

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS:

I have argued here that the change which took place in the physical environment of Deir Ghassaneh should neither be looked at as a rearrangement of the existing structure nor merely a transformation or borrowing of new architectural elements. Rather, such a change in the built environment is seen to have been evidence of the reorganisation of the society as a whole on a new basis.

This change did not initially happen at the architectural level, or in the architectural sphere, but took place first in the socio-economic and cultural spheres, and was eventually reflected in the architectural process.

Obviously, this is not a view on which there is a consensus by architects or architectural critics. In Primitive Architecture Enrico Guidoni argues that:

...wherever there has been extensive contact between primitive communities and Western colonizers... Myths, community organization, and language are all somewhat change-resistant, but architecture has often proved highly sensitive. With the first pressures, important materials and building techniques brought in from outside are promptly adopted. Indeed, an architectural tradition seems to be modified even more hastily than the sociocultural context in which it exists" (Guidoni, 1978:8)

The assumption that the built form changes before the community's socio-cultural content is debatable. This certainly was not the case in the village of Deir Ghassaneh. While critical changes in the cultural conditions started to take place in the early twenties, critical changes in the built form happened much later in the mid-fifties.

Guidoni also suggests that the change in the architectural form could take place "without necessarily implying a total mutation in the social content" (Guidoni, 1978:9). One should perhaps make a distinction between cases whereby people "directly" forced to change their physical environment (natural disasters, wars) and other cases where people were slowly and indirectly changing their environment.