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Spending a full semester learning from a well-known missions professor, Dr. Cal Guy, the author has heard him countless times accusing the Western church of having an “edifice complex.” As the twentieth century draws to a close, Western society is poised for a new millennium and a society of new perspective. Yet, despite the great opportunities that lie before Western society, there is a great turmoil present. This turmoil is a society of great segregation. Segregation in this instance does not necessarily mean racial distinctions, or even the polarization of the classes. In this instance, segregation describes a wide variety of subcultures with different ideals developing within the Western culture.

For the sake of this discussion, the confusion caused by the numerous subcultures will be limited to the United States. In order to demonstrate this segregation, a small amount of analysis related to music and other design fields will be included, but primarily the focus will center on architecture. After establishing the reality of the subcultures, the discussion will then move toward a Christian response. Specifically, how should the Christian community respond to the ever-broadening spectrum of architectural expression and the philosophies that drive them at the dawn of the twenty-first century?

To begin the discussion of musical and architectural theories, the first note to be made is that there is a wide variety of philosophies that are driving these art forms. For instance, Kate Nesbitt edited a series of essays entitled Thoerizing a New Agenda for Architecture: an Anthology of Architectural Theory in order to develop an analysis of the current architectural philosophies. The volume contains fourteen chapters of essays by various architectural philosophers of the late twentieth century. Each of these chapters focuses on a different approach to architectural theory. Several of these chapters include essays both supporting and
diminishing the importance of the particular philosophy in the contemporary architectural community.²

The contemporary music scene contains a similar widening of accepted philosophical values. A definite resurgence of an acoustical genre is presented alongside a neo-big-band sound known as Ska, a neo-disco known as Techno, and a continuing Punk culture. It is interesting to note that every one of these styles is a contemporary interpretation on a previous theme. Each artist and listener, in the midst of cultural turmoil, has identified with another cultural period of the twentieth century and has sought to deliver those ideals into the current cultural chaos. Some of these musical styles are quite pleasing to the listener, others are quite disturbing.

Whatever the musical genre chosen, when an artist chooses to include meaning and depth to the lyrical statements, the cultural chaos becomes apparent. Vocalist and acoustical pianist Sarah McLachlan is an example of this phenomenon. Few listeners will doubt the artist’s musical talent. Yet, on one album, the first song is a letter to God expressing her disbelief in Him, another is a plea for immortality through remembrance, and yet another is a dream of suicide.³ The search for identity and purpose is quite apparent on this album. The lyrical expressions described on this particular album are not uncommon for each of the genres described above.

Architectural expression is quite similar in its variety of expression. The plea for meaning and purpose in life is also apparent. Another similarity of architecture to the contemporary music scene is the roots from which the expression developed. Architecture has also found its contemporary expression through interpretation of previous philosophies.

One architectural style that is prominent today is a continuation of the neoclassical
order, which when traced thoroughly, has its roots in the Vitruvian model of “Firmness, Commodity, and Delight,” which is translated into the modern terms of use, structure, and beauty. An extreme case of this can be found in the prominent (and notably Christian) architect, Quinlan Terry. It will be noted later that Terry is one of few architects who has found meaning and purpose, and he finds this fulfillment apart from his architectural practice. The primary aim of this architectural philosophy is to develop spaces based on function, order, understanding, comfort, and aesthetic pleasure.

A second prominent architectural philosophy is rooted in deconstructionism. This philosophy is directly opposed to most of what the neoclassical model considers ideal. This approach is often considered the ideal incorporation of technological breakthrough into architecture. The architects who subscribe to this design philosophy often point to the fact that modern science is responsible for even making their type of expression possible. The long-standing traditions of order and regularity are suddenly broken by a sharp, cutting line or an unexpected curve. Inspiration for design is no longer limited to rational thought blended with creativity. Inspiration can come from such unusual sources as the imaginary lifting of a dropped box of matchsticks to a hallucination that comes from the use of a controlled substance.

Peter Eisenman has long been a prominent proponent of such a design philosophy. Early in his career, Eisenman’s work was often far from functional, even for the intended purpose, and was nothing short of a disturbance to the beholder. As his philosophy has developed, so has Eisenman’s architectural expression. The more recent work of Peter Eisenman continues to follow this design philosophy, but the architect has begun to incorporate functionality and economy. This development has become so apparent that the architect is
competitive in the design of such function-oriented spaces as sports facilities. Eiesenman’s design philosophy can easily be compared to Ford’s “New Edge” aesthetic automobile design philosophy of the late nineteen-nineties.

Other architectural design philosophies with significant influence on the contemporary landscape include roots in Modernism and a form of functionalism. The functional design philosophy seems to be growing in influence through the architecture of the middle class. Prototype shopping centers and magazine-ordered houses no longer dot the countryside, but rather have become the lifeblood of the American architectural landscape.

In the midst of all of these design philosophies lies an ever-decreasing Christian influence in American culture. How should the American church of the twenty-first century consider this broad spectrum of architectural thought? What should be the driving principles of a Christian’s approach to architecture? Specifically, should one or more of these philosophies define the architectural expression of structures for Christian occupation, or is there a Biblical perspective that will define the Christian’s approach to the architectural endeavor?

To answer these questions, several items must be discussed. First, the prominent instances of architecture and design described in the scriptures will be listed and discussed. Second, a discussion related to the differences in the philosophies related to architecture from the Old Testament to the New Testament will be considered. Finally, all of this information will be brought into a discussion of how the twenty-first century Christian should approach each of the prominent architectural theories.

Moving in to a Biblical discussion of architectural philosophy, the first argument must center around the architectural pieces ordained by God in the Bible. The first architectural
The piece listed in the Bible is Noah’s ark. God gave specific instructions to Noah on how the ark was to be constructed in matters related to material and size. Provision for ventilation and light was considered. There are no notes in this account as to the exact shape of the ark, or any detailing of joints or edges. This piece was to be a purely functional piece, to serve as a safe-haven for those God chose to save from the flood (Ge 6).

The second prominent architectural object listed in the Bible is not ordained of God. In fact, the tower of Babel in Genesis 11 is cursed by God. God caused a confusion in the language to destroy the abilities of the workers to finish building the structure. This great architectural endeavor was a symbol of total independence from God (Ge 11:6).

The tabernacle is the next prominent architectural object described in the Bible. God goes to great length to give every detail of how this structure is to be financed, constructed, detailed, and used. The tabernacle served five primary purposes for the nation of Israel and their relation to God. First, the tabernacle allowed God to dwell in the midst of the nation (Ex 25:8). Second, it gave God a manner in which to reveal His glory to the people (Ex 40:34,35). Third, the tabernacle set up the system of sacrificial worship, which allowed sinful people to approach a holy God (Lev 17:11). Fourth, the orientation of the spaces symbolized a separation of sinful man from a holy God. Finally, there was a hope inferred in the tabernacle that anticipated a final redemption through Christ (Heb 8:5).

The next great architectural endeavor described in the Bible is the temple built by Solomon. The original proposition for the temple came from the heart of David, not from God (2 Sam 7:2). God promised David that his prayer would be answered during the reign of his son, Solomon. The Lord blessed the building of the temple. Several details of its construction are
described in 1 Kings chapters five through eight. The very best in materials and craftsmanship was used in the building of the temple. The temple was simply a permanent replacement for the tabernacle. God blessed the building of the temple. God came into the temple and dwelled there among the people (1 Ki 8:10-12). In the New Testament, God would come and dwell within His people through the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 3:16, 17), leaving the temple bare of His presence, as is signified by the tearing of the curtain at the death of Jesus (Mt 27:51; Heb 9).

Throughout the rest of the Old Testament, architectural references surround the building and rebuilding of Jerusalem, the walls surrounding it, and the temple. Less detail is given as to the architectural drives, and more to the utility and craftsmanship. Not until the years of exile in Babylon would there be a new religious architecture to speak of regarding the nation of Israel. This new form would come about as a result of the development of synagogues.

Very little is known about the synagogues of the Biblical period or how they developed. The synagogue usually was a substantial stone building with a raised platform for the speaker, and a clear floor for mats upon which the worshipers would sit. A synagogue would be established in any community where ten or more Jewish men resided. The synagogue became the primary center for religious, social, and educational life for the Jews during the time of Jesus’ ministry. This development was probably due to the spreading of the Jewish people outside of Palestine.12

The introduction of Christ into religious culture changed the manner and philosophies of worship dramatically. No longer would the Spirit of God dwell in a house or building built by human hands, but God would find His dwelling place in the heart of those who believed (1 Co 3:16, 17). Perhaps the most prominent feature to emphasize this from an
architectural perspective is to discuss the places of meeting of the early church.

The early church met primarily in two places: the homes of believers (Ac 2:2, 12:12) or the pre-established places of public meeting and discussion (Ac 18:4). Often, Jewish believers became a sect within their local synagogue (Ac 24:14). Despite these awkward meeting arrangements, multiplicative growth occurred in the early church (Ac 2:41, 47).

No architectural references are made in regarding the New Testament church, yet there are countless church buildings all around the globe. What Christian philosophies will guide the Christian into a proper perspective of architectural interpretation? How can American Christians relate to the surrounding culture through architectural expression?

Perhaps the greatest Christian mind of the twentieth century in relation to how artistic philosophy is a mirror of the societal ideals was Francis Schaeffer. The entire book, How Should We Then Live?, is dedicated to analysis of Western culture through art, architecture, and music. As already demonstrated, the American society is fragmented. Schaeffer continues this thought by suggesting that only two values remain: “personal peace and affluence.”

An explanation of Quinlan Terry’s meaning and purpose for life will begin the discussion of the Christian’s response to contemporary architectural philosophy. Terry was once quoted as saying, “Faith, not architecture, will save the world.” Terry is known as a Christian, and has been nicknamed, “God’s architect.” While Terry’s approach to the architectural endeavor does not fully agree with the present discussion, his realization that fulfillment will come through faith in Christ rather than cultural or work-related issues is essential in a Christian view of the architectural endeavor.

The fulfillment described in the discussion about Terry is essentially the Christian’s
fulfilment of the driving cultural value of personal peace. The foundational purpose of Christianity is achieving peace with God. Through achieving this peace, personal peace can be found. The Christian faith is the answer to the first value that Schaeffer sets forth as the cry of contemporary culture.\(^\text{15}\)

The second value named by Schaeffer, affluence, is more related to the architectural endeavor. Perhaps the most appropriate springboard for a discussion on Christian affluence in the American culture is to understand the level of affluence in the American culture at large. According to the 1998 Edition of *The World Almanac and Book of Facts*, The United states has both the largest Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and highest Per Capita GDP.\(^\text{16}\) According to the CBS Information Please web site, the United States houses less than five percent of the worlds population, but over twenty-one percent of the world’s wealth.\(^\text{17}\) From these statistics, there is no doubt that a vast majority of American society lives far above the average level of affluence in the world.

From this point, the discussion of a contemporary Christian’s approach to architecture will be considered a stewardship issue. Architecture is a development of an affluent lifestyle. In the poorest countries on earth, architectural forms are developed by the user or by cultural repetition. In many village societies, the building of a thatched hut is a community affair and is occasionally part of the celebration surrounding the marriage of a villager. In stark contrast, a vast majority of jurisdictions in the United States require either a trained architect or builder to be employed in the construction of a structure. This is yet another sign of an affluent society.

So what is the proper Christian view on affluence and stewardship? Whenever the
word stewardship enters a discussion among Christians, emotions are stirred. Richard B. Cunningham describes this phenomenon: “When many American Christians hear the word *stewardship*, its sound immediately unleashes a flood of thoughts about budgets, tithing, financial campaigns, pledge cards, offering envelopes, and catchy slogans. It also triggers conflicting emotions.”

American Christians attempt to hide much of the teachings of the Bible about financial matters. Many Christians will dismiss such a discussion and demand that a Christian’s response to wealth is an individual matter, as if the Biblical teachings on the subject are open to private interpretation.

Any study of the teachings of Jesus will dispel such a view. Jesus spoke of economic issues more than any other social issue. Compared to contemporary culture, the culture of Palestine was quite simple. Yet Jesus despised the materialism of his day, and would certainly continue in this war today. A Biblical standpoint on stewardship is directly opposed to nearly every economic value in contemporary American culture.

A proper perspective of stewardship issues is essential to healthy church growth in the United States. Stewardship is as much a corporate issue as an individual issue. Healthy, growing, evangelistic churches are churches that give sacrificially. While giving of resources to missionary causes is declining on average in the United States, healthy evangelistic churches are increasing their giving, including resources such as people and time in addition to monetary resources. When healthy churches approach the call of the great commission as stated in Acts 1:8, they do not see an either/or, nor do they see a this/then. This means, these churches do not first seek either missions or local evangelism, nor do they consider one task to be done before
the other, rather both simultaneously. These churches approach the commission from a both/and perspective, meaning they must always be giving to missions causes outside the local church, while maintaining a growing ministry within their own community. Charlie Shedd affirms this concept by stating, “Outgo determines income.”

Essential to an understanding of stewardship is a glimpse of Jesus’ staunch actions against the misuse of resources. Take a close look at the instance where Jesus clears the temple of money changers in John 2:13-19. Jesus did not simply see all the commotion and go crazy in his anger, he took the time to think about what he was about to do. Jesus took the time to make a whip out of cords (vs 15). He drove everything that even hinted of materialism from the temple courts. No matter how right or convenient it would seem to the culture, Jesus refused to allow the temple to be used in this way. In light of this, how would Jesus view those churches which contain bookstores and the like in the name of convenience? The merchants in the temple were selling goods useful for the worship of God. In contrast, the contemporary bookstores are a convenience stop for the American Christian as they leave worship, to save a trip later in the week. Here is one example of where secular affluence has invaded the Christian church.

Richard Cunningham brings this argument into an architectural mode:

Many sensitive Christians now question the disproportionate amount of money invested in church property and facilities. Excessive building debts frequently require money that is needed for vital ministries. . . In some instances the buildings represent frill or satisfaction of ego needs. But when the church determines that the buildings are vital to its basic purpose, then the church should build functional and aesthetically satisfying buildings that do not flout ostentatious luxury.

Peter Wagner affirms that there is nothing wrong with the building of a house of worship for the contemporary church in America. In fact, with growing difficulty in finding secular meeting
halls willing to cope with the liabilities of a religious meeting, in many instances a church house is necessary, and when a new building project is needed, it should be embarked upon. However, there is a great chasm between a necessary facility and the frill or satisfaction of ego needs that Cunningham describes.

Patricia A. Reuse spares no expense in describing the state of American Christians in regard to affluence. She also terms American affluence staunchly as materialism. The second chapter of her book, *Our World of Things*, creates a dialogue between the value a Christian places on personal possessions and the possessions of the local body. She tells the story of a friend’s opinion on the matter:

A friend recently told me that he had always felt that our church buildings should be as nicely appointed as our own homes with carpet, fine furniture, and so on. After all, we should be willing to spend as freely for the Lord as we do for ourselves. Then his point of view changed. Is that really what God wants: fine pews and carpet? Now instead of championing equal rights for our church buildings, he wonders why our homes need all of these comfortable extras. In essence, we need to be good stewards of what God has given in our homes and in our church buildings.

John White also tells a story regarding an affluent Christian’s stewardship experience, this one with a much more negative ending. This particular Christian had a breathtaking house, with details and finishes beyond imagination. White insists that the flatware may have been solid gold. White goes on to describe the man as about sixty years old and very knowledgeable about Scripture. The report given was that this man “planned to make enough money to spend his closing years in serving the Lord ‘without being a burden on anybody.’” White continues:

He never did get to serve the Lord. He had sold his heritage for stone and metal trinkets inside a painted fortress. He would have agreed that spiritual things matter more than material security, but his behavior contradicted his professed beliefs. Riches had coiled
like a living vine around his heart, slowly strangling his love for God and people.  

These two stories contrast greatly. On the surface, each of the Christians seem to have valid points. Many Christians would have said the same claims as Reuse’s friend prior to his enlightenment. Many who feel less affluent than White’s acquaintance would scoff at his blindness. Christians must be careful not to compare the self with others too often. The first priority of every Christian should be to compare the self with the example set forth by Jesus.

Jesus said, “Foxes have holes and birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has no place to lay his head” (Mt 8:20). Jesus was homeless. The only things Jesus had were food and drink, clothing, and his relationship with the Father. Unless Christians can be content with only these things, the world has impressed its materialism in upon them.

Jesus never said that having shelter was wrong. In fact, he enjoyed the use of the homes of his followers. However, it can be postulated that all of these followers would have gladly accepted a resignation of these things had it been required to follow Jesus. Their love for him far outweighed their desire for money. James and John left the family business to follow Jesus (Mt 4:21, 22). Matthew walked away from one of the wealthiest professions in Palestine, apparently leaving an untold amount money sitting in the collector’s booth (Mt 9:9-13).

As a trained architect, the author often considers the witness of the congregation by the most recent construction projects and their development. When considering each of the architectural philosophies described before, there seems to be no distinct direction for the Christian to follow. Any of these philosophies of design are equally valid at this point, provided they are approached from the perspective of proper stewardship.

Seminary graduate and Auburn University Professor of Architecture, Doug Burleson,
commented in a casual conversation that spaces can be very well developed and finely detailed without being “gold-plated.” The author has been in churches accused of overspending on their facilities simply due to necessity of space, only to find that the economy of the building is simply impeccable—each penny is invested in the work to which the particular church is called.

The author has also observed a building project at a church where a Family Life Center was constructed at nearly double the average cost per square foot of religious buildings in the region. To amplify the astonishment, it should be noted that this type of facility often costs less per square foot than a worship space or spaces for other religious uses.

With this understanding of architecture from the perspective of stewardship, the precedent of the great cathedrals in Europe must not be ignored. While the cathedrals are undeniably great architectural pieces, there is no spiritual or Scriptural defense for their existence. The cathedrals are a product of poor theology, based not on a personal relationship with God through faith in Jesus Christ, but rather a fearful theology based on some element of works. One could argue that in an illiterate society, the stained-glass windows told the stories of the Bible to the commoner, but since many of the windows are too high for viewing, this is a highly suspect argument. Plus, the pictures themselves cannot tell the story adequately, rather they are a tool for continuing the oral tradition.

One could also argue that the dangers of traveling made the cathedrals necessary for safe hospitality. This is a just argument, except that the cathedrals themselves became the very reason for travel—a pilgrimage, again a result of questionable works theology. In addition to this, the hospitality quarters of a cathedral were not the source of glamor, but rather the worship space. Also, the construction of cathedrals was more often a political endeavor based upon the
glorification of a relic or a local leader or event. If this was not the case, the competition for bigger and taller would not have been so fierce.

To conclude the issue of stewardship in architecture, a localized perspective within the United States will be discussed by introducing some basic guidelines as a solution to the problem. First, guidelines regarding the necessity of construction will be discussed. After these guidelines are laid out, some basic principles of construction and detailing will be introduced. Finally, to conclude the discussion, the international effects of the current desire for affluence and projected patterns for a change of philosophy will leave hope in the hands of the American Christian with a mind for wise stewardship and a heart for the fulfillment of the great commission.

The necessity of a new structure or renovations is the first guideline to be analyzed. According to Peter Wagner, if worship space is the problem, three options are available. The first is multiple services. Many fear this will divide the church. Wagner agrees, but considers this a positive, not a negative, as it negates a disease he calls koinonitis. Koinonitis is a disease where a church becomes self-centered and inward focused, losing their passion for the non-Christian masses. Wagner gives basic guidelines regarding multiple worship services in his book, *The Healthy Church*.

The second option for an overcrowded worship space is the architectural answer—to build or renovate facilities to accommodate the needs. There are also several factors involved that the common pastor or churchgoer may not foresee. Wagner suggests the employment of a church growth consultant prior to preceding in this direction. The issues of stewardship in architecture discussed herein should also be considered.
The final possibility to consider in relation to inadequate worship space is the one which Wagner considers the most effective evangelistic method anywhere. This method is planting a new church. The only problem Wagner has found with this strategy is that it is only effective within the United States for a maximum of approximately three cycles. The first cycle is often extremely exciting and immensely successful, but each subsequent split damages both the new church’s and parent church’s morale. For a church that has never split or has not split within recent memorable history, this option should be seen as the ideal plan if properly employed.

If a church’s desire for facilities other than worship space is the concern, there are many other factors to be considered. First of all, is the church using existing facilities wisely? The question must be asked, is it wise stewardship to have any one space in the church structure that is used on average only one or two times per week? Is there any way that this kind of space can be adapted for more uses?

A second factor in spaces for activities other than worship should be the question of projected ministry. All spaces built should have as first priority the growth and development of current ministries within the church. If a new ministry need is seen, the first task should be to determine if the ministry can be begun prior to construction of specific facilities for the ministry in order to test its effectiveness in the community. It is unwise stewardship to built structures to house a non-existent ministry in hopes that it will develop, unless careful planning and appropriate measures have been taken to ensure its success.

There are some simple guidelines that should be considered in the construction of a facility when wise stewardship is employed. Most of the cost of an architectural piece in
American culture is never seen. Much of the cost lies in structural and mechanical systems and other factors hiding behind the walls. Sometimes a small increase in initial cost is a wise investment over time. Examples of this can be insulation, thermal windows, and energy-efficient lighting. Since an architect will be required in nearly if not all circumstances, employing a professional who understands environmental issues can be a long-term asset.

From the outset, an approximate cost estimate per square foot and for similar structures should be attained for the sake of comparison as the project progresses. If the cost per square foot or overall project costs exceed the average cost for a similar project, simplification should be considered.

In attaining this initial comparison, various construction types for the region should be considered on the basis of availability, cost of material, cost of labor, and life-span. For example, in some areas, the cost of labor on masonry is fairly negligible due to the common usage of the material, thus the exterior walls would be wisely constructed of masonry. In other regions, masonry is scarce and labor costs are high. In these areas a different structural system should be considered.

The level of detailing and materials used in finishing both the exterior and interior of a building are vital to the final cost. As stated earlier, the monetary priorities of the organization are easy to spy with a simple glance through the space. A space that is overly detailed, or is detailed with costly materials states that wise stewardship may have been averted according to the previous discussion.

While it has been stated that none of the prominent architectural philosophies are inherently wrong, when employed using wise stewardship techniques, the church can quickly see
where some of these philosophies seem to cost more than others. Finding an architect that understands the spiritual implications of wise stewardship through Christian faith is not always an easy task, but may be essential.

Wise stewardship in architecture at the local level has international consequences. Even more than that, the modern missionary movement has illustrated how unwise desires for affluence have hurt missionary work. Often, missionaries have entered foreign lands with the goal to evangelize the people with the Gospel, but also strive to lift their socio-economic level. In doing so, the first and greater endeavor fails. Donald McGavran demonstrates how this “lifting” separates the new converts from their people, and subsequently limits future growth.35 When missionaries enter a new tribe, they ought to enjoy the simplified lifestyle and work from this to establish an indigenous church that can grow and reproduce itself within the culture. This suggestion means breaking every American stereotype of Christendom known, and establishing a church strictly under the direction of the example set forth in scripture.36 This means leaving the idea that a church building is necessary behind, as there is no precedent for it in New Testament Scripture.

Quite often in parts of the world where affluence has had less effect on the church, there is a life and joy not often found where affluence abounds. John White agrees: “In the other half of the world where Christians are much less affected by the temptation of our kind of materialism, we find evidence of a spirit and a joy (in spite of suffering) which makes Western Christianity seem hollow.”37 Perhaps a call for increased simplicity through wise stewardship will bring new life and vitality to the American church.

In conclusion, it has become apparent that American society is fragmented with a
wide variety of artistic philosophy which reaches into the architectural realm. The two driving philosophies that remain common are personal peace and affluence. Christ is the answer to personal peace, and affluence is generally opposed to the teachings of Jesus.

Jesus said: “Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth . . . But store up for yourselves treasures in heaven . . . For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also” (Mt 6:19-21). Most American Christians consider it possible to accumulate treasure both on earth and in heaven. This scripture hints at no such thing. In addition, a Christian’s treasure does not follow his heart, rather his heart will follow his treasure. Where has the abundant treasure led the American church of the twentieth century, and where will it lead the church in the twenty-first century?
Perhaps it is necessary to interject that there are racial and economic factors that determine many of the sub-cultures, but in this discussion it is postulated that these factors are not the exclusive, or even primary cause of the vast number of subcultures.
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