The first purpose of architecture is territorial. It is about defining a place that a person, a group of people, a denomination, a community can imagine as its own.
Creating physical shelter, spaces that are warm enough and dry, or cool enough and quiet, is only part of architecture’s charge — an often necessary but seldom sufficient way to make places that are claimed for human purpose.

Creating buildings in ways that are stylistically or culturally identifiable is another way to differentiate territory. Styles inscribe a place with an array of symbols that proclaims literal ownership or dominant use; they encode forms with established values. More provocatively, the pervasive evidences of a mode of thought, a way of making things, or a pattern of occupation serves to qualify our understanding of territory, proclaiming aspects of investment, aspiration and status.

Most simply put this formulation suggests that architecture separates inside from out. Less benignly (and increasingly these days), architecture is used to separate insiders from outsiders; haves from have-nots — or not-as-haves. Instead, architecture, in our time, should provide less decisive distinctions. In a democratic culture, dedicated to personal advancement and freedom of opportunity it must define territory that is porous, if not ambiguous. Architecture that serves only the marketplace, the temporary bonding of place and consumption, is a throw-away unless it speaks generously to another level of community, to common values and patterns of thought, or to qualities so fundamental to the human condition that they evoke some deep chord of recognition and invite many different kinds of people to empathize with its patterns and each other.

Architecture becomes most interesting when it serves many purposes, creates multiple definitions — when inside and outside are not binary, but overlapping; when it weaves a pattern of spaces which can be used to create shifting territories and alignments, and to offer multiple means of identification. Architecture then becomes the locus of social exchange, the setting within which we encounter ourselves in many faces, or recognize our presence among others.

In this issue, we examine some aspects of place that promote sociability. The examples presented range from the layout of towns and the selection of house types to the management of a strip of asphalt, from elements that promote intimate encounter to public barriers that prompt speculation. We include places that are scrabbled out of leftovers and places that have been generously defined. Together they present an instructive array of conditions where the specific nature of the forms and their relationships to each other prompt and qualify exchanges between people. They reveal shifting, fluid, overlapping territories that are not determined by, but made tangible through, and lent character by, the physical structures that define them.

As corollaries we include a portfolio with images of splendid momentary isolation, musings on two small private gardens that are utterly different in character and lodged in contrasting cultures, and a dispatch on a joint civic-private effort to stimulate ideas for remapping the territories of an urban waterfront.

Beginning with this issue Frances Halsband will serve as publisher of Places. A practicing architect in New York City, she has been a most wonderful support during the last many years and we look forward to initiatives that she will bring. She inherits the mantle so magnanimously worn by James Fulton. His generous efforts and persistent dedication have made it possible for Places to continue to exist. He has been a great collaborator and genuine friend. We are very, very grateful to him and heartened that he will continue to provide Helmman’s advice, and remain active in the conduct of our business, as chairman of the Design History Foundation.

— Daphne Lyden