

November 27, 1967

You probably know that your exam group III and the exam time is Monday, the 11th of December from 7 to 10 P.M. in 160 Kroeber. If you see anybody who missed this lecture you might inform them about this, so they realize what's happening.

I will expect you to hand in your patterns and the coordinating material for them at that time. And the exam itself will be quite trivial I think. I'll probably ask you to make some statement, or answer some specific question in connection with the pattern with which you have been working on. I doubt if we'll use the whole three hours and I may even warn you in advance what the question will be so if you want to work on it ahead of time that's all right too. * In other words, it's not an exam on the content of this course.

This week we're going to discuss the ~~xx~~ sixth of the certain topics, namely the relationship between the pattern language and the system of society and culture as a whole. I'm just going to sketch out today is the notion that the pattern language when completed is a complete working model of society and the reason for drawing attention to this kind of isomorphism - actually that's sort of a pretentious word for it - anyway, for this kind of correspondence - is that what we've said so far has not shown us how to decide whether the pattern language is complete as a whole. Suppose that we have a large pattern language. Do we know - how do we evaluate the thing as a whole - there is always the possibility that important things have been missed out. Now, I don't know the answer to this completely but that's the crucial issue in this week's discussions. Can we be satisfied that we have an operating whole?

The thing that I want to draw attention to this morning is something that I have ~~drawn attention to~~ mentioned from time to time before. I want to elaborate it

and that is that the parts which appear in patterns are not merely physical objects or spaces but can in many cases be activities or things like activities. So that a part may be defined a part within a pattern may be defined by some activity or something more subtle also. And what we're harking ~~about~~ back to here is - remember I think at the very beginning the 1st or 2nd lecture I said that we were going to try and construct a theory of the environment that was purely spatial and at that time many of you objected vehemently on the grounds, I think, that I meant the theory was going to have to do entirely with things like floors and ceilings and roads, and doors, and walls. Of course, that would be quite incomplete, you couldn't hope to develop a comprehensive picture of anything like that.

Before trying to develop the connection between this idea of activity and the theories of social structure which are available I just want to give a couple of examples. To make it clear that the activities which appear as parts in patterns may be new ones. In other words, its not - in the dicussion of activities in relation to design that is common among architects and planners the activities are usually regarded as being the functional basis for the design. That is ~~xxxx~~ they are the givens and one then constructs certain physical arrangements to house them. Now I'm talking about something quite different. I'm talking about a situation where the ~~xxxxxxxx~~ activity appears on the solution side of the equation. Here are some examples.

One of them from a piece of work we're just engaged in now in New York, We are designing a pattern system for buildings called multi-service center. Now a multi-service (multi-purpose????) center is a place usually built under the auspicious of the poverty program or something s comorable where poor people can go to get legal aid, job counselling, job skills training, family counselling, information about available apartments, information about theire rights under welfare laws,=all these kinds of things. These centers have been en existence for sometime.

They are usually very, very unpleasant places which have all the marks of welfare programs and ~~a~~ people who go to them are treated like cattle, or at any rate are treated in such a way as to emphasize their poverty and the fact that they are ~~xxxxxxx~~ relatively impotent in the social scale and they are being given things. In order to try and deal with that one of the patterns which is rather central to the whole concept ~~w~~ that we're developing says in effect that the fundamental organization of such a center consists of three concentric zones.

An arena surrounded by community projects, surrounded by agencies. Now the agencies are the federal and local government offices that normally run these buildings. They are the people that are giving legal aid or job counselling. The idea here is that in order to make it quite clear to the members of the community that this operation is there's, to enable them to take possession of it in a literal territorial sense, and in order to encourage initiative on their part, They are first of all going to be furnished with a place where they can engage in public discussion about community problems. This arena is to be equipped with a large number of microphones all around it, and a loudspeaker system and is located on the edge of an important thoroughfare.

Surrounding that is a zone devoted to community projects as they arise, still under the ownership of members of the community who wish to solve local community ~~x~~ problems and the agencies who are normally in charge of ~~xxxxx~~ this whole operation are being brought in as tenants only when these two activities have been established. I don't need to discuss the conception any further. The important point is that these activities although there are rudimentary versions of such things happening in society, we are making a prescription which is basically one of a new form of social organization. We're recommending in other words, that new kinds of activities take place in this building. In the pattern, although it is a space ~~x~~ based pattern that is really the most salient feature of it.

The same thing is true in the pattern that I've mentioned once or twice before to you where I proposed that houses be equipped with a transparent living room on a street and a large number of very very secluded private pavilions. The purposes of this ~~xxx~~ had to do with dropping in - that is of encouraging informal intercourse among friends and the possibility of an informal pattern of visiting. Now, there are functional arguments behind that - there sort of long and tedious and I won't go into them.

But again, the point is - from the point of view of this mornings lecture - that this situation would not make sense unless the people who lived in such a building were to do slightly different things here and here from what they normally do in houses. In other words, in order to be in this room a person ~~x~~ would have to be much more explicit about the fact, to himself, that fact that he was now in a public mode. That he wanted to be visited ~~xxxxxx~~, that he was visible from the street and that that's the way he wanted to be. When he or they retired to one of these places it would be a much more explicit acknowledgement, again psychologically, that they now did not wish to be disturbed. Now although there is of course of sense in all people who live in houses that sometimes they don't mind being disturbed and sometimes they don't want to be disturbed, there is not at present quite such an explicit, deliberate version of this feeling that this really constitutes a social institution which is being recommended in this pattern that is apparently just physical. Whether or not it would succeed, that is whether it would take, whether people would adopt it is another matter. I don't want to discuss that this morning either - the important point is that the prescription is a social prescription, not purely a physical one.

I want to link - No, I think I'll conclude that by saying the major of really significant patterns will have this quality. I don't think all patterns will by any means, especially the smaller scale ones. I mean this is something also that

architects have been aware of for a long long time. Of course the reason that we admire Frank Lloyd Wright or LeCorbusier is that they actually made prescriptions for new kinds of social order or psychological order. They didn't just make buildings.

In order to discuss the idea that this is consistent with the sorts of pictures of society that sociologists and anthropologists have tried to create, I want to define a notion which is central to the work of all social theories in one form or another, and I will call - this is the element of social structure - the fundamental element of social structure as seen by social theorists is the situation.

A situation is a characteristic social situation whose participants, whose setting and the rules governing the behaviour of the participants are all more or less known in advance and the situation is therefore a framework into which a given set of particular individuals can float and operate and then disperse. The social theorists have not - although they have all discussed this atom of social structure in one way or another, they haven't all called situation. In fact the only sociologists who has used that word explicitly is Irving Goffman. If you want to follow this up I'll mention several books where this kind of thing is discussed. I think it is fairly important to see the connection between the whole pattern language and these theories of social structure.

Malinowski regarded the fundamental unit of social structure and he called them institutions. In his ~~mind~~ meaning of that word the institution focus on the group - on a group of people. In other words to him the significant pieces of social structure were associations between individuals, whether in the form of corporations or families or groups of friends, whatever. Each one of these groups operated according to well known ways.

Talcott Parsons also ~~uses~~ uses the word institutions but he means something much more mental he is not referring to a group of people but to a concept, a social concept like greeting or funeral or in even very abstract cases a thing like property but in every case as he points out these concepts are embodied in what I just called situations. That is the roles of the various individuals are ~~prescribed~~ prescribed, the rules they are to follow are more or less prescribed and the setting in which the whole thing is to take place is more or less prescribed. Goffman sometimes calls them situations, sometimes he refers to them as encounters that excludes the one person case. I am not excluding the one person case. An encounter again, he uses that word to define the same entity precisely. Nardoll ~~wrote~~ wrote a book called the theory of social structure, sorry Goffman's work on this is to be found in two books, one of them is called Encounters one of them Behavior in Public Places. Nardoll tries to talk about the whole thing in terms of roles that is for him he picks out the various roles that an individual can fit into -- the slots and he merely regards those as primary but then he says of course the situations that are really crucial to defining the social structure are those where there is interplay between roles and this is again prescribed and this is again prescribed. So that the situation where a priest is hearing a confession there are two roles there and what is to go on in the situation in those two roles is prescribed. Now it is important to understand that the frame work of a ~~society~~ society -- the definition of a society is a bundle of ready made situations. This is what society and culture gives us as individuals. They provide us with a very large bundle of these situations and then it is up to each individual to flow through these situations there are certain situations ~~in~~ you cannot become a member of I mean you cannot participate in because you have the wrong characteristics but there are a large number of situations that are available to you so that your life is a kind of a strand or a necklace of the situations ready made in your culture that are

available to you then the critical ~~part~~ question is whether each individual in the society has at his disposal an adequate stock of situations to meet all of his needs now that seems an obvious statement next time when we start to look at it a bit more ~~xxxxx~~ & carefully you will see that when you look at this ~~xxxxx~~ society in that way it is quite clear that the available stock of situations does not meet the needs ~~xx~~ of huge proportions of the populations.

Now these situations are relational objects tremendously like patterns. Now let's get that ~~xxx~~ first of all just like a patterns are the basis for the theory of environmental structure so these situations are the basic objects of any reasonable theory of social structure. I want to go further than that though and say that the - all the situations available in a given society can be found in the patterns of the pattern language of that society and visa versa a pattern language for the environment always contains in full the stock of situations ~~xxx~~ which is available. So that in that sense the pattern language contains the -because ~~xx~~ of the activities can appear as parts this is true. Because this is so it means that first of all the pattern language - the inexplicit pattern language that is in use right now in a given society reflects its social structure in this rather precise sense. More important a pattern language that we design is a design for a society and culture and we must be clear about that. And further more anybody who is in the business of transforming society that is anybody who is in the business of inventing new social devices or new social situations is in our terms inventing new patterns and his inventions if they make sense would have to be incorporated in the pattern language. Now the only thing which is not quite nice about this correspondence is the following situations can sometimes correspond to a part within a pattern it can sometimes to a whole pattern and I think occasionally it can correspond to a complex of patterns so that is rather muddy. I mean occasionally where situations

correspond to a part of a pattern is the case that I just drew a minute ago
where you have those three concentric rings. It is clearly this situation
which is one where individuals are encouraged to come forward and use the
microphone and to discuss community problems that is a situation in a
sense that I just described it defined it and that is identified here with
that part of the pattern now in other cases the situation can be identified
with the whole pattern for instance in the case of the good bye pattern on the
entrance which related to the door to that little place outside the door
rails of that place and the steps that lead around it and the car. That whole
pattern corresponds to a situation this is unfortunate the third kind of example
where the situation might correspond to a whole bundle of patterns I am not
sure about I have included it here partly for instance Barry Kinball mentioned
the idea that the useful bundles of patterns could be thought of as action
steps and it does seem that in a way one of those action sets if you call
them that that might also be interpreted as being a situation. Now I find this
rather uncomfortable and it would be nice to have a much clearer correspondence
between the notion of a situation and the notion of a pattern I think it is
partly because the situation is not that well defined. The different authors that
mentioned I defined Goldman, Parsons, Malinowski and Nardol do all give different - as I
say they all agree at an intuitive level when it comes right down to defining
it they disagree and I am afraid that the notion of a situation is not well
defined in the lists of sociology and that is why it is hard to make the
correspondence ultimately I suppose - I forgot to mention one other writer
Roger Barker some of you have probably read some of his works, who writes a great
deal about behavior settings he is also talking about situations but with special
reference to also environmental qualities that are required to preserve the
nature of a situation. It seems to me that the most promising identification
to make is simply to say that any situation is a part of a pattern but it
can go all the way up to being the whole of a pattern or can correspond to that

I am not sure how likely this is going to be. Now it is all I have got to say this morning. Now I do want to emphasize the fact that although these situations are a bit like activities and in that sense you might say there is nothing new here we have been talking about activities for a long time. I really want to emphasize and underline the fact that in this way of viewing it that I have presented it the idea appears in the solution not in the statement of the problem and that each situation is of course a solution to a ~~xxxxxx~~ certain needs and tendencies that arise and in that sense if we can make the identification inbetween a situation we can say that a situation corresponds to a ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ particular pattern or a particular part of a pattern then we also have the beginnings of the connection between these situations and the needs that they are supposed to deal with. I ought to mention here that just as it is in architecture a serious problem to view the whole pattern of needs in a culture in connection with the whole environment also in social theory there has not been much luck in trying to relate the system of institutions or activity systems or situations to the background of the needs that arise ~~if~~ in the culture. It is clear to everybody that there is a connection I mean that the situations have been formulated and created by the society in order to meet needs but nobody ~~know~~ knows how to talk very nicely about the connection between the two but in a way because our pattern have this complex little pattern solution - problem have this nice integrity if we can find the items in here do correspond to situations that would help to bring out that connection. I think that is the place to stop. I am going to have questions and ~~s~~ discussion.

~~Q~~ Question:

Reply: No definitely normative. Well it could be either but as far as we are concerned the main interest is normative. In the work of social theorists they are describing situations and institutions in a descriptive way of course they are not interested in ~~the~~ prescribing anything, that the essential nature

But they are saying

of a society is that it is made of a stock of situations which people can flow through . Now given that fact it then becomes clear that if you want to invent or change society you must also do it in terms of inventing new situations. Inventing new situations in that sense becomes exactly the same as inventing ~~x~~ patterns. So I am merely saying that for us as designers I suppose we would want to make use of this mainly in a normative way. We want to prescribe new situations to meet needs that are not being met by the existing stock of situations. I didn't make that clear enough perhaps and if you look at the existing stock of situations available in a culture and a society it is suspect and liable to be bad in exactly the same way that the environment that we ~~xxxx~~ look at from our professional stand point is suspect and liable to be bad since it is not adequate and does not meet needs properly. It is a rather strange fact about sociology departments and anthropology departments and that is so far they have refused rather persistently to get them selves involved in normative problems that is that they take the view that we can describe the stock of situations because it is available in a given society but we refuse to take part in trying to invent new ones. As a result some of the burden of investigating new ones is ~~a~~ falling on the kind of people that are coming out of this college because in this college one has the explicit attitude ~~xxxx~~ that we are in the business of invention these things. But I mean this is a curious twist there is no real reason that we should be doing that anymore than they should . Obviously they should be ~~do~~ getting in there faster than us.

Question:

Reply: Yeah but let's look at what our situation really means. A situation is the counterpart of this thing I mean in other words. Look one of the situations that is available in the functioning of ~~the~~ a department is the faculty member can go talk to the department head in his office. This is a setup and of course what happens with the setup depends on - that is a situation and it has certain modes of behavior that are appropriate to it. It has particular given roles

in it. It has a given kind of a setting. It has certain sets of rules. Now it is operation precisely in the same way that a pattern is in the sense that it either satisfies the stock of these situations either satisfies needs or don't. These things seem to come out of it. In other words you can ask of - these are the tendencies that both give rise and make necessary the situation and also arise out of it. That is the same that has been true when we ~~talk~~ talk about inventing a pattern. We base it both on tendencies which are kind of basic and anterior to it and we also say but within that pattern certain little tendencies will pop up and then we must try and make sure that none of them kind of leak out. I think it would be misunderstanding what I mean by a situation to say isn't that ~~xx~~ really part of the situation. That is all the dynamics that ~~xxx~~ lie behind the situation. The situation ~~x~~ is really a solution one of many. Correction from student.

That's right. For the moment I am really not. - I haven't meant to get the whole conflict thing in here - I admit that is unresolved. But all ~~a~~ I am saying is a situation is a social device which solves - it always solves some problem. It may leave other problems unsolved. In the same sense precisely the independent condition. - condition 3 is a mute point because it will always be with a situation because a situation ~~x~~ causes more difficulties than it solves.

There is also - I think this is the one - this is the place ~~x~~ where the idea of situation is more promising than this idea there ~~xxxx~~ seems to be more interaction between situations than there ~~x~~ is between patterns. In other words a tendency ~~xxxxxxx~~ that is not solved in one situation might then adequately be solved in another situation. Because it is understood that each ~~situationxxxx~~ individual goes through all these situations in the ~~xxxx~~ course of his daily life. And that is not so clear in this notion.

Question:

Reply: Isn't that mainly - I wonder - See I think the situation would seem very rigid ~~x~~ to a sociologist who is not interested in the whole social ~~xxxxxx~~

structure. A situation has fantastically tight rules most of which we are not aware of as normal participants in situations. It is only ~~human anthropology~~ an anthropologist or a guy like Goffman who recognizes how extremely constrained the situations are that we participate in. What you are not allowed to do as compared with what you are allowed to do. It may be that it seems looser because it is more familiar. I don't know. I mean - it is hard to discuss that does anybody else have any feeling about that point.

Comment:

Reply: There is something coming out ~~xx~~ here that I want to resist very strongly and that is in a way what you are doing is gradually floating it back into the ~~xx~~ idea that the ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ environment is a kind of housing for activities. I am not making - K I think it is quite wrong to say that a pattern is a sort of housing in which a situation can happen. A housing is the same sort of thing as a situation. The components. - the only difference is that a pattern is always referring to the spacial structure of the situation but it is the structure of the situation and not the housing for the situation. It is its spacial part.

Comment:

Yes it is the spacial structure of it. But it is not the case - there is this sort of conception that the environment is the housing for the activities. In other that words/you have ~~the housing for the~~ activities and then you must house them.

Or in terms of what we were talking about this morning. ~~xxx~~ you have situations /ing for and then you must ~~house~~ house them. ~~xxxx~~ That is definitely ~~xx~~ not what I am saying. We are agreed now. I mis understood you actually. I thought that you were saying something like that. That seems to be quite wrong. In the sense that on the good bye porch the spacial organization there which refers to a spacial organization of activities as well as a spacial organization as steps and stones is the situation it is not the housing for a situation. but that spacial pattern is the

spacial structure of the situation. and if you change that spacial structure you are changing the situation. You are not then confronted with a different ⁱⁿ houding / which essentially the same situation occurs.

Comment:

Reply: Well because in some cases it is obviously not true. At least if the idea of pattern is right in other words /n that example where you have arena community projects and agencies. In one sense you could describe the whole of that as the whole situation but in another sense if you imagine these people ^{loud} coming in off the street gathering and talking into ~~xxxx~~ speakers and everything else that is happening purely here and that would really be a more accurate thing to call the situation there. One - I mean that is one of the ~~xxx~~ situations. That would really be a more accurate thing to call this situation there. That is one of the situations and that might be another situation and that might be another situation so that at least in that case it would be ~~xxxxxx~~ seen more appropriate to say that the situations are corresponding to parts of this thing. As I said I think the trouble is that there is no precise definition of a situation. You would really need to read all the works that I mentioned to get a sense of how difficult ~~xxxx~~ it is to define that. It is very difficult.

Question:

Reply: Rather than get into that today I would like to deal with that next time because I will be giving alot of examples of it.

Question:

Reply: I don't understand the last part of what you said at all. Let me just answer the first part. Because I think the change of getting stuck on the patterns that you have created is a real one but is also dependent on the attitude of the people that are doing it. Remembering the analogy between patterns in our work and hypotheses in science. The ~~xxxxxxxx~~ scientists do not usually get stuck on hypothesis ~~they~~ have put up. One of the main reasons is ~~that~~ the generation change it is often the case that a given scientist will get stuck on ~~his~~ his hypothesis

but then the next generation of scientists in that same field will sort them out. So that you are not likely to get stuck to them for very long even though you might in an individual. I think the same thing will be true of patterns since - I mean assuming that we take that same attitude to them. I don't see that it is a danger provided we ~~are~~ have the right attitude. The other thing - well I mean the whole intention is being to give a basis for criticizing patterns which ~~are~~ is more object ive than that. I mean you don't have a politics of nuclear particles. Now what ~~was~~ this thing about the middle class I don't understand. Yes, but one of the whole points of what we have been saying is that you don't attact patterns on the basis of your values I mean that leads nowhere. I tried to show that that cant be done in a consistent manner. Of course you are quite right that somebody could come along and make that statement but if be are trying to deal with a pattern language on the basis of people criticizing it from the point of view of ~~xxx~~ their own values.~~that~~ there is absolutely no change of getting anywhere. I mean somebody could say that and somebody could say the opposite. I don't really see can you connect that up with the business of conservatism.

~~Re~~Comment:

REply: Well you have to show what the problems really were. Well it may seem strange to you but people do ~~absolutely~~ alot stranger things than that. The question is whether there is anything wrong with that for the people that are doing it. That is really the meaning of the whole tendency ~~are~~ argument. Just evaluating that kind of. From that point of view the anthropologists have done a very valuable job in not trying to criticize people for having beliefs different from their own. You would have to show what conflict arose add could not be resolved as ~~axxxx~~ result of that form of behavior.before you could criticize it in a legitimate way as far as I am concerned. Yeah I think that is a real problem. Obviously you cannot do it simply by building the building. So in that sense there is no intention of that sort in that statement

the way we are operating in New York, I suppose it is fairly obvious it is the only thing you can do is to discuss these matters with the people concerned until they recognize for themselves ~~a~~ that this is the sensible thing to do if that doesn't happen the solution is not good anyway.

Question:

Reply: In view of the fact that patterns are definitions of culture how one sends out the new definitions of culture to an existing culture is a very thorny matter which I will at least mention in one lecture to ~~me~~ come. We can have a protracted discussion about it. Is it one o'clock.