one in whom we have entire confidence. This, I believe, is absolutely essential.

At a very early stage, schematics should be drawn up to clarify the program and the relationship of secondary functions. These things being well established and fully understood, and the economics well thrashed out, the architect should then design the building. At this stage, the architect should be given full reign and should present to the congregation a solution that answers in every way the requirements of their program. The role of the patron would be to ensure that practical aspects of the program have been met. They have every right to be critical of design but when they engage in evaluating architectural principles and aesthetics, and demanding changes to architectural details for visual reasons, they are impeding on grounds that are invariably beyond their full understanding. In most cases, they are doing a dis-service to themselves by mitigating and distorting what might have been a strong and harmonious solution.

In the final analysis, if the functional requirements have been met, the evaluation of the solution would then be a matter of taste, but taste involves a choice between two possible rights, not the choice between a right and a wrong.

If we are designing churches for the prairie region, our analysis of function must also include the psychological, the physical, the social and geographical conditions we live in.

Our landscape is generally drab and flat. Perhaps then, should we not reconsider the importance of verticality in this environment? In our prairie landscape, failing the presence of our faithful grain elevators, some type of vertical expression might be essential.

We experience extremes in climate from 90° above to 30° below; we have up to 50 inches of snow in the winter. We are blessed with much sunshine, and our winds are predominantly north west. Our church architecture must then be moulded to resist these physical pressures, and express this very resistance. It should also blend in this unique environment to create an architecture that belongs to Canada, and particularly to the prairie regions.

It is surprising that with our extreme cold, heavy snow and costly construction, we have made little attempt to go underground. Or again, why have we not given some importance to the atrium as an enclosed space, and the psychological preparation to enter the church. We could thus achieve the logical architectural and religious progressions that our regional expressions are lacking so much. Could we not have the parish hall and the Christian Education unit serve as this transitional element and become our covered church atrium?

Our prairie architecture must necessarily be an introverted architecture, it must acknowledge our climate conditions in its expression as much as in its details. Its sense of enclosure, protection should be prevalent; it should cling to the earth and fear the elements.

In conclusion, I would like to say, we cannot be satisfied that having created a strong and definite religious mood, we have designed a successful church, nor can we take any justification when we have failed the proper expression in saying that it was economical. I also find it a small achievement when we can only say of a church that it does not disturb the faith of the people; or that it has traditional connotations, or simpler yet, that it looks like a church. I believe we cannot be complacent about religious matters. Our churches must move us, in one way or another, to greater enlightenment.

St. Paul's College Address at Dinner Meeting
Friday, February 21, 1964
by Rev. John E. Page, S.J.

"SUMMATION OF CONFERENCE"

Mr. Chairman, your Grace, Ladies and Gentlemen: In spite of the two introductions today, both men have omitted the essential fact of why I should not be here and that is a simple reminder "that man is not a prophet in his own country". But I am very happy to be here for two principle reasons, one is that this is the 50th anniversary of the School of Architecture, which is my own alma mater, and that the School of Architecture which to me says, "John Russell" has been honored on its 50th anniversary by being raised to the level of a Faculty of this University community.

I am very privileged to be able to be back here and yesterday to have seen Professor Russell and to share somehow in this anniversary year.

The second is, that this is my first time to come back to St. Paul's for any kind of occasion and to be in a building that I had some part in working through the program stage, plan stage, and the building stage, going through some of the travail that we spoke of today. I have notes here for a long talk, I hope you are ready for probably 50 minutes, but everything I could have said, or planned on saying, has been said today. One by one I was ticking my talk off in my mind as the program unfolded this morning, so really there is nothing to add now, so if you are to go away now, you would be as well off.

I will sum up the Conference today in the expression, "A Renewal in Religious Architecture in the World Today." This is the thought that has been going through my mind for several weeks. I tried to look at Mr. Kidder Smith's slides last night with his viewpoint and I have chosen three key words to try and exemplify what I think has been the theme of this Conference, that is, a renewal of religious architecture in the world today, and I think if we try to grab hold of what these three words mean to us we will be able to have perhaps three notions to sum up the day's deliberations, talks, remarks, and questions, and so on.

When we think of a renewal in 1964 and onward, we are speaking in a very Christian sense and I think it is important to be sure of our grounds when we speak in this language so that we will know that we are not doing anything that is strange to people who are committed to Christ. Because, if we go back and look at the Old Testament, and to see that it was a promise of something to be fulfilled, and then carefully go through the New Testament, we will find, I think, that renewal pervades the whole Christian message. Our Lord spoke about propagating

the new law. He spoke about the new Jerusalem. He spoke about the new man. He himself is referred to as new Adam. These are always expressions that simply flood the New Testament and perhaps we have not been conscious enough of this element of newness; and yet when I say this, I am not talking about novelty, they are two different notions. Novelty, for novelty sake, has nothing to do with this. But the newness, that is the newness of Christianity, is a newness that speaks of some kind of fulfilment that is yet to come. We are moving toward some type of development that God has planned out for us and we take an active part. Our Lord spoke of it in such intense terms that He said, "unless a man be born again," and we can't imagine any more renewal than being born again.

That is how radical a commitment to Christ becomes, through baptism, so what has begun in baptism then is simply the beginning of this renewal, this making new of all things, not just men and women, but of all the things in Jesus Christ, and this is the process that will go on until the end of time. And when we hear of a new Jerusalem it is simply an image which speaks of time when this fulfilment will have reached its completion. So, I think, when we consider the matter of church building and church architecture in 1964 we have to be very conscious of this making new which is our responsibility. Otherwise we may be inclined to back away from and look forward to the past, as someone mentioned in the last 24 hours, instead of looking forward to the fulfilment as promised to us. So then, making new in the Christian sense, is really the challenge that faces us in the matter of church building.

The other point is that we are going to try and renew church architecture, religious architecture, and we will think of the time when the term renaissance was applied to church architecture in the 15th and 16th century. This is not the type of renewal I am speaking of, because in the 15th and 16th centuries when the renaissance in art and architecture was taking place, the people were looking forward to the past. That is precisely why it was not a Christian renewal in the sense that I am speaking of. They looked back to the glorious times of Greece and Rome and said to themselves, "can we not be as great as they", and they imitated the form that was then common. They resurrected, they brought back Greek and Roman architectural forms. They measured every little detail they could find among Greek and Roman ruins in order to duplicate exactly the physical forms of these classical buildings.

Well, today, we are not in that position at all. If we are going to embark upon a renewal in religious architecture we have to go out and take a tremendously big step in the dark. We are not looking forward to the past, we are looking forward to the future. It is the future that is uncharted, it is the true frontier land of human living, and as we step forward

and go over this frontier, it is darkness before us, and so we have to go and experiment with daring and courage and confidence and wisdom, as well as with humility and great trepidation. I can't help thinking of the remark one of our architects made in San Francisco about three weeks ago when a new cathedral model was unveiled to the people of San Francisco, that he himself was caught up somehow in the feeling of humility and trust that must characterize the stepping forward into the area of almost darkness, because this is what is involved I think in a creative art. We don't know what the result will be, it is not going to be a Greek temple, we know that, but we don't have any idea of what its form might be. The architect said, let us above all keep a fear of God in our hearts as we move from this design stage of the model, and so on, into the working drawings, into the construction, and into the final enrichment and endorsement of this new cathedral, that it will fulfill the promise that is already there in the sketch stage.

Well I think this is the type of spirit that must characterize what we mean by a religious architecture. It is looking forward to a future that is promised to us by God in and through Jesus Christ. We are doing our work that is our responsibility as human beings. We have been called to this; it has a vocational aspect to it; and so we can go ahead with a very strong faith that, what God has called us to, He will guide us through to as we work with trust and confidence, and above all, as we work with as much wit and talent and with as much of our resources that we can possibly bring to bear on this task of trying to make architecture today when we bring it to a church building to make it truly religious.

During the course of the day we have been trying to grasp what it is about a building that makes it religious, and this is really a very difficult thing to express. It is difficult to express because it involves feeling and human experience, and a total human experience can not be reduced to words. But we know as surely as we are sitting here in this room tonight that, if we walk into a building that is authentically religious, we know for certain that this building is speaking to us about God, and the person can be a Hindu or a Moslem, or a Protestant, or a Catholic, of any rite, of any cult, as long as this person is open to hear God, or feel God's presence, walk into such a building and be aware that this is a religious space created by man.

Now, it is a very intangible quality, and yet we know that it is an objective reality, it is not a subjective thing. It is not a religious feeling that is connected with some pious association of the past. It is not because there is something in it that reminds us of our childhood - no, this is something that is very objective that has been planted through the skill of the architect and builder, and the congregation has somehow made this a living reality, made this a prayer in three dimensions, made it as it were to say, I am architecture at prayer.

I think that this is what the church building, a religious bit of architecture, should try and be. Now, how this is accomplished is another matter. That is the architect's problem, and so then when we speak of religious architecture today, we are speaking of basically an attitude. At the Conference, which parallels this one a little over two years ago, and even today, there has been a frightful concern about function and the expression even that form follows function, has been thrown out to the delegates to consider.

I would like to go to the stage that comes before a consideration of function and I think it is at that stage that we begin to create a religious building. In other words, it is something in the way of an attitude, a sense of direction, a sense of dedication, a sense of deep faith and trust. All these things somehow together which precede the beginning of your program, precedes the talk about function, so that I would be tempted to say, and in front of my Bishop here, that, if a truly religious building begins in this way, somehow it is a secondary step in this particular church whether this church will be dedicated to a Christian form of worship, to Moslem form of worship, or to a Hindu form of worship. In other words, it is a religious building before it becomes a specifically sacramentally directed building for Catholic use or dominantly spoken word form of worship, or a congregationalist assembly. Before that happens, this building is a religious building. In other words, it is not because the plan is a cross-shaped plan, it is not because the cross appears on the roof of a church, that we notice this is a religious building. It is that every bit of it now is caught up in this act of worship, an act of dedication in the simple, humble act of prayer to God.

Again I say, how is this done? I have no idea. But at least I think we can go back to the Bible and find two directives that may help us whether we be the congregation or the builder, or whether we be the architect, and that is the notion that runs through the Old Testament is fulfilled in Christ in the New, the notion of giving of our first fruits, giving the first born child, the first born of our flock, to God. I think it is this basic orientation that somehow illuminates us, gives us the spirit of God, which allows us to go and use what we have more suitably, more in accord with His plan. In other words, I think perhaps the reason we have been troubled for so many years now over trying to create a religious building in a technical civilization of the 20th century, is because we have not been sufficiently conscious of the fact that we must give God our first fruits, and the first fruits that I speak of here are the magnificent fruits of our 20th century technology.

All the materials that we have, all the knowledge of past ages, all the techniques that are now at our disposal, somehow this has to be taken first of all and consecrated to God through an act of worship which characterizes what we have

come to learn about through the teaching of the Bible, that this is what God first wants us to do. In other words, it is something like the children at home, give them a new toy, the first thing you teach them to do is to say "thank you", and then the child is able to go out and somehow enjoy the toy in a more happy fashion. And perhaps this is what we need to do as architects and builders and congregations, somehow take hold of this magnificent technology, as all of our developments have taken place in our lifetime and before, and somehow make a great act of worship of this in a religious building that will give meaning to all the architectural work that is going on in the world today.

Then I come to the point of doing this in the world today. Today's world is unique like every other year was in the history of mankind and before man came upon this earth. But somehow today's world is in a state of tremendous revolution as I see it. We feel this in many dimensions of our lives. We have seen it for example most poignantly in the death of President Kennedy when, through the extraordinary means of modern communication for four days, certainly all of North America, and even vaster regions of the earth, were caught up in sharing the single experience of mourning the death of one man. Never before in the history of mankind did we all actually experience the sorrow of a man's family over his passing from our midst.

This is something entirely new and I think it gives a new dimension to human living, and this has a feed-back into the work we do when we come to design and build a church structure. Somehow today we are becoming one human family. There was mention made this afternoon that perhaps the horizontal line, having a more suitable expression in our building than the vertical line, and it occurred to me then that this horizontal line, in spreading out on the horizontal line, somehow speaks to us of the making one of the human family that is going on in the world today.

Also, when we think of today's world, we think of the tremendous variety of materials that the architect is given to use. And this is the temptation - anyone who has tried to create knows that there is a step in the dark involved, that somehow the creative process is going to produce more than he anticipates. When we begin to prepare a design for a building, we have to realize that there is going to be something greater produced here if we give ourselves completely than we ever dreamed about. Again we have to realize there is a temptation here to allow certain types of technique to replace the complete self-dedication that must be present as we come to make this effort, either the congregation as a builder, or as an architect. Somehow, when we come here to do this particular job of providing a home for God's family to worship in, we have to resist the temptation of all these very modern materials that are at

Rev. John E. Page, S.J. cont'd. (Page 7)

be faced with, is to know that in some way we are fulfilling a task that God has given us, and so we can go forward with great confidence and trust that, if we give ourselves completely in this dedication, somehow God is working with us as we go about our jobs. And that is why there can be this added dimension in the final results, something that we did not expect because God's great creative power is entering in and working with, and through us, as we give ourselves completely to this work of trying to build a truly religious architecture in the world today. Thank you.