
The Architecture of Spiritual Space for the New Millennium

A. Richard Williams

It is with great pleasure that I join in honoring Dr. Donald J. Bruggink on the occasion of his retirement from Western Theological Seminary. Although I have known him for only two and one-half years as one of his crew on two voyages in search of the best we know in modern church architecture, first in Poland in October 1996 and last summer in Finland, I feel we have been close friends for a much longer time. I am sure this is because all of us on these Interfaith Forum on Religion, Art and Architecture/American Institute of Architects (IFRAA/AIA) study tours led by Don have shared a timeless devotion to the essence of spiritual space as the wedding of worship to its setting—that is, to the finest harmony of religious inspiration and the art and architecture that expresses it.¹

As a sailor as well as architect and educator, I think of Don as a steadfast captain, seasoned from long piloting through sometimes rocky archipelagoes, or in architectural terms, as an ideal client chairman, joining those rare few, from my own experience in designing churches, who have a superb understanding of how crucial mutual respect and teamwork are in the creation of truly ennobling houses of worship. After almost thirty years of emeritus status myself, I can affirm to Don that the word “retirement” is in fact misleading—for captains never leave the bridge of action.

On the threshold of the new millennium, taking stock of directions in architecture is as daunting as perceiving and predicting change in all of society and inseparable from it. The crystal ball is cloudy as never before. In contrast with the past when religious architecture was perhaps the most clear-cut expression of human aspiration anywhere, its distinction is increasingly lost in the blur of today’s built environment. Even so, some traces of enduring value may be found—gems that include but are not limited to places of worship. May they foreshadow new directions—a new Golden Age!

In this search we must begin with a candid view of where we are today following the shift in cultural values over the past century. Although the broadest view of cultural change is the province of social scientists, economists, historians, and philosophers, we clergy, worshipers, builders, artists, and architects are on the front line in the creation of spiritual space. Our direct catalytic experience lies at the heart of critical reflection. *Let our voices be heard!*

Sometime last year NBC's "Today Show" played a global game—"Where in the world is Matt Lauer?" Each day for a week Matt appeared in a different place on his round-the-world safari, and viewers with aid of a clue were to guess where he would turn up next. His first stop was St. Mark's Square, Venice, then at the Parthenon, Athens, followed by the pyramids of Egypt, the Taj Mahal at Agra, India, and finally the Sydney Opera House in Australia. Strangely, neither the word architecture nor the names of the builders and architects were mentioned, though all these places were world-class architectural landmarks, evidence that architecture is still a "mirror of civilization" as historians have long described its honored place in human culture.

But now this traditional regard is threatened, mixed, and diluted in a collage, in a passing parade of cliché-ridden styles generated in our late twentieth-century age of rampant materialism, money absolutism,² celebrity worship, and media inflation. The result is that in the popular eye architecture has become a skin-deep cosmetic. Such blatant examples as Las Vegas and Branson, Missouri, with their exorbitant, showy fronts and cheap metal building behinds, are echoed in countless commercial strips, shopping malls, and Disney Worlds across America and around the world.

The dignity and significance of civic institutions in our society—government buildings, libraries, museums, theaters, and churches had clear identity in the past through differentiation of spiritual and functional expression, a special recognition of permanent cultural value that rose above style, mannerism, or current fashion. It did not really matter if the choice was classical, some other period revival, or modern as long as highest quality of design, construction, siting, landscape, and contextual relationships in the fabric of the city were understood and honored. But for at least a half-century now the bottom line imperatives of expediency, profit, speed, and "throw away" mentality have combined to degenerate this cultural tradition of civic identities to the monotony of cheap look-alike boxes.

Although a full exploration of the cause and effect of this all-too-familiar dilemma is beyond the scope of this essay, it is necessary to review the background of the current threat to architecture as a cultural value, especially as it relates to spiritual spaces for the new millennium.

We are immediately presented with a paradox. The scholarship of art and architectural history provides standards for measuring architectural excellence by studying and identifying noble works from the past as they inform the present and future. But this gift of critical judgment has been limited by its preoccupation with outward visual characteristics and its neglect of such invisible qualities of substance and value as functional and spatial organization in context, ethical questions, and integration of structural and other hidden systems of energy sustainability. Ironically, the classification of architecture (along with painting and sculpture) as art has limited its appreciation as a broader cultural value by its being judged primarily as separate artifacts in formal visual terms. Although scholars and experienced professionals have long

tried to bring this discrepancy to the attention of the public, architectural criticism in the popular press is still relegated to journalist art critics. These journalists often joust with each other with smart writing about appearances just as celebrity architects and those aspiring to celebrity have strained to gain attention by doing outrageous architecture based on looks above everything else.

In contradiction to this skin-deep regard, criteria of architectural excellence have as never before become broader and deeper due to the increasing availability of information. The accumulation of knowledge, experience, research results, and retrieval technology through publication systems, libraries, and the internet offer the potential for an evermore-stringent critical judgment. The search for canonicity in architecture has become an even sterner discipline involving both timeless and timely components of quality measurement which are never permanently fixed but in dynamic equilibrium are always building in intellectual accountability and wisdom. In this view the current facile oscillation from fashionable style to style is increasingly revealed as a fast track change for the sake of shallow display rather than steady qualitative advance.

In many ways we are positioned in a time warp—a replay of Charles Dickens' beginning in *A Tale of Two Cities*. "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times"—a bewildering complexity of opposites with twilight/sunrise zones between.

It is the best of times for the economic growth of the "have" nations; the advance of science, technology, and information. It is the best of times for the privileged elite who in ever-greater numbers enjoy luxurious life styles, segregated more and more in protected, gated estates, playgrounds, communities, cities, and nations. It is the worst of times for the vast majority of peoples yearning for equal opportunity, access to quality education, health care, satisfying employment, a place to live in peace; in sum, a higher quality of life.

The twilight zone between is loaded with questions, doubt, and debate. Is high-tech advance good or bad? Are giant mergers and internationalism good or bad? Are media and celebrity inflation good or bad? Is it good or bad that billions are spent on litigation, "justice," gambling, sports, entertainment, cars, private and public indulgence? The list is endless.

The sunrise zone is more optimistic. There remains a vast middle ground of steadfast if unimaginative tradition—honest work, responsibility, trust, and caring. The dormant values awaiting a new enlightenment constitute a challenge for educational reform.

In the face of this complexity of opposites one looks to our most esteemed thinkers and critics for both understanding and strategies for renewal of timeless values bridging to the future. Those who have earned eminence in literature are the most eloquent. I single out Harold Bloom's *The Western Canon*³ and Quentin Anderson's comments in an interview with Oliver Conant titled, "The Hazards of American Individualism."⁴ In reflecting through literature a parallel to the state of American architecture, both have more profound relevance than

the narrow focus of current architectural criticism on superficial looks, fashion, and form.

Bloom seeks canonicity within more than five centuries of writing in the Western world. He places Shakespeare at the canon's center with Dante, Milton, Johnson, Cervantes, Goethe, Tolstoy, Freud, Wordsworth, Austin, Dickens, Montaigne, Proust, Emerson, Whitman, and Dickinson in close orbit; their common link being a quality of strangeness, originality, and diversity that somehow shares a commonality of excellence, or seen conversely, excellence in diversity. He decries today's loss of aesthetic and intellectual standards in what he calls, after Vico, the Chaotic Age.

Although in architecture there is no agreement about who, like Shakespeare, occupies the center of the canon, a parallel list of architects may be identified through a similar search for enduring contributions to canonicity—seeking the same common denominator of excellence in diversity: Vitruvius, Palladio, Alberti, Bernini, Michelangelo, Gabriel, Schinkel, Richardson, Sullivan, Wright, Le Corbusier, Gropius, Aalto, Mies van der Rohe, Saarinen, Kahn, and of course, others depending on one's own pantheon of heroes. Sadly, each of their contributions has tended to be a singularity, even adversarial, rather than an additive in the evolution of canonical qualities. Recently, however, there has been an advance in recognition of design excellence in vernacular building, a sign that underlying principles of architectural quality may be found over a very broad spectrum, beyond epic and labeled styles. A summary of canonical principles evoked and advanced by both known and unknown heroes will be attempted later in this essay, with emphasis on their particular relevance in the design of spiritual space.

Speaking about both the powers and limitations of American individualism, Quentin Anderson points to Emerson, Whitman, and Thoreau as champions of the idea that as individuals we try to define ourselves out of context with our history: "Their example seems to me to be priceless. It shows that radical individualism is a dead end and that a respect for history and for one's own history of the self is the first step to take if you want to back out of that dead end. We cannot free ourselves from our immersion, our membership in a species that is capable of both glorious and terrible things." As a time-honored cultural value I see architecture today trapped in the same dead end, unwilling to suppress the ego and self-gratification that either ignores or makes a caricature of the lessons of history.

The plight of architecture as a cultural value in America is most evident in my own practice over fifty years. It can be measured by the change in clients' expectations and the support of quality performance as a team that includes the full range of criteria for excellence—grace, beauty, harmony with landscape, and respect for community beyond meeting the immediate needs of the client's program. In spite of the urgency to catch up on building delayed by the depression and World War II, building committees after the war always included members who stood firm for architectural excellence as a community value.

They were respected and supported by fellow committee members who recognized them as trustees of qualities beyond the usual pragmatism of money, management, and expediency to satisfy taxpayers. In scarcely one generation these few stalwarts almost disappeared. By the seventies, client committees seemed interested only in minimum budgets, fast track delivery, and recognition by their constituents of "practical" concerns above "frills." This attitude was as true for church building as for schools and other civic structures.

What had happened? Their older colleagues, educated in the first half of the century, somehow possessed a larger vision and sense of cultural responsibility. Was that the result of liberal arts education that prevailed before the dominance of specialization? Civic responsibility then enjoyed a broader and more idealistic meaning. The *Wacker's Manual of the Plan of Chicago*,⁵ a textbook in Chicago's public schools in the teens and twenties begins: "Chicago is destined to become the center of the modern world if the opportunities in her reach are intelligently realized, and if the city can receive a sufficient supply of trained and enlightened citizens."

This was also a time when the Chicago School and Prairie Schools of architecture and landscape architecture were an innovative and inspiring new expression of mid-American vitality and idealism, surprisingly well understood and adopted by the new multi-ethnic society. Over the century this broad base of approval and support shifted to an ever-narrowing enclave of privilege. This shift is clearly seen in the general disappearance of residential design in architectural practice since the fifties when expectations, stimulated by Wright's "Usonian" house, and *Arts and Architecture* magazine case study house series, made the idea of architect-designed houses part of the American dream.

A memorable and shocking experience of this value shift occurred in the early seventies when I presented the design of a new county courthouse to a board of supervisors' building committee. Sited on a landscaped, downtown open space, the design concept was based on an open ground floor plan for general public contact, with courts above, their limestone walls projecting and forming an overhang on all sides. Although very contemporary in design, the use of limestone and carefully studied proportions, scale, and details echoed and continued the same palette of materials in other important civic structures in the city: the old courthouse, the civic auditorium, the city hall, and the post office were all limestone. The committee's unanimous reaction: "Too much money. Make it straight up and down and cut out the limestone. After all it's mainly an office building."

In that community and most others like it in prosperous America, the extra resources of money, time, and respect that used to be afforded to education, worship, and other civic institutions are now lavished on banks, corporate palaces, and affluent neighborhoods as architecture becomes a veneer expressing success in money, power, materialism, and celebrity.

This view may overemphasize the extreme change in values that have brought about the decline of architectural appreciation. In fairness, there

continues to exist a broad reservoir of trust and integrity in our society that not only respects and quietly takes pride in building unassuming structures to accommodate everyday needs, but also is increasingly supportive of preserving buildings and sites of historic importance. But in this body of modest, unassuming work, peaks of excellence remain unknown and unheralded. No doubt this neglect is attributable to the journalistic habit of publicizing sensational, provocative work in journals, and overlooking virtue in the common place. The creation of new architectural trends and heroes based on self-conscious, evocative "look at me" expression is a disastrous influence on public perception in general, and on architectural education in particular.

In witness to the panorama of change in architectural education over the same half-century of time, significant observations may be made that parallel practice. Earlier on, in the late 1800s, when professional programs began in American universities, architecture was a single discipline, often one course taught by one person. Gradually, then swiftly, specialties and options within proliferated—design, structures, construction, history, management—so that the singularity of the profession became diluted and fragmented. Separation into "turfs" has generated sibling rivalries. The most serious is the rivalry between theory and practice, carried out at the expense of a higher ethos that requires both at a high level of mutual respect. The separation of design from technology and buildability has opened up the susceptibility of both students and faculty to mimic visual clichés and glamorous heroes enshrined by slick, elitist magazines and books, now widely diffused by video, the internet, and other electronic media. Just as solid, unassuming work is unheralded in terms of public perception and recognition, so also it is not widely appreciated in the schools. There are, however, encouraging signs of pioneering in design-build courses and experience in direct "hands on" construction.

Similarly in public primary and secondary education, programs that involve children in the crafts of making and in the traditions of good design are fewer and fewer. In some parts of the world this tradition has never been lost. There is no need to replay the history of great architecture from ancient times through the glories of cathedrals, mosques, Buddhist temples, and achievements of the Renaissance, for they depended directly on craftsmanship and art as an integral part of the architectural fabric. These great buildings are of course still celebrated, but with more and more detachment as tourist attractions.

Much less well known, however, are fine examples of contemporary church architecture. Most of them are modest in scale and in remote locations. Nevertheless, this remoteness has not deterred pilgrimages of architects, artists, clergy, and patrons young and old to learn at first hand some of their qualities of inspiration that serve as models for the future. The IFRAA is a mainstay for fostering excellence of design, and in collaboration with the AIA, to organize under the leadership of Donald Bruggink tours to the far corners of the world in search and study of the best we know. From this experience, most recently in Poland and Finland, and from my own travels, I have selected a few particularly

impressive examples that clearly embody excellence in diversity and evoke the canonical design principles summarized in this essay.

I begin with the Chapel of Notre Dame du Haut, Ronchamp, France, designed by Le Corbusier. Most noteworthy is its clear evocation and expression of harmony with its site and its integration of art and architecture in the spectrum of sensory media of light, sound, aroma, and touch. It is a *ne plus ultra* example of the inseparability of the ritual and setting. The style of this performance is poignant through body language expression, oral communication, and gesture of both the communicant and priest. All the senses are at climax level even though quietly expressed. They are reinforced by appropriate physical response of the setting in terms of direction and amount of lighting for the sequence from dark intimacy to the dramatic luminosity of the sanctuary, of change of sound from a whisper level in the confessional to a "choir of angels." One moves from absence to presence of aromas: incense, wine, and candle wax. This kind of intimate space exists directly in front of the sanctuary. One feels so close to the rough, white stucco walls that their roughness is perceived as though touched. Rows of candles in a candelabra are so close that their heat as well as smell is sharply sensed. The hardness of floor paving and walls, even in a rather small interior space, gives a sense of sound reverberation slightly muted by the absorption of the coarse, fabric dress of the communicants. The lighting is a rich combination of sanctuary glare and warm luminosity of a perforated sidewall with stained glass inserts—dominated by one hearth-like scarlet window. The style of this set of props and the setting is one single harmonious impression. It is most keenly perceived through the personal experience of prayer, quiet contemplation, and the sacrament of communion itself.

Outstanding on our 1996 IFRAA tour of churches in Poland was the Swietego Church in Tychy by architect Stanislaw Niemczyk. A true measure of greatness in art and architecture is its power to be deeply felt by all who come in its presence. An awareness dawned that beyond the borders of Poland (which included other fine new churches), Tychy found its place at global scale in the company of such masterpieces as Le Corbusier's chapel at Ronchamp. It is a prime example of timeless/timely design: timeless in its reflection of regional character—its sky silhouette of a low-pitched pyramidal roof topped by slender Byzantine-like spires, and the ambiance of its mystical dark interior; timeless also in its welcoming approach under wide eaves from all sides, and in the interior focusing of colorful iconography on a natural wood background. Tychy is a timely success as well, judged by our ever more exacting modern criteria of excellence—functional, aesthetic, social, economic, technical, environmental, and contextual qualities in the total equation of critical judgment. Like the Ronchamp chapel, the harmony of art and architecture as a single expression reflects the ancient heritage of craftsmanship, a spirit of highest mutual respect, and total absence of competing artistic egos.

There is also a certain added attraction, an aura of strangeness of the kind found in such a far corner of the world as Katmandu. Tychy's low-keyed

exuberance of art and architectural collaboration, together with its harmony of limited materials, is in contrast to many modern churches in which the egocentric personalities of artists and architects clash (including also the tastes of clergy and patrons). In Poland, as in the rest of the world, it is rare to find a work so free of fashionable clichés and signature styling.

Finland, like Poland, has been a fertile ground for exceptional church architecture from the time of rustic wood and stone structures to the present. In the global scene of modern design, perhaps no where else has the heritage of design sensitivity developed from traditional arts and crafts made a more seamless transition to modernism. This legacy goes back to pre-World War II days where the work of Saarinen, Aalto, and others attracted international attention through an extra measure of refinement in form, space, scale, light, and skillful use of a limited vocabulary of materials—above all a “humanizing” of the otherwise austere, abstract character of the Bauhaus movement and other European internationalist trends.

Among the dozen or so highest quality modern religious buildings in Finland, two of the smallest examples stand out. One is the university chapel at Otaniemi by Heikka and Kaija Siren, built in the mid-fifties. It shares the very Finnish character of two principal materials, brick and wood, in antiphonal relationship, like Aalto's Säynätsalo town hall built in the same period. Brick as a wall-bearing material rising from the rocky landscape is clearly supportive to the wood superstructure, a carefully proportioned truss and roof deck overhead, that frames a glass altar area facing the woods in which a simple exterior cross accents the altar focus space.

The other is the Resurrection Chapel by Erik Bryggman in Turku, the main western seaport of Finland. Begun in 1939 and completed in 1941 after the Winter War, this funeral chapel is sited on the crown of Unikankare Hill in a magnificently wooded cemetery dating back to the beginning of the nineteenth century. The approach upward is a carefully arranged sequence through mature pines along a path modulated by glacier-smoothed, granite outcroppings partially covered with lichen and moss, edged with wild flowers. Entering the chapel one immediately experiences a mood of quiet reverence (see Fig. 1), achieved by the smooth, white, unbroken north wall rising to a barrel-vaulted ceiling, lighted by a low, continuous, horizontal glass wall along the south side facing a pine-wooded terrace that then drops off to a semi-clearing, the main portion of the cemetery. Natural light is intensified in the altar area as the glazed south wall becomes vertical. This sanctuary space is subtly enriched by a tracery of interior planting and the play of shadow from foliage and branches of the trees outside. Symbolism, iconography, and furnishings are all low-key, allowing the quiet majesty of space, light, and landscape to be the main instruments of spiritual space. The Resurrection Chapel thus becomes one of the world's finest and most powerful demonstrations that architecture and landscape are one, inseparable in reaching the highest level of expression and fulfillment of humankind's place in nature.



Figure 1

Resurrection Chapel

Turku, Finland

ARW Photo



Figure 2

Country Church

Petäjavesi, Finland

ARW Photo



Figure 3

Thorncrown Chapel Eureka Springs, Arkansas

ARW Photo

Long before our IFRAA visit in August, 1998, I was fortunate to spend time in November, 1939, with both the Aaltos and Bryggman. I was deeply impressed to encounter the same quiet sense of compassion and humanism that had been conveyed by Gunnar Asplund in an earlier interview in Stockholm. Bryggman, especially, in his humble manner of explaining the design process for the Resurrection Chapel, then just beginning construction, revealed a profound depth and thoroughness of study, contemplation, dedication, and patience. His office was full of partial models, alternative detail drawings, color studies, material samples, and combinations, all communicating their purpose as *means* to the full scale reality of the building. They were not ends in themselves as so often seems the intention of slick presentation drawings, models, and glossy computer displays in our age of media inflation. In reaction to these trends that glorify paper architecture and “talkitecture,” the Finns stand fast in preferring the word *rakennustaiteen*, “art of building,” as most reflective of what architecture has meant among them for centuries. The meticulously preserved wooden church at Petäjävеси, circa 1765, now on the United Nations’ highly selective list of historic world architecture, expresses the length of time in which this distinctive art and craft of building has evolved and been refined (see Fig. 2).

Responding to widespread public appreciation of good design, architects, collaborating artists, and craftsmen emerge in such a culture—not as separate, synthetically trained, label-identified professionals—but simply as the most versatile, skillful, and sensitive among many in their design-oriented society. Finland is truly a unique global model for emulation not only in design arts education and practice, but in the broad scope of learning for all who aspire to a higher quality of life. Their quest for spiritual space may well lead the way.

In contemplating the entire twentieth century, especially its last half, it is clear by now that excellence in modern church architecture has been reached in Europe far more than in America. In spite of achievement in residential and other secular building types refreshingly influenced by the Chicago and Prairie Schools, and by the San Francisco Bay and Northwest regional styles, church building has clung to conservative revivalism, diluted and cheapened by expediency, minimal budgets, and fast track imperatives as discussed above. To this pervasive condition must be added the rise of TV evangelism and its influence on worship as entertainment. Crystal cathedrals, notwithstanding their architectural showmanship, somehow communicate a hollow ring of liturgical showmanship as well. Churches, especially in fast-growing parts of the country, are now built as a transitory commodity, a part of the real estate establishment, at the mercy of profitable commercial development, growth, and change. The decline of religious purpose in our American culture, as it may or may not reverse course in the new millennium, is a question best addressed by theologians and sociologists. Without a reversal it is hard to imagine in the immediate future how the highest quality church art and architecture can lead the way on its own. Still, the finest work of the recent past can have enormous

influence, if not leadership, in a spiritual renaissance and in the quest for spiritual space.

I nominate the Thorncrown Chapel in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, designed by Fay Jones FAIA, as exemplary (see Fig. 3). Like Bryggman's Resurrection Chapel in Finland, it is a superb demonstration that architecture and landscape are one and that the magic of light, scale, and structural delicacy intertwine to inspire elation of the spirit. In both examples progression on foot through a grove is a necessary preparation for the entire sequential experience. Once inside Thorncrown, this preparation is fulfilled at more intimate scale by details of glass and solid material intersections, filtered light and shadow, and a sense of the sound of silence. This quality of quiet sensory perception and harmonies of the many natural and manufactured ingredients in one powerful impression are felt by all who enter. That special quality has no doubt contributed to the chapel's amazing appeal as a place for memorial services and weddings, as well as for quiet contemplation.

These few, widely separated achievements in modern religious architecture underscore more than anything else that a single style or rote formula is not the answer to light a path to the future. Rather, their excellence in underlying design principles may result in a great diversity of approach and resolution prompted by the uniqueness of each size, spiritual and functional needs, structure and materials, all combining magnificently as if pre-ordained.

In the broadest view, the essence of spiritual space may exist anywhere across the world, in or out of formal religious settings: a path through virgin California redwoods, Cape Sounion in Greece, the sand garden of Ryoanni Temple in Kyoto, the endless forest of columns and arches in the Great Mosque of Cordova, Thoreau's Walden Pond, the south transept of Chartres Cathedral with the blazing reds of Blanche of Castille's rose window made more intense by the afternoon sun, the galleries of the Kimbell Art Museum in Fort Worth, Texas by Louis Kahn, a gray December dawn in the deserted Piazza San Marco, Venice, with echoes in the mind's ear of the Modern Jazz Quarter's "Golden Striker" theme from the film, *No Son in Venice*. Many more may be added to these favorite few.

In the same way, canons of architectural design, evolving as best we can know them from history, though enduring, are nevertheless incomplete, always open to deeper understanding, growth, and change. The following canons that range over the entire spectrum of building for humanity and all other living things are especially poignant for the design of spiritual space:

- The search, deep in the design process, for the "existence will" of a project. Martin Buber speaks of the idea of "an in between realm"⁶ in the I/Thou relationship that gains its own strength and identity through mutuality. Louis Kahn spoke of what a project wants to be on its own terms. Such a theory demands a new order of humility and a greater investment of time, study, and patience on the part of all participants: client/users, artists, architects, and builders. At a recent gathering of Native American artists

and craftsmen at the Sonora Desert Museum, Tucson, a Hopi basket weaver expressed this idea very simply. She said, "The basket wants to be made."

- A basic compassion for the human condition, with determination to bring architecture and good design, in harmony with nature, within the reach of all.
- An understanding that heroes, greater or lesser, work together, or in respectful succession, over the full scale of environment—microscale settings, architecture, landscape, urban design, and regional planning.
- That the design response to well-being begins at the intimate scale of each individual, in both public and private life, as an extra effort to make the ensemble of detail into works of art. Recognition, too, that architecture as building art—is only possible through knowledge, experience, and respect for the construction process.
- To bring all scales of environment into harmony with themselves and with nature through higher team and/or individual compositional and orchestrational skill—architecture and landscape as one.
- To bring spiritual and poetic qualities into every design ensemble—art and architecture as one.
- To ensure that the principle of excellence in diversity is understood and respected as a most fundamental readable common quality, transcending superficial differences in fashion and style, possessing qualities that are both timeless and timely.

Though architectural stars and their work, known and unknown, may remain brightly alone, or may have dimmed, formed into constellations or fused into nebulae, our perception of them should really gain with passing time, just as the lenses of astronomers perceive more of the cosmos. The educational obligation is therefore to respect and delight in accumulating learning and wisdom: from the greatest works, old and new, humble to scintillating, from heroes, anonymous sources, from literature, the fine arts, and philosophy. Why cannot this challenge be infinitely more alluring than the easy choices offered along the Main Line Strip—illuminated by signs of the latest clichés of attraction leading nowhere?

ENDNOTES

¹ [In response to the publication of *Christ and Architecture* and subsequent service to the architectural community in the area of church architecture, Donald J. Bruggink was made an honorary member of the Michigan Society of Architecture (now AIA-Michigan); the American Society of Church Architects; the Guild for Religious Architects; and the Interfaith Forum on Religion, Art and Architecture. In 1984, the Interfaith Forum on Religion, Art and Architecture presented Dr. Bruggink with the Elbert M. Conover Memorial Award in recognition of the contribution made to religion, art, and architecture. This is the highest award that IFRAA can bestow upon a non-architect. As chair of the committee on overseas education, he has

planned and directed the IFRAA Overseas Seminars on Art and Architecture in Switzerland, Germany, and the Netherlands in 1984; Japan in 1986; Mexico in 1988; Denmark and Norway in 1990; Austria, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, and Hungary in 1992; Spain in 1994; the east of Germany and Poland in 1996; and Finland and St. Petersburg in 1998. —Ed.]

² Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, "The Exhaustion of Culture," address to the Academy of Science in Moscow, as reported on the front page of *Domenica*, a weekly Roman Journal of October 15, 1997. In his critique of the twentieth century Solzhenitsyn describes the accelerating decline of the human spirit, tired and wasted after decades of the three totalitarianisms: communism, nazism/fascism, and the absolutism of money, but holds out hope for the new millennium.

Pope John Paul II, *Fides et Ratio* (Faith and Reason) Encyclical No. 13, published October 16, 1998. "At the end of the century, one of our greatest threats is the temptation to despair. . . ." He offers alternatives to the twentieth-century philosophies of Marxism and post modernism and urges the church "to lead people to discover both their capacity to know the truth and their yearning for the ultimate and definitive meaning of life."

³Harold Bloom, *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages* (New York, Harcourt Brace, 1994).

⁴ Oliver Conant, "The Hazards of American Individualism," *American Heritage* magazine, September 1995, contains Conant's interview with Quentin Anderson on his book, *The Imperial Self: An Essay in American Literary and Cultural History*.

⁵ Walter D. Moody, *Wacker's Manual of the Plan of Chicago*, Chicago: Chicago Planning Commission, 1995.

⁶ Martin Buber, *I and Thou* (New York: Scribners, 1970), 56-57. Paul Tillich, *Courage to Be* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1952). Buber, Tillich, and other existential theologians point to the positive nature of mutuality—an "in between realm," an "existence will" that can only be reached by intensity and depth in a bipolar relationship. Architect Louis I. Kahn translated this meaning to the design process—discovery of "what a project wants to be." "A School wants to be a school"; the architect and client as agents both suppressing their ego in recognition of the soul of the project as if it had a life of its own.