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Foreword

In year 2009, Prof. Ivan Marušič and Prof. Dušan Ogrin celebrated their 70th and 80th anniversary respectively. It was a special year. It was an opportunity for The Department of Landscape Architecture of Biotechnical Faculty, University of Ljubljana to show an appreciation to our distinguished colleagues, the founding fathers of landscape architecture in Slovenia, for their long and devoted contribution to the field of landscape architecture as well as an opportunity to critically reflect the current developments in landscape architecture. For this occasion, the Department of Landscape Architecture organized an international conference with invited speakers to discuss Dilemmas in Contemporary Landscape Architecture. The conference took place in Ljubljana in November 2009. Magne Bruun, Diedrich Bruns, Carl Steinitz and Janez Marušič opened a morning session with topics from a field of landscape planning. Malene Hauxner, Martin Prominski, Robert Schäfer and Dušan Ogrin presented their thoughts in the afternoon in so called “landscape design session”. After all presentations, Olav Skage conducted the round table that closed the conference and the second part of the celebration day started dedicated to the two laureates: Janez Marušič and Dušan Ogrin. Diedrich Bruns, the ECLAS president delivered ECLAS Lifetime Achievements Award to Prof. Janez Marušič for his 45 years long teaching practice in a field of landscape planning and his contribution in landscape planning methodology and theory. Professor emeritus Dušan Ogrin, a founder of modern landscape architecture in Slovenia received the award for his more then 50 years long teaching career during which he developed a theory of landscape design and some critical views of our profession discussed in his new book simply titled Landscape Architecture which was for the first time presented at the conference and which is coming out in fall 2010.

Dilemmas in Contemporary Landscape Architecture

Among many others, landscape architecture is undergoing several important processes that were directly or indirectly addressed at the conference and are discussed in this conference proceeding. One of the problems is modernization and unification of LA study programs inside Europe defined by the Bologna process. Europe is facing changes of study programs due to the Bologna process which could profoundly change the face of the profession. The development of specializations within the profession, i.e. landscape design, landscape or environmental planning and landscape management, indicates the maturity of the profession but at the same time reduces the identity and strength of landscape
architecture, especially when new study programs that offer specializations in mentioned fields are organized within other basic study programs. In these cases even the term »landscape architecture« is lost. Tuning process is one of major issues in ECLAS and cooperation with EFLA in a process of program accreditation is announced but there is not yet a clear operational scheme how it could be done. This was not a problem of this conference although questions what is the proper methodological approach in landscape planning and what do we teach in landscape design studios directly shape study programs and profiles of future landscape architects.

Legislation and international conventions, such as the European Landscape Convention, have provided a platform that would have seemed like a utopian vision a century ago. But in everyday life we see that the power of economic interests, especially driven by mighty global concerns, still tend to overshadow landscape and environmental values, and primary guiding principles stated, for example, in the Landscape Convention are rarely mentioned. Have educational institutions for the landscape profession been failing to stress leadership, and should this be given high priority in future programs? Or should we just simply be realistic enough to accept that our profession is but a cog, though ever so important, in the complex and intricate machinery of the global world we live in, asks himself Magne Bruun in his paper. Beside its influence to the curriculum, an implementation of European Landscape Convention in member states that seems to have a possible positive influence to other World countries and its influence to landscape/environmental planning is a serious question which requires effective and immediate solutions. European Landscape Convention is implemented “à papier” in many European countries but only few actual and positive changes have been transferred into legislation and in planning practice. Even more, the convention is used as a cover to promote many other professions. While landscape architecture is dealing with imperatives from the convention for decades landscape architects are obviously not successful enough to present and promote our profession as a crucial and most competent player in the spatial planning process that includes Landscape Convention.

Carl Steinitz implements landscape convention in practice through An Assessment of the Visual Landscape of the Autonomous Region of Valencia, Spain: a case study in linking research, teaching and landscape planning. He links together two themes: the first is the need to consider the visual landscape and the role of landscape architecture from a much larger perspective than the normal project scales that most landscape architects work at – the scales of river basins, regions and cities – and the second is the need to consider landscape change through public policy as well as through built projects.

Diedrich Bruns raises more questions, such as: What are the planning requirements of a society when, instead of one, more than thirty nationalities live in one city district, while 10 percent of the population is exchanged per annum and entire regions are drained of people while others are growing rapidly? The suggestion is to critically review “old” planning visions and “old” values. By presenting case studies, and with reference to the European Landscape Convention, his paper discusses methods that support social inclusion and participation of people in planning.

Janez Marušič deals in his paper with an expansion of designed urban and cultural landscapes projects and plans. As he
says, many landscape design projects, implemented in the last ten or fifteen years, clearly show a polarized character of landscape design: they range from subtle, ecologically and socially sensitive projects to numerous »arty« projects on the other side that follow sensational/excess architecture. All these raise questions of adequate critique. Do we need in the face of the climate changes, economic crises, increased mobility and the overwhelming injustice a new socially and ecologically responsible landscapes which would respond to expanding human needs while at the same time participate in the creation of a new, poetic world along side the world of nature? What is a good landscape design and is there something like right landscape design?

Malene Hauxner addresses dilemmas in the profession through dilemmas in art and society. She sees a solution in "Carnation Revolution" in landscape architecture which can restore the significance of public space, to step into the arena of the city and render visible the story of one’s self by sharing it with others; this plays an important part for the self-understanding and self-knowledge of man. She calls her paper “The Art of Transformation” but it could be called also “The Art of Cultivation” and she will present subtle differences in meanings of both expressions in her presentation.

Robert Schäfer sees Landscape as Topos in the sense of a platform on which we try to solve problems. He quotes David Witty who said “It is design which will solve the cities’ social, ecological and economic problems.” Schäfer will try to prove that maybe it is hard to envisage that we can plan and determine the sense of well-being in a city, but we can certainly provide a framework that admits enough freedom and scope for individuals to be proactive. In general, freedom is the key to happiness. Why should it be different in landscape design?

Martin Prominski goes a step further in world of cyborgs and hybrids as he says, and where the term “nature” is so blurred that it is hardly recognisable anymore. His hypothesis is that contemporary landscape architecture has found some very innovative answers to deal with inconsistencies in modern world and that the shaky theoretical foundations might in turn be the reason for optimism in landscape architecture.

Dušan Ogrin titled his presentation simply as "Quo vadis topos europaeus?" Under this title, he, among other issues, asks an important question how far designed landscapes satisfy people as he puts man in a centre of our design approach. He rises at the end new questions in order to clarify the “mushrooming ecological mysticism” appearing as ecological design, ecological planning, ecological art, ecological architecture, ecological aesthetics etc. in contemporary landscape architecture.
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Professor Bruno Zevi at the University of Venice stated in a lecture to the VIIIth IFLA World Congress in Israel 1962 that the battle for the future of the landscape was about to be lost all over the world. In his opinion, landscape planning efforts had been a constant defence struggle from case to case, without any leading strategies. If landscape architects should have a chance to win, they must attack the problems much more aggressively and seek a modern, dynamic dimension for their practice. Creative leadership was urgently needed, in a way that could impress and convince planners, architects and the general public. There was no other alternative, he said. Landscape architects as individuals might survive as subordinate assistants for architects and planners, but their profession could only exist if they were able to provide leadership (1).

Now, nearly fifty years later, it may not be very difficult to agree in principle with Professor Zevi’s analysis. But then there is a major question to be asked: Have landscape architects been able to produce adequate leadership in the meantime, can any successful results be traced back to that, and what challenges are still hanging in the air waiting for a solution?

Early in the 20th century there was in fact a visionary movement and a strong policy-making process going on among those few people who had chosen the young and immature profession of landscape architecture as their future career. Their main concern was design, but a great deal of attention was also paid to planning of the urban landscape. Before World War II, landscape architects met annually at international gatherings in northwestern Europe. Here, contradictions between conservative design traditions and progressive modernism came into the limelight. The modernists came from different countries. Among them was the gifted British landscape architect Christopher Tunnard, who became a professor at Harvard after the war (2). In the Netherlands, remarkable achievements had been made in the urban landscape, which is referred to in Giedion’s work “Space, Time and Architecture” (3). Scandinavian countries and Germany also played important parts. Through his book “Park Policies for Town and Country” (4) the Danish landscape architect C.Th. Sørensen exercised a definite influence on Scandinavian urban planning even up to recent days. A similar position was held by the founder of Norwegian landscape architecture education, Professor Olav L. Moen (d.1951), within his own country. Sweden had several pioneers who participated internationally and made Stockholm known as the world’s leading example of a modern green city. Swedish landscape architects also yielded remarkable results at an early stage regarding the landscape of roads and industry, inspired by the achievements of their colleagues in Germany, whose activities had expanded into rural landscape and connected landscape architecture with civil engineering (2).

Against this background, Zevi’s statement might seem somewhat exaggerated and perhaps not entirely justified. Leadership was not lacking among the pioneers of the profession, and they certainly had shown their ability to formulate long-term policies for the landscape, at least in urban areas. But this does not imply that their leadership
was recognized by decision-makers or that their policies were brought into action. In the post-war period, most European countries had to concentrate on rebuilding and economic restoration. Industry and housing had top priority, but the development was guided by a political vision of a dawning welfare society with equal opportunities for all. In a historical perspective, this situation might seem like an open door for ideas and programs advocated by landscape architects. Successful results were, indeed, achieved in certain cases, e.g. regarding rehabilitation of derelict industrial land. But if we search for a general trend of that period, I am afraid that we'll find very few impressive exhibits of what Landscape architecture can yield.

One reason why landscape architects had not reached their goals half a century ago was, of course, that there were all too few of them. In many countries the profession had not even been established yet. But the hegemony in planning was held by architects, engineers and economists, whose predominant philosophy seemed to be centred on economic and technological progress, efficiency and standardisation. The message presented by landscape architects, related to a green and viable environment, was simply interpreted as a reactionary attempt to revive the bourgeois garden city ideals. Such voices obviously were not listened to in the 1950s. One might say that Le Corbusier’s famous slogan about “Sunshine, air and greenery” was not read the way we like to think. I am referring mainly to general trends in the country where I belong, but the situation probably was far more conspicuous in strongly industrialised countries with high population pressure.

Then there was a veritable turn of the tide after 1960. A new awareness of threats to the natural environment and our own welfare was beginning to grow all over the western world.

We discovered that we no longer could trust technology to solve all our needs, that we needed alternative measures to mitigate the adverse effects and that nature conservation was necessary to protect our own existence. Some examples from Norway may serve as illustrations of the process that was about to start.

As an important part of the social democratic program to industrialise the country, development of Norway’s hydroelectric potentials increased to vast dimensions in the 50s. The tremendous impact on scenic landscapes alarmed a lot of people and literally came as a shock to the members of parliament. As a result, a special landscape section was established at the National Electricity Board. Almost overnight the situation was turned the other way around. Norway could have become a model for successful landscape planning and rehabilitation of rivers and water courses if the results had caught international attention. A landscape section was likewise founded at the Board of Highways to be responsible for landscape planning in connection with a highly needed national program for development and modernisation of the public road system in the country.

Conflicting interests resulted in a strong nature conservation movement. The cultural landscape in rural areas came into focus in connection with structural changes in farming. The demand for land and facilities for public outdoor recreation became important issues in national politics, as in most other European countries.

The demand for landscape architects increased rapidly as all the different environmental issues entered the political agenda. Consequently, the education program was improved and strengthened, with a rising number of graduates. Landscape architects are now called upon for important positions in governmental agencies. Private consulting firms have expanded strongly, and their field of activities also goes beyond the national border. Landscape architects are working out recommendations and solutions of major importance in order to ensure optimal development in both urban and rural areas. They participate in policy-making and have a certain influence upon decisions of crucial significance for the future of our landscape.
The situation I have been trying to describe briefly here, presumably is not specific for the country I come from, but is recognisable to various degrees in most countries in Western Europe. If we can imagine that this had been reported to the participants of the VIIIth IFLA Congress back in 1962, it certainly would have sounded like a futuristic dream. But does it really indicate that all is well, so that we can look upon the future with innocent confidence? Of course not. The world is not Paradise and never will be. Even in areas considered as the most civilised regions of the Earth, competing and contradictory interests will be in a constant struggle for power and control over resources of the landscape.

At the Congress almost 50 years ago there was a call for leadership. Today we find that the hegemony held in former days by other professions has been broken and that landscape architects quite frequently are in leading positions where crucial decisions are made. But landscape planning is a multidisciplinary operation, where no specific profession can or should expect to enjoy undisputable predominance. It might hurt our professional vanity when ideas and concepts fostered and developed by landscape architects are taken over or captured by others, but such are very often the procedures in the competitive world we live in. We can only stand up and advocate approaches and strategies that we find appropriate for the desired objectives. If our arguments are strong enough, we might get listened to. But there are inherent chances and risks of gain or loss.

Nature conservation is a field where landscape architects played a considerable part in the initial phase. However, it seems to me that their influence soon faded. Academic programs have been developed to provide a scientific basis aimed specifically at the task of nature conservation. This came in response to a political demand for improved expert knowledge especially adapted to handle an intricate set of problems. As a consequence, the role of landscape architects became less accentuated. Nevertheless, our profession should not lose focus on these issues, provided that we still deem our concepts and ideas to be of significance.

One main question is whether we as professionals have fulfilled our tasks as advocates for the qualities of the landscape and sustainable policies for it. At international landscape conferences we frequently hear inspiring keynote speakers who call for leadership in the struggle to guide the development of the landscape onto more sustainable paths. But what is meant by the term leadership? At least the modern concept of leadership does not imply a powerful authority where all decisions are made once and forever. That would have been in total disharmony with fundamental democratic principles of public participation. In such a context we should rather see leadership as a way to clarify alternatives and convey knowledge and awareness. Have we as professionals been able to respond to this challenge?

A prerequisite for successful leadership is a certain background of laws and recommendations. Most European countries have introduced legislation which more or less enables action to safeguard sustainable development of the landscape, and some have specific landscape planning acts which seem effective and updated. It would have been of great interest if a comprehensive study were carried out to clarify how and to what extent these legislative tools have been used and adapted in practice. One might also ask if there has been enough focus on the potentials of these legislative tools and how they can be used to foster positive development of the qualities of the landscape.

The European Landscape Convention, together with other international declarations and agreements, has provided a platform for planning and decisions that would have seemed like a utopian vision a century ago. I have, however, seen very little if any presentation and discussion of the Landscape Convention in international magazines that are being read outside professional circles. As a joint effort by the five Nordic countries, a thorough study of the possibilities and implications of the
Landscape Convention was published in 2003 (5). Since then, land use issues with important and dramatic consequences for the landscape have been discussed on our national scene, without any reference to the Convention at all. Spiteful comments have been heard about the Landscape Convention being a well guarded secret! Open and vital discourse on the responsibilities and potentials implied in the Convention and its possibilities in relation to legislative tools seems to be urgently needed. Could all this be an indication that we among others have done our job badly when it comes to letting our professional voices be heard?

In modern democracy there has been a typical trend towards stronger public influence and participation whenever important strategies are chosen or decisions made, e.g. regarding land use and landscape. In the Landscape Convention we find frequent emphasis on the importance of public participation, for instance when qualitative objectives for the landscape are to be formulated. This requires a new understanding of the role of expertise and points to new aspects of leadership. An expert is no longer seen as someone who knows all the answers, but rather as a mediator whose task is to convey insight and guidance and clarify alternatives for actors in the process of decisionmaking. The implications of this situation most probably should be reflected in the way we organise our training of landscape architects.

Our educational programs have been constantly improved and have moved a great step forward as a result of advanced technology and creative international cooperation. Still, the challenges and demands for leadership in its different aspects obviously need to be further stressed in our educational strategies. Success in this field requires a strengthened base in relevant research, and here we come upon one of our sore spots. Landscape research no doubt has made important gains in recent years, but does that mean that it is dynamic, bold and comprehensive enough to fulfil the objectives and expectations for tomorrow?

The obstacles are manifold. We all know that one of the difficulties is research funding, especially since resources tend to be tied up in large, complex programs whose profiles and objectives often have been set up without much priority for landscape aspects. As we move farther into the 21st century, competition is likely to increase – not only competition for funding, but competition for influence, which is far more important. Our graduates deserve to be prepared for this difficult world. I see a need for structured programs offering training to promote not only their own expertise, but also the importance of the qualitative aspects of the landscape and the necessity of sustainable development of landscape, in pristine and rural as well as in more or less degraded urbanised regions – in essence the message which is presented in the European Landscape Convention.

In recent years we have seen many examples that landscape planning and a growing public awareness of landscape qualities have led to successful results. On the other hand, in spite of the purposeful tools that legislation and international conventions provide, and contrary to well founded efforts by landscape planners, we also experience many lost cases. A typical trend of today is that capital investors whose development projects have been stopped by governmental intervention, to increasing degrees are bringing lawsuits against local communities in order to gain compensation for claimed losses. If we get many court decisions in their favour, I am afraid that rather gloomy perspectives are likely to turn up.

We only need a brief look at the past to realise that economic and political forces are some of the most determinant factors causing landscape changes. In the age of globalisation with all its promising aspects, economic forces to an ever-increasing extent will be found in powerful global corporations. Different forms of counteraction have been organised in order to minimise the detrimental impacts of this. Still, landscape planning quite doubtlessly will be facing difficulties and challenges of greater dimensions than ever before.
This requires advanced skills, well founded strategies and, last but not least, strong and reliable alliance partners.

Seen in this context, landscape planning has the chance to become an important and influential agent in the complex and intricate process of shaping tomorrow’s world. But we should not nourish any illusions that we can save the world alone. To return to Bruno Zevi, - he certainly was not right when he declared that the battle for the landscape was about to be lost all over the world. This battle is not about to be lost, but it will never end.
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AN ASSESSMENT OF THE VISUAL LANDSCAPE OF THE AUTONOMOUS REGION OF VALENCE, SPAIN: A CASE STUDY IN LINKING RESEARCH, TEACHING, AND LANDSCAPE PLANNING

Carl Steinitz

My talk will be an argument for two linked two themes: the first is the need to consider the visual landscape and the role of landscape architecture from a much larger perspective than the normal project scales that most landscape architects work at— the scales of river basins, regions and cities —and the second is the need to consider landscape change through public policies as well as through built projects. My example case study is the Comunidad of Valencia, which intends to become the first autonomous region in Spain to fully implement the European Landscape Convention, by designing and implementing a set of policies and plans to protect and enhance the landscapes of the entire 23,000 square kilometre Comunidad of Valencia. The visual landscape assessment is an integral part of that program.

The landscapes of the Autonomous Community of Valencia have been undergoing rapid and destructive changes that impinge on the attractiveness and economic vitality of the region for both residents and tourists. This is especially the case in the region’s coastal zones and we can all recognize this as a pattern common to many countries, including Slovenia.

When I first came to Valencia in 1960, I drove through agricultural landscapes to the sea, and there I saw what I had come for—cities and villages by the sea, separated by beautiful views of the sea and farms and hills. Three years ago I returned, and along the main roads I saw very many tall urban residential buildings, lots of commerce and industry, some farming and an occasional view of the sea. And I know that if I come

- Marginalisation of the hinterlands
- Decline in the traditional littoral-mountain relationships
- Several intense pressures on littoral and plains: infrastructure, tourism, intensive agriculture, industry, urbanization,
- Heavy littoral traffic
back 10 years from now, and certainly in 20 years, I may never see the sea.....just a fully urbanized corridor for the full length of the Spanish coast. We are all aware of the worldwide slowing of development caused by the current economic crisis, but we also cannot ignore the long-term trends related to the worldwide movement of populations into temperate and warmer coastal regions.

Many persons in the Province of Valencia understand this long-term trend. Some, including landscape architects, have and are making a lot of money because of it. But other people also understand this trend, and see it as part of an unsustainable long-term disaster. When we add the complex issues of the region’s inadequate water supplies, the forecast reductions in the European Union’s agricultural and other subsidy programs, and the development needed to accommodate the region’s increases in new immigrants from Spain, Africa and other parts of Europe, such enormous pressure for rapid change will result in a seriously degraded regional landscape unless immediate action is taken. Much damage has already occurred, and today, the Valencia’s coastal landscape is at a critical point. The trend is powerful, but it is not too late for corrective action.

The European Landscape Convention of the Council of Europe offers a very useful model for attempting to manage this crisis. The Action Plan of the European Landscape Convention was adopted by the Heads of States and Governments of the member states in Warsaw, on 17 May 2005. Spain ratified the European Landscape Convention in November 2007, and is now required to implement this international treaty.

The principal provisions of the European landscape Convention’s Action Plan are in Article 5:
1. Recognition of landscapes in law as an essential component of people’s surroundings, and expression of the diversity of their shared cultural and natural heritage, and a foundation of their identity.
2. Establishment and implementation of landscape policies aimed at landscape protection, management and planning.
3. Establishment of procedures for participation by the general public, local and regional authorities and other parties with an interest in the definition and implementation of landscape policies.
4. Integration of landscape into regional and town planning policies, and in its cultural, environmental agricultural, social and economic policies, as well as in any other policies with possible direct or indirect impact on landscape.

Over the past few years there have been several laws and programs to protect important landscape areas in the Comunidad of Valencia. There is a considerable amount of land which is under differing degrees of protection. However, and as in many of the world’s coastal zones, these landscapes are predominantly in places where there is little pressure for urban or industrial development. Most of the Comunidad’s development is where the roads are, along the coast and in the coastal plain, in relatively flat land, and below 100 meters in elevation. Most of the people reside there, and most urban, commercial and industrial development will occur there. Most of the land in these areas, and especially land within 1000 meters of a major road, is under weak or no protection. These lands are where Valencia’s urban/industrial/commercial sprawl continues to take place. These coastal areas are also where most people perceive the landscapes of the region. Its landscapes form the gateways to its cities and the shoreline, and they create an indelible impression of the quality of the region’s landscape. It is essential that these highly valued landscapes be understood, planned, protected and enhanced at regional and municipal scales.

Covering a surface of 23,000km2 and with a population of 5 million people, the Valencian Region is one of the most dynamic areas in the Mediterranean Arch and in Spain. The topography of the Valencian Region presents a very clear contrast between the interior mountains and a series of coastal flatlands which receive the flow of permanent and temporary watercourses or gullies, which feed marshlands and lakes like the Albufera of Valencia. Water in Valencia
is in any case a scarce resource that has been carefully collected, distributed and managed since the Roman times and which has produced a unique water culture that has given shape to our landscape and a network of compact urban settlements. This pattern has been deeply modified in the last decades of the 20th century when a series of intense socio-economical changes—some of them based on massive tourism from Europe—caused a concentration of most of the economic activity and the rapid growth of urban areas in the coast. The Valencian Region has protected around 30% of its territory but the protection sites include outstanding landscapes that are disconnected and hardly accessible for most of the population.

The expected increase in population estimated at 20% for the next 25 years, together with the consequences of climate change, will increase the demand of our scarce water resources, transforming the landscapes that we have today and causing a serious impact on the rich biodiversity of the Valencian Region. The decline of agriculture is particularly worrying in the Valencian Region, where 85% of the land is devoted to this use, where agriculture plays a very important environmental role and where it maintains some of the most valuable, cultural landscapes.

The Landscape Policy of the Valencian Region is structured around the 4 key action lines based in the European Landscape Convention that we have just heard about.

In 2007 the Valencian Landscape Department was created, a government body with the responsibility of defining and supervising the application of the Landscape Policy. The Valencian Region has been the first Region in Spain to define a legal framework based on the Territorial Planning and Landscape Protection Act which requires every municipality the development of a Landscape Plan and its integration in the local planning. The legal framework demands as well the preparation of a Landscape Impact Assessment in any project likely to affect landscape in a significant way. Due to the very fast
transformation of the Valencian Region and due to the risk of losing invaluable environmental, cultural and visual landscape resources, it was decided to give priority to their protection by means of a network of interconnected open spaces, also known as the Valencian Green Infrastructure, defined by the most ecological, cultural and visually valued landscapes. The Valencian Landscape Department is working on a series of plans and projects associated with the primary Valencian Green Infrastructure (VGI).

And all this is the formidable responsibility of my former student Arancha Munoz Criado in her role as Director of the Territorial and Landscape Department of the Autonomous Region of Valencia.

About three years ago I received a telephone call from Arancha, asking whether I would come to Valencia and talk to the President of the Region? I said sure! Valencia is a nice warm place and it was cold where I live. I met with President Camps and Arancha for well over an hour. And the issue that was raised was the following. The President was receiving substantial public criticism, including a published letter from the European Union, “that the region of Valencia had become ugly”. The substantial prosperity that had come to the region through Spain’s joining the European Union and receiving a disproportionate new members’ share of financial aid, and the development that had occurred on top of the private development of the previous 20 to 30 years, was widely perceived as being ugly. The President did not know what to do.

I said “I have a taught a seminar on Visual Landscape Assessment at Harvard for more than 30 years. I think I know what to do. Let us study it and propose remedies.” So I gave some public lectures and a set of workshops to provincial and municipal civil servants, very similar to the course that I teach at Harvard. In three days we did a very preliminary study of the public perceptions of the region, and of the main entrance road to the City of Valencia.

Then Arancha became Director of her government department and responsible for landscape planning. At a meeting about a year and a half ago, (it was in the bar of a hotel in Madrid), we decided to do a serious visual assessment of the entire Region of Valencia, and within the principles of the European Landscape Convention. This meant that the assessment would not be based on expert judgment but rather on popular judgment. There are some important theoretical, technical and ethical issues in this position. When you say that “the people” should decide whether Valencia – or any area-- is ugly or beautiful, or whether they like it or not, who are the people?

I will now show you this study. It took five months. It was conducted in the context of a course of lectures and seminars that I led. Juan Carlos Vargas-Moreno, Tess Canfield, The Valencia Landscape Department and I met five times during Spring 2008 with a large group of faculty and graduate students from the University of Valencia and the Polytechnic University of Valencia, and several people from Arancha’s Department. Basically, I gave lectures on visual assessment theories and methods, and during the 3 weeks or so that we were away each time the students did the field work and The Valencia landscape Department team conducted the analytic phases. Everybody gained —the students got a course and academic credit, and Valencia got a study which is probably the world’s largest visual landscape assessment.
The Region of Valencia is more than 300 kilometers North-South. There are good GIS data in this area. Because of the region’s size, and physical and social diversity, we had the hypothesis that people might not agree with each other. And so an early decision was made to divide the various local governments into 8 groups: north, central and south, and coastal and mountain. There are three main cities, Castellón, Valencia and Alicante, and we thought that there might be a cultural differences between the people who live in the villages in the mountains and the people who live in the cities.

We divided the students into 8 teams of 3, gave each team a car and a credit card, and we gave them directions. They were to photograph all the the landscape and land use types that are known in the database, and different combinations and conditions of these. In addition, they should photograph whatever strikes their interest. The teams drove all the main roads and they brought back 4,800 photographs.

We then had an incredibly interesting two-day task. We knew we were going to make a preference survey using photographs and we wanted to limit the number of photographs to sixty for each area. We took every characteristic landscape type that was in the database for each of the 8 regions and selected not the best photograph of it but the most characteristic photograph of it. In addition, there were different combinations of things that we wanted to see in the photographs. By the time we were done we had selected 46 local photographs in each of 8 sub-regions and we picked 2 of these photographs that symbolized that area, and which would be placed in each other sub-region’s interview set. For example, would the people in the northern mountains like the city center Alicante in the south? We did not know.
We then had a two-hour seminar discussion about hypotheses, under the assumption that the photographs represent those landscapes, an assumption which is well established in the 50-year history of visual assessment research. What is it that explains whether people prefer or do not prefer scenes? What is it that explains whether they like something or they do not like something? We identified 13 different hypotheses and in this study’s five-level graphics convention, dark red means people do not like it, dark green means people do like it. Each hypothesis - the land use, the natural character of the landscape, the presence of vegetation, the complexity and simplicity of the landscape, etc. - was defined by a set of qualitative or quantitative measures on a five-level scale. Then, at least 3 people evaluated each photograph. Does this photograph have chaos or order? Does it have a distant view? Does it have diversity of vegetation? Which is the predominant land use? This took about three hours. Then, the encoded hypothesis evaluation values for each photograph were placed into a large computer spreadsheet.

To summarize: for each of eight sub-regions, we had 48 pictures from the sub-region and 12 pictures from others, a total of 384 photos. And for each photograph we had a number for each of 13 hypotheses ranging from 1 to 5, with 1 likely to be negative factor, to 5 likely to be positive in preference. Five-level scales are useful. Visual researchers found that out many years ago. People can deal with 5 levels easily, 7 with difficulty and 9 impossibly. We presumed that people’s visual landscape preferences have a normal distribution. There are some things that they like very, very much; there are more that they like; most things are in the middle; there are less that they do not like, and some things that they really do not like. A normal distribution of preferences is frequently found in visual research. We therefore used an interview structure which I and others have used in many studies in the last 30 years. It basically asked 3 questions. The first question was “Please place these 60 pictures into 5 piles—of 6, 12, 24, 12 and 6 photos”. Pile 1 means you do not like it, pile 5 means you like it a lot, and there are no preference distinctions among pictures in a pile”.

The technique is really quite simple. You give people a randomly sorted set of pictures, they look at them all, they start putting them into piles, and it takes 10 to 15 minutes for a person to sort these photographs. We did it with adults and we did it with school children. It was fun! The second question was “Which 6 pictures represent your area today?” The third question is “Which 6 pictures represent what you would like your area to be like in 20 years?”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muy baja</th>
<th>Muy Alta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Carácter tradicional de la Arquitectura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carácter natural del Paisaje</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Presencia de vegetación</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Diversidad de la vegetación natural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hitos visuales artificiales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Densidad del espacio urbanizado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Carácter costero</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vistas a masas de agua dulce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Uso del suelo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Caos y orden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Profundidad visual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Horizontalidad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Productividad del paisaje</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preferencia**
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The next issue was: who should we interview? We decided that we had to closely reflect the census of the Valencia Region and also each of the 8 sub-regions. In the Valencia Region there are residents and many tourists. The residents are national residents—meaning Spanish—and immigrants—meaning non-Spanish. They have different types of education, different gender and different age. A sampling plan was derived, and the students, who had been assigned in part because they came from the sub-regions, were directed to find and interview persons who filled the census categories. We interviewed about 900 people, and accomplished a very, very close correlation to the pattern of the census. The green numbers show the census percentages, and the red shows the interview sample which we accomplished. The preference ranking from each person for each photo also was put into the computer.
These are the extreme results: the columns are the ranked ordered photographs and the rows are the 8 sub-regions. These are the 10 highest ranked out of 60 photographs in the 8 sub-regions. And you will notice that the Albufera, the famous large wetland, is either number 1, or up to number 4 in every region. It is the highest preferred landscape across the Valencian region. There are other regionally symbolic and highly preferred landscapes, but most of the highest-preferred scenes are local to their sub-region.
These are the 10 least preferred photos.

We now need an explanation: Why are some landscapes highly preferred and some less so? The visual preference model is based upon the multiple regression analysis equation $v=f(h(a,b,c,d,\ldots,n))$, in which visual preference (the dependent variable value) is a function of the hypothesized independent and weighted variables $a,b,c,d$ to $n$, and with all values ranked on a scale of 1 to 5.
The $R^2$ measure represents the strength of the relationship between the predicted value of the analysis and the actual value of the interviews, and in this case is 0.6. That is a high value, and it indicates that we have a powerful explanatory model. When graphed, the distribution shows that there are very few pictures (there are a couple) where the variance is greater than the five-levels question we asked. Almost every picture lands within its level of prediction, but not necessarily precisely. If we later want to make visual landscape policies in categories of very high, high, middle, low, and very low, the model will be reliable. But if we want to know whether it is the 14th or the 15th most preferred landscape, we cannot predict this.
We then tested for the several personal variables for the interviewees. This step is very important from a political perspective. The inter-correlation among all personal variables is about 0.95. This is the comparison of the regional pictures between men and women: there is no difference. Between residents and tourists: there is no difference. Between old people and young people: there is no difference. People agree. That is an extremely important finding. There is an extremely high agreement among regions and among personal variables which basically gives Arancha a very powerful argument— we only need one visual policy for any landscape. It has to accommodate diversity, but we do not have different groups of people looking at the same landscape in fundamentally different ways. (That would present a very difficult situation).

The Valencia landscape department has a very skilled GIS team which made maps of the eleven most significant hypothesized variables from the regression analysis. Most of these spatial analyses and interpretations are based on land use/land cover and terrain data.
These hypothesis maps were then weighted according to the regression analysis, and the final map of visual preference was made. What this map implies is that if I parachuted any one of you blindfolded to anywhere in this map—regardless if you were Valencian or a tourist—and I took off the blindfold and I asked you, on a 1 to 5 scale, do you like the scene or do you not?, that I could predict it and I am willing to put money on it. So this is a map not of what the landscape is, but rather of what you see from where you are in the landscape. It takes into account distant views and terrain, and as seen from every 10m by 10m pixel of data in this database. The regional visual preference map shown above shows preferences as seen from all places, most of which are not accessible.

Recall the original question posed by Francisco Camps, President of the Autonomous Community of Valencia—“is Valencia ugly”?
If you are living and traveling in Valencia, you can see the view sheds from the main roads, railroads and urban areas. However, most people most of the time do not look at the view shed. They look at the foreground. So this version of the map limits visual preference to the foreground of the railroads, the major roads and the urban areas of over 25,000 people in the area. That is closer to what you really do see. In each pair of the graph, by color, on the left side is the percentage of that visual value in the entire region. On the right side, is what people can see on the roads and near the settlements of over 25,000. Least preferred views proportionally quadruple.
But most of the time you are close to home. And if you weight this analysis by where people are most of the time, this map shows is what you are likely to see. Most people live most of the time in places which do not have preferred views. People are exposed to about 10 times more of views that they do not like than is relative to the entire area. And they cannot see from half of the areas that they would really like to see from. In other words, relative to where people really are, the Community of Valencia IS perceived as being disproportionately ugly.
The images show some examples of landscapes in different levels of visual preference and protection. Some of the areas that are protected and of highest visual preference are these. The Albufera is protected and of high value. The beach is protected but it is only of high visual value if you look towards the sea. The same is true of the barrier dunes. These have huge buildings right behind your view.

Valencia, following the directives and guidelines of the European Union, the Council of Europe’s European Landscape Convention, Spanish Law and its own Valencian Law, has done a considerable amount of protection. The principal areas that are currently classified as “protected” (and one can argue about what that really means) are mainly ecological and most are the result of the EU’s Natura 2000 Program. There is no protection whatsoever, except indirectly, for overtly visual reasons. On this map of currently protected areas, light green-gray tones are the protected areas. And this map shows the generally high visual values of the areas that are protected, but they are protected mainly for biological reasons and not for visual reasons. The incidental and indirect visual benefits of the biological protection is high.
However, these are many of the highest visually valued landscapes that are not protected. And they represent about half of the landscape views that the people of Valencia and the tourists value the most. They are easily accessible. Most are what are considered “cultural landscapes”. One of the interesting things is that they are frequently located in valleys, and represent links among more mountainous ecologically significant patches that have been protected but not connected. And they are part of the armature of a connection strategy, but not based on ecology, but rather on public visual preferences. This connective strategy needs legal implementation and strong landscape management.
There are two fundamental strategies for implementation. One is to improve the worst areas and the other is to protect the best. There are many very important locations from which there are very highly preferred views but which have no protection. There are only about 8 short lengths of major highway in the Region of Valencia from which you can still see the sea. And the sea views from the main highways are probably the number one priority to protect. If you lose these –and Valencia will lose them without fast and direct action, the public image of Valencia as a region on the sea will be lost.

Get rid of the billboards. And do not let new ones be built. Increase the planning and management of highly valued scenes that are listed as protected, but with weak, partial or even no effective planning and implementation. Concentrate on linking these via active planning and management of all riverine areas and the heavily populated coastal zone.

And this is a daunting challenge. There is a window of opportunity but it is a short one.
As I have shown, Valencia has protected many landscapes, but not the ones which are the most frequently seen and used, and which are also under the greatest development pressure. This will result in an almost 350 kilometer-long urban sprawl if development continues for the next 20 plus years, and this pattern of change will continue all along the coastal plain of Spain in neighboring Comunidades. The result will be bad for residents and their sense of pride in their region, for tourists and their impressions of Spain and their impacts on the regional economy, and for future investors. It is imperative that the regional landscape, its history and its visual perception be paramount considerations in regional, municipal and private plans. The Comunidad of Valencia needs to rapidly implement policies to defend its most valued landscapes, landscapes which are essential elements of its patrimony and identity.

The Landscape Convention of the Council of Europe provides a fine basis for action, and I believe that a work plan such as the one being developed for the Autonomous region of Valencia can and should be rapidly implemented years. It can be a Green Infrastructure model for other regions and metropolitan areas worldwide.

I thank the following persons who participated in the Valencia visual study:

Arancha Muñoz Criado
Juan José Galán Vivas
Teresa Canfield
Juan Carlos Vargas

Students and Faculty of the Polytechnical University of Valencia

Students and Faculty of the University of Valencia
Prologue

3000 years ago, on the Aegean Coast, Ionian colonists founded a series of city-states such as Ephesus and Milet. Employing principles of Greek state administration and practicality, Hippodamus devised an ideal city and polis to be laid out on a grid (Gorman, 2001). In his home town of Milet we can find the prototype of the Hippodamian plan, a standard that has appealed to many democratically minded planners.

1500 years ago, a former bay of the East China Sea was cut off from the ocean and became what is known today as the West Lake of Hangzhou (about 150 km southwest of Shanghai). The relationship between the West Lake and the city of Hangzhou was described by the Song Dynasty (960–1276) poet and governor, Su Shi (1037–1101), as the “eyes and brows of the face”. This appreciation of connectedness is based on principles of the Feng-Shui (Wind and Water) theory (Yunbo Yang, 2009).

In both cases the conceptual planning and the design are founded on widely accepted principles and ideals. These are rooted in ancient beliefs and people’s collective memory. Hence, planning and design - are part of the ideals of society, - take a leading role in changing environment and scenery, and - respond to the needs of society and their leaders, producing efficient and well organised landscapes.

Should, or could, the same be said about modern landscape planning?

1. Statutory “landscape plans” established

In Europe, every country has its specific system of territorial planning, including official “landscape planning”. Therefore, any review of “Dilemmas of Landscape Planning” must, on the one hand, consider official plan-making and, separately but closely linked to it, the development of landscape planning approaches. On the other hand, the review must be region-specific. The following presents mainly German perspectives. In this country, official “landscape plans” are prepared within a legal system that provides the framework for landscape planning. Landscape planning is the domain of landscape architecture, but, as we shall see, during certain periods of German landscape planning, it developed separately from landscape design.

If someone were to interview “hard core” German landscape planners and ask them what they considered to be “dilemmas” in their field, the responses would most likely include three points:

1. Statutory landscape planning is required, by law, to contribute to comprehensive planning and, at the same time, to be the main sectoral planning instrument for nature conservation.
2. Statutory landscape plans make proposals for landscape management, while relying on others to implement strategies and measures. Landscape planning itself is not in a position to have the funds or the power to make things happen.
3. Landscape planning is, at least according to the opinion of landscape planners, the only existing form of “integrated environmental planning”; it includes all
relevant environmental factors and should, by virtue of “understanding” the complexities of ecosystems at the landscape scale, take the lead in what is generally known as “environmental planning” – but, alas, it doesn’t.

Official landscape plans were introduced during the 1960s and ‘70s. With the Federal Building Act of 1960 (Bundesbaugesetz) and the Planning Act of 1965 (Bundesraumordnungsgesetz), it became obligatory that all decision-making affecting the environment must consider nature and landscape. In practice, consultants are asked to provide relevant information, usually in the form of landscape assessments and planning recommendations. The first versions of official landscape planning were thus part of comprehensive or sectoral planning (Runge, 1998).

With the Nature Protection Act of 1976 (Bundes-Naturschutzgesetz), statutory landscape plans became established in their own right. From this time on, consultants found themselves performing two fundamentally different and sometimes even opposing tasks; first, to engage in landscape planning as a new official sectoral planning instrument for nature conservation, and second, to continue and fill the role of landscape planning as servicing the needs of comprehensive and sectoral planning. To complicate matters, state agencies had to define the goals for nature conservation, for example in regional landscape plans, and it was up to municipalities to specify and implement pertinent measures, usually in local landscape plans, and usually without a budget provided for this task (Marschall, 2007).

As environmental issues began to rise on the political agenda during the 1970s, a growing bureaucratic apparatus developed that was held responsible for implementing and enforcing state policies. While municipalities emphasised their traditional decision-making autonomy, it was left to planners to find a balance between the two. Administrative positions created for landscape planning and management were filled, not only with landscape architects, but also with people from forestry, geography, ecology and especially biology. I remember well the kind comments that were made by such people, particularly during the 1980s and ‘90s, on landscape planning documents that freelance landscape architecture firms provided. Of all the chapters dealing with water, soils, climate, flora, fauna, landscape scenery and heritage, one got all the attention: the protection and management of habitat for indigenous species. Municipalities became weary of having to pay for what they viewed as “nature-protection-studies”. Stakeholders started to reject planning proposals that were formulated in a rather abstract manner. Soon, landscape planning was perceived as a bureaucratic instrument itself and almost became a stereotype for nature conservation at large. As administrative conservation gradually lost popularity, so did landscape planning.

2. Methods and tools developed

The term landscape planning (Landschaftsplanung) was introduced in Germany during the 1950s, after a considerable history of forerunners with different names but similar intentions (Körner, 1995). Pertinent publications began to appear as early as the 1940s and planning research started to produce noticeable results during the late 1960s (Körner, 2001). Most post-WWII scientific treatises have one thing in common: they are written with reference to drastic environmental changes of the ‘50s and ‘60s, and they are set in a firm belief that land use decisions should be guided by sound environmental and landscape planning principles. The placement of new infrastructure, urban development and the management of land should be encouraged in areas best suited for it and discouraged elsewhere. What planning needed, therefore, was a basis for making suitability judgments. Responding to this call, individuals in universities, government administrations and landscape architecture offices collaborated to develop and apply approaches that would enable planning to keep abreast with economic growth.

A first set of methods and tools appeared during the ‘60s and ‘70s, before the passing
of the Nature Protection Act (Marschall, 2007). They include approaches for comprehensive analysis of environmental impacts of proposed plans and projects (Wirkungsanalyse). For example, a matrix was developed that includes a great number of possible cause-and-effect relationships. After a few trial applications this tool was dismissed as being too rigid (the tool had a useful valuation system that was also dismissed). A second set of methods and tools appeared during the 70s and 80s, after the passing of the Nature Protection Act. These approaches include adaptations of the first set, making the assessment procedure more flexible. A tool was introduced to define environmental “sensitivity” and landscape “values” at regional or local scales. In order to make judgements of the severity of environmental impacts, an open matrix was used where environmental effects of proposed development intersect with ranked environmental sensitivity and landscape values. This approach was designed to make predictions of impacts; like most predictions they include a certain amount of uncertainty and the term “risk analysis” was introduced, expressing that forecasted impacts might possibly occur.

The term risk analysis eventually became “ecological risk analysis” (Ökologische Risikoanalyse). In their search for ways to substantiate rankings and value judgements, landscape planners increasingly relied on scientific findings, mainly from geography and ecology, and particularly from landscape ecology. These sciences offered representations of the world that allowed for practical reductions of environmental complexity. What planners are finding useful, for example, are “natural landscape units” (Naturräumliche Einheiten), which provide a reference system for landscape and impact assessment. To be able to make reliable value judgments, experts developed standards and so called “environmental quality goals” (Kiemstedt, 1989).

With the passing of the Nature Protection Act a formal procedure for quantifying compensation for impacts was also introduced (Eingriffsregelung). Like others in the field, I felt the need to contribute to making useful compensation proposals myself. Not design, but science, I thought, had the answers. Since concepts of “nature development” had been introduced as a viable means for mitigating and compensating impacts, I began to study processes of natural succession. Results, I was sure, would help to better predict the success of nature development measures (Bruns, 1995).

One of the advisors of my doctoral dissertation (1983–1986) was Horst Rittel, professor of planning theory at the universities of Stuttgart and Berkeley. Ten years earlier, during the 1970s, Rittel presented his famous critique on rational planning. He said, in colloquial terms, that spatial and territorial planning is not like solving benign (“tame”) problems; in fact planning is more like tackling malignant (“wicked”) problems. For example, a tame problem would be playing chess: the task, the rules of solving the assignment, and the ultimate aim are clearly defined. This is not the case with landscape planning problems. The properties of wicked problems include: (i) every problem is a singular case; (i) there is no clear or ultimate definition, and describing a problem remains preliminary; (iii) and there is no immediate and/or final evaluation of the proposed solutions (Rittel, 1972; Rittel & Webber, 1973).

By accepting Rittel’s critique, planning at large gained in theoretical substance. Adopted were, among others, the concepts of communicative planning, of planning with limited knowledge and uncertainty (Antrop, 2004). Attempting to stay aligned with both developments in mainstream planning, and also with procedures introduced by environmental administrations, landscape planning experts in Germany did two things:

---

1 In the English version of his publications Rittel uses the terms “tame problems” and “wicked problems”; in German versions he uses “Gutartig” and “Bösartig”, which, at least in the context of medicine, translate into “benign” and “malignant”. 
first, respond to pressure from administrations to help them make planning procedures fast and efficient; and, second, work on improving the general image of landscape planning and raise the acceptance of planning proposals.

The dilemma is that one contradicts the other. For example, to simplify applications of the impact-compensation procedure, some state administrations issued point systems. Points would represent “eco-values” and these were defined for landscape element types, not for individual elements. A parallel currency developed which could be traded, first only within the natural landscape units, later on also within larger landscape regions. This was an attempt to make a wicked problem tame; however, it more than confirmed the image of nature conservation as a technocratic apparatus. On the other hand, procedures for participatory planning were introduced. These were meant to improve, first, the image of landscape planning, and second, the likelihood that stakeholders such as farmers would agree to proposed nature development measures. The aim was to raise acceptance, not to discuss rigid administrative procedures and expert value judgments (Luz, 2000).

Again, landscape planning missed a chance: instead of fundamentally questioning the validity of standard approaches, new attempts were made to cure symptoms (the loss of image and acceptance). This is the dilemma of a field where theoretical development depends, at least partly, on applications and tests of methods in practice.

A new chance for landscape planning to finally take the “argumentative turn” (the term used to mark the paradigm shift in territorial planning during the 1980s and ’90s; Fischer & Forester, 1993) is currently presenting itself: a strong general trend towards “good governance”. This trend is supported by the implementation of the European Landscape Convention and of the Aarhus Convention. These new chances also present new dilemmas. I will discuss these next (before closing with an epilogue).

3. Answering to new challenges (European Landscape Convention)

According to the European Landscape Convention (Florence Convention), landscape is “an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of action and interaction of natural and/or human factors”. What does this mean? Does this mean we should consider elements of cultural landscape in addition to natural elements? Should we inventory not only the physical world but maybe also map the mental landscapes people construct in their minds? I think that such interpretations are interesting, but they fall short of the Convention’s intentions. “As-perceived-by-people” implies that the perception (and view) of all members of the civil society “in the broad sense” matters (Prieur & Durousseau 2006: 165), not only the views of an academic elite. Landscape management and planning are hence to be concerned with the characteristics of the landscape that the involved population wish to give recognition to in their surroundings (Jones, 2007: 615).

Where the ELC calls on signatory states to establish procedures for participation, the objective is to draw into every stage of landscape management and planning the views of all concerned groups of stakeholders. This includes the identification of landscapes, the analysis of “their characteristics and the forces and pressures transforming them”; it also includes defining landscape-quality objectives, landscape assessment, and, finally, the decision making process, “taking into account the particular values assigned to them (landscapes) by the interested parties and the population concerned” (ELC).

The dilemma is that the more stakeholders get involved, the more planners, administrations and politicians feel they are losing not only time, but also their grip on planning and decision-making all together. Authorities “need people’s agreement and support, but they fear that this wider involvement is less controllable, less precise and thus likely to slow down planning processes” (Pretty, 1995, p. 1252). Even the
ELC’s own Explanatory Report subscribes to a patriarchal relationship between experts and the public: “Because of the inevitably subjective and varying public perceptions of landscape, the Explanatory Report recommends ‘performing the evaluation according to objective criteria first’ (as if any criteria can be objective), and then comparing the findings with the various assessments of the landscape by people concerned and other interest groups. The emphasis is on interested parties having the right to express their opinion at a public inquiry. Further, public participation is to be ‘fostered by providing the public with information, consulting all representative bodies, using the media and conducting awareness-raising campaigns at all levels.’ Even though public participation is referred to, the procedure described is very top-down” (Jones, 2007, pp. 619–620).

The opportunities provided by the ELC are not yet fully appreciated. In Germany, at this time, reactions to the apparent need for change include the following:

1. maintaining (or defending) existing planning and decision-making models;
2. ignoring that new models are needed, or may be useful;
3. assuming that new models of planning are impossible to devise.

In my view, with all three of these attitudes we are closing the doors to appreciating landscape values “as perceived by people”. If we ask ourselves why some of our planning prognoses are substantially weak, we might find the answer with reference to this attitude: scenarios are weak as long they do not include information on what people perceive to be the future.

At the same time, and considering the global phenomenon of an increasingly mobile and flexible society, we have to ask ourselves if the visions and values we once relied on will continue to exist. What are the perceived landscape values of peri-urban-type landscapes where more than thirty nationalities live in one city district, while 10 percent of the population is exchanged per annum, and entire regions are drained of people while others are growing rapidly? Are we losing the collective memory and the societal consensus that we seemed to be able to trust? How can we learn what the next generation thinks about, for example, the idea of well-being, about health, local and regional identity; and what are their future aesthetic preferences?

Once, planners truly believed that, if they only provided a scientifically sound basis, a well organised form of urban and rural development would follow. This approach may have worked well during an era when, as was the case during the “Golden Optimism” of the ’50s and the “Soaring 60s”, development was happening at a great speed and magnitude. Planners were expected to be able to wave their magic wands and, abracadabra, the plan is pulled out of the hat and all problems are solved. Was this not also the case in Hippodamian Milet and Su Shi’s Hangzhou?

**Epilogue**

The city of Milet was originally founded on the shores of the Latmian Gulf, a former bay of the Aegean Sea. Today, about 3000 years later, her visible ruins are found several kilometres away from the coast. Hangzhou was originally founded (as Qian tang) about 2200 years ago, on the shores of a former bay of the East China Sea. This bay was cut off from the sea by the growing delta of the Qian Tang River approximately at the same time the Great Meander River rendered the harbours of Milet useless (Crouch, 2004).

What do both of these examples have in common? The two bodies of water are subject to siltation from rivers that are fed from mountainous hinterlands; in both cases, increasing sediment loads are the result of exploitive landscape management. One important difference between the two examples is that, while the Meander Delta continued to fill in the former Latmian Gulf (Müllenhoff, 2005), the West Lake still exists today. Starting with the period of Su Shi as governor (1089–1091), generation after generation the people of Hangzhou dug out tons of sediment in order to keep both “eyes and brows” of the “face” open, i.e. the landscape of their home city (The famous Ten Scenes that were first defined during the
Southern Song Dynasty, 1127–1276, added to the value of West Lake as a nationally treasured cultural landscape) (Yunbo Yang, 2009).

Hippodamian Milet and Su Shi’s Hangzhou both have world heritage qualities. They are famous examples for planning and design. And yet, they may also serve as examples where planning led people to make landscapes that did not meet sustainability criteria.

Would modern landscape planning have been able to prevent this?

Of course, we are unable to answer the question. Here we have a final dilemma. Every landscape is unique, every planning process is unique. In landscape planning we have no chance to do what researchers call a “controlled study”. No process can be repeated, and we cannot run two trials in parallel to learn which of two approaches works best (there also is no ‘placebo’ landscape).

What we can do is collect case studies and learn from analysing processes; here, Milet and Hangzhou may serve as examples (Fig. 1 and Fig. 2). What we should want to know is what EFFECT planning has in the long run. Did we change policy? Did we change how people think about landscape? Do they care more about their landscape than before we worked with them? Did we attain a higher degree of sustainability? Should we not want to know all these things?
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Figure 1
Process of sediment accumulation and growth of the Great Meander River Delta (after Müllenhoff 2005, simplified)

Figure 2
Size of water area of the West Lake of Hangzhou (upper sequence) and changes from one dynasty to the next (lower sequence: blue = area reduction, olive = area expansion) (Fig. 108 in Yunbo Yang, 2009)
INTRODUCTION

Standardisation here is defined as an approach based on ready-made solutions that can be applied when preparing decisions on future spatial organisation and/or future land use. Ready-made solutions, i.e. solutions prepared in advance, do not arise as a result of the analysis of a given spatial situation for which a decision is to be made. By this definition of standardisation, the distinction between two forms of decision-making processes is pointed out, namely the distinction between standardisation and coordination on the one hand, and prediction/optimisation on the other. A similar distinction has been made by H. Simon (1996:42) in discussing the ways in which managers make decisions. Standardisation otherwise may have different meanings. These include a full range of such aspects as technical solutions and specifications, unifying ideas, criteria, methods, processes and practices. For our discussion, it is very important that the term standard be applied to ideas, assumptions and views of the future, which can be characterised as broader, more universally applicable solutions of spatial development/conservation problems. With standardisation in connection to the institutional approach, as it is called by planning theorists (Salet and A. Faludi 2000), we can obtain a picture of spatial planning practice that is becoming the prevailing form of spatial planning in Slovenia. This type of spatial planning has important implications for the further development of landscape planning.

PREDICTION/OPTIMISATION

In dealing with the future, we may use, as has already been said, a generally accepted or agreed-upon solution – a standard. A standard can never be an optimal solution for a specific problem, as it is predefined; it represents a more generally acceptable solution which should fit into potentially different situations. With conservation activities, a standard generally appears as a still-acceptable limit of environmental change. This limit may be spatially defined, e.g. as the boundary between areas where environmental change is permitted and areas where it is not. Different protected areas, such as nature conservation reserves, parks, conservation networks like Natura 2000, protected agricultural areas, water bodies, etc. function as conservation standards. They are, in fact, predefined, ready-made solutions for land use. They also have all the typical characteristics of conservation standards:

a) they represent the lowest level of an environmental conservation effort;
b) they are compulsory elements which planners have to include in planning solutions;
c) their definition and implementation require specialist knowledge;
d) the responsibility for their implementation resides in individual sectors which represent specific societal interests, e.g. nature conservation, forestry, agriculture, etc. They
are institutionalised normative principles, as planning theoreticians would express their role in societal preferences.

**a. Standards as the lowest level of an environmental conservation effort**

Conservation standards are by definition the minimum of conservation aspirations that are still acceptable in a given socio-economic context, i.e. they prohibit environmental change only within predefined boundaries. Although the reasons why standards are becoming more demanding over time may be different, for example a new interpretation of the importance of environmental change or the impact on public health that was previously unknown, the fundamental reason, however, is that standards represent the lowest level of conservation aspirations. This fact is particularly visible in the Nature Conservancy. The maximum level of protection effort would have meant a complete withdrawal of humans and the impact of human activity from the environment, which, of course, is neither a feasible nor reasonable aspiration. Therefore, the actual requirement for environmental conservation is indeed the smallest possible demand in a given social and economic situation. Conservation standards should, therefore, change over time. The fact that conservation standards are becoming more demanding with the passing of time can be very clearly demonstrated in the spatial growth of Slovenian protected areas. Table 1 shows the increasing extension of protected areas because of their importance for nature conservancy in Slovenia from 1924 to 2005.

The expansion of protected areas in this case means an increase in the rigorousness of the standard of nature conservancy.

**b. Environmental standards as compulsory elements which planners have to take into account**

Conservation standards, by definition, represent predefined limitations in disposing of the environment and space. Therefore, the enforcement implied in a standard has to be built into the planning solution of the planned area no matter what an actual analysis might disclose. In Slovenia, for example, the Act on Regional Spatial Planning of 1967 provided that all protected areas had to be identified and the need for their protection evaluated within the planning process, i.e. during the preparation phase of regional spatial plan (Act, 1967, Art. 6). In this case, the definition of protected areas was actually part of the land use planning process, and the spatial extension of protected areas could be verified by weighting various possible options. According to the two distinct ways of preparing a decision which were initially presented, such a method for identifying protected areas may easily be defined as a prediction/optimisation approach to making decisions. In the 1980s, the importance of protection of agricultural land in Slovenia gave rise to a concept of planning that turned the previous way of thinking on its head. The classification of agricultural productive land according to its fertility was introduced. Classification of agricultural land resulted in the definition of areas in which only the agricultural use of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Surface area (in ha)</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of reserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>Alpine Protection Reserve</td>
<td>Natural reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Triglav National Park</td>
<td>National park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>83,807</td>
<td>Triglav National Park</td>
<td>National park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>84,805</td>
<td>Triglav National Park</td>
<td>National park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>91,490</td>
<td>All areas of nature conservancy</td>
<td>Parks, reserves, sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>236,841</td>
<td>All parks</td>
<td>Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>635,944 (31.4% of SI)</td>
<td>Sites of Community Importance</td>
<td>Areas and sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
land was allowed. This agricultural land use determination has to be conducted well before the preparation of a comprehensive spatial plan. By this, agricultural land reserves, i.e. conservation standards for agricultural land, were established. Areas of land classified for agricultural use have become a mandatory point of departure for long-term spatial planning. This method of protection of sectorial interests has become an important general rule in spatial planning in Slovenia. It particularly influences landscape planning, due to the fact that, in landscape planning, land use for many sectors such as nature conservation, forestry, water management and agriculture has to be defined.

c. Disciplinary definition and implementation of standards

Standards are defined as facts about space, for example a habitat type or land with soil characteristics that indicate soil fertility. Such conservation standards act as a reference to which an actual situation in the environment is compared. Their identification and subsequent control of their implementation seem quite specific and particularly a disciplinary problem. Take the case of the determination and enforcement of the EU Birds Directive. Annex I to this Directive (1979) specifies the wild birds that are protected, and thus it is obvious that the interpretation of Annex I requires specific ornithological knowledge. However, a similar situation characterised other areas as well. Which agricultural land should be protected is determined by the specific soil properties, which can only be identified by experts trained in the field of soil science.

d. Sector enforcement of standards

Standards are represented as facts, but they only seem to be facts – they express values. The value component of standards is implied in their role as a threshold for acceptable environmental change. In fact, standards are institutionalised normative principles of different societal institutions. The system of protection of agricultural land reflects the value system of the agricultural sector.

When institutionalised, it seems to reflect the overall societal recognition that limited agricultural land resources are of crucial importance for the production of food. A similar transformation of values can be seen in all fields of specific societal normative principles, e.g. nature conservancy, water protection, forestry, etc. A standard, which is expressed as a list of names of biological species, can be created by a qualified biologist, but the fact is that such a standard also reflects attitudes towards nature, the value definition of nature, which cannot be established only by a biologist. The value definition is a matter that is up to the whole society.

Standardisation as a tool of the institutional approach to planning

The institutional approach to planning results from the normative pattern of the society, the pattern of social rules that form the framework within which the planning problem is to be interpreted. It is obvious that the planning problem itself may affect the reconstruction of the normative framework, but this regulatory framework defines the role and responsibilities of various actors in the planning process. Among various forms of institutional approach, there is an interesting one for us, namely the one characterised by efforts to transform its normative principles into the realm of intrinsic values through their “institutionalisation”, as in the transformation described above in the case of protection of agricultural land. In so doing, institutions are defined as instruments to be used by planning subjects in order to ensure the implementation of certain principles (Salet W., Faludu A., 2000: 8). These principles are then expressed as conservation standards, or, as has already been shown, as control over the land by a declaration of spatial reserve. As the different normative pattern is institutionalised and turned into conservation standards, the standards become a tool for the direct exercise of individual normative principles around which social institutions are established. Spatial planning thus takes on the character of coordination between sectors. In such coordination, sectors fight for their own normative principles.
Normative principles without the character of social institutions are eliminated from the coordination and therefore cannot influence the planning outcome.

**Other approaches to spatial planning**

The classification of spatial planning approaches done by W. Salet and A. Faludi (2000) also highlights the problems landscape planning confronts in its role in overall planning efforts.

a) A communicative or discursive approach to spatial planning results from the characteristics of the (strategic) plans to present societal aspirations in symbolic language and to set a reference for future opportunities and necessary actions for the future. The approach has a long tradition in the use of cartographic representations, planning concepts and metaphors, according to Salet and Faludi (2000:8). With certain simplification we could say that the communicative approach is what traditionally was meant as preparing land use plans or plans of the spatial organisation of future activities within an area. Evaluation of such plans in respect of their environmental acceptability, i.e. strategic environmental assessment, is merely a procedural version of this approach leading to the same goal, which is the idea of creating a viable future presented in symbolic language. In cartographic language, we try to incorporate a variety of social aspirations and value systems which relate to the future.

b) An interactive approach became widely adopted in practice in the 1980s and 1990s, according to Salet and Faludi (2000:8). This interactive approach was a reaction to the inadequacy of more traditional approaches in which government organisations acted as the main coordinator of the planning process. The one-sidedness of such planning raised many questions about the legitimacy and effectiveness of planning, and therefore the interaction of planning entities in the planning process was adopted as a new starting point. Interactive approaches rely heavily on sociology and the organisational and management sciences. There are many different interpretations in respect of the organisation of such interaction. A technocratic approach, for example, arises from the interdependence of various governmental bodies, such as the interdependence of planning and infrastructure policies. Sociocratic interaction models focus on the self-regulatory ability of social actors. These models of cooperation and coordination are stimulated by the trend towards the liberalisation of government policy and social openness on the one hand and the expansion of civil initiatives on the other. Many interactive approaches consider the country’s authorities and citizens as equal partners in the planning process (Salet and Faludi, 2000:8).

**Consequences of standardisation and the institutional approach to landscape planning**

The main characteristics of standards – that they appear to be facts and that they act as a tool to promote individual social institutions in control over space – are a particular challenge for landscape planning. Landscape planning is interdisciplinary and comprehensive by nature. It is a synthetic activity which includes a broad range of knowledge on the physical and social environment. By creative efforts, it tries to connect various normative principles into a common solution to problems of spatial development. As such, landscape planning may be a good representation of the communicative or discursive approach.

Since the 1960s, landscape planners have been in the forefront of developing explicit planning procedures, primarily aimed at the interpretation of various social discourses and at facilitating social communication. They developed a complex symbolic language that allows the mapping of various value systems, particularly environmental conservation value systems. Shortly thereafter, computer cartography allowed enough flexibility to make the mapping of different societal normative principles easy, thus allowing more dynamic social communication and in particular
more detailed and complex content of such communication. With more articulated content it was possible to transform complex societal expectations into visions of the future more accurately. Computer cartography opened the possibility of creating cartographic representations of alternative routes to future action. By this, the technology for interactive communication in the planning process was established. In these procedures, standards can play the role of thresholds, expressed as different normative principles enabling the definition of a range of possible landscape quality calibrations.

The institutionalisation of normative principles and their transformation into a tool to directly impose the objectives of individual institutions as a common value is fundamentally alien to landscape planning. It appears, however, that the institutional approach to spatial planning is becoming dominant. Landscape planning is losing the role which seemed to be very promising in the 1960s.

In Slovenia, the interactive approach to spatial planning began in the 1970s, starting with the direct protection of agricultural land. It soon became increasingly asserted in other areas, such as the Nature Conservancy, protection of cultural heritage, water management, etc. Even European conservation planning seems to be dominated by an institutional approach. This is particularly obvious in the European Natura 2000 network (“Bird Directive”, 1981; “Habitat Directive”, 1992), which is, as part of the debate on conservation and landscape planning, of particular interest. Here the normative principles of a societal institution – the conservation of nature – are reframed in the general interests of society. With their institutionalisation they are transformed into conservation standards, i.e. transformed into the instruments which “planning actors use to ensure the implementation of certain principles” (W. Salel, A. Faludi, 2000:8).

It appears that the interactive approach reflects the spirit of our times. This can be concluded on the basis of the current emphasis on the importance of social participation. Reality seems radically different, however – at least the reality that can be identified in Slovenia. An example of the enforcement of the endangered species “standards” in the United States shows that the problem of “enforcement of standards” is much broader. The Endangered Species Act, soon after it was adopted, created many conflicting situations at local level. The Act was then amended by make endangered species protection more interactive. This meant the inclusion of all stakeholders in the preparation of specific plans in order to protect habitat – Habitat Conservation Plans (HPC). This involvement of stakeholders in the process of preparing plans has been discussed in the political science literature as an example of deliberative democracy implemented in a real-world situation (A. Fung and E. Wright, 1999). Interestingly, these procedures were enforced by a Democratic administration, but later they were eliminated by the Republican administration. Of course, we must ask ourselves why it was so. It is obvious that standardisation and an institutional approach to planning seem to be more appropriate to conservative political actors. Standardisation enables implementation of normative principles, regardless of how much environmental protection is guaranteed. This means that standardisation in and of itself does not guarantee more consistent protection. On the contrary, standardisation functions as a lever to impose normative principles that would be accepted with difficulty by the broader social body. Even in the implementation of the European Natura 2000 did the belief probably prevail that centralised definition and control of institutionalised standards would better ensure the protection of endangered species and habitats.

**Impact of standardisation and the institutional approach to the education of landscape planners**

Standardisation, as we have shown, requires specific expertise and specific disciplinary knowledge. In the field of landscape and nature protection, this means knowledge of ecology, landscape ecology and other
natural science disciplines. But for proper prediction in decision-making on land use in particular, methodological knowledge is of crucial importance. This, of course, requires reconsideration of the curricula in schools of landscape architecture. If, in planning practice, standardisation and an institutionalised approach prevail, the education of landscape architects must inevitably place greater emphasis on basic natural science knowledge, or even abolishing landscape planning or replacing it with landscape ecology. If, however, spatial and landscape planning practice is oriented more towards the application of an interactive approach, then the education of landscape planners should place greater emphasis on learning optimisation procedures and organisational and communication skills.
The art of transformation is the title of this presentation. I might as well have called it the art of cultivation with the subtitle as an approach to sustainable transformation of the urban landscape. Cultivare means to cultivate. Cultivation implies that you have something beforehand and end up with something different and better than before. To cultivate is not the same as to consume. When you consume, only waste is left.

What we call nature very often is culture – man-made historical phenomena. It was a long time ago that we have realised that heath, commons and forests are the results of a specific kind of cultivation. This kind of refined cultivation is traditionally called garden art if it is old and landscape architecture if it is not that old.

According to Martin Heidegger, “building” and “build” do not only mean aedificare, but also cultura, i.e. to look after crops. Man also builds the fields and the vineyards. Landscape architecture is aedificare – the art of building understood as the creation of spaces. But it is something different and more. Analogous to the art of building and Heidegger’s division, I call this the art of cultivation in order to underline the aspect of cultivating, the formation process, development and designation.

If landscape architecture is understood as the art of cultivation, as a refined form of landscape treatment, two aspects can be distinguished: a regulatory one that has to do with physics and biology, and that concerns gravity, weather conditions, means of production and processes; and an artistic, socially communicative one that is about association and knowledge, imagination and explanation, essence and construction. Both aspects concern the relationship between man and nature. As the art of building, aedificare, landscape architecture creates space and structure, shelter and cover; as the art of cultivation, cultura, it has an existential meaning, as a witness to our living on an Earth that can be cultivated.

When we have to find a sustainable, significant and comprehensive language for
transformation of the urban landscape, there is help to be found in the art of cultivation. It has an inbuilt respect for creation, beginning and renewal. The art of cultivation knows change, transformation and movement. It communicates origins, surroundings, time and place. It expresses the meeting between man and nature. It is culture understood as the result of cultivation. In one language it can signify initiative, growth, development and action, and in another, balance, maturity and existence.

Dilemmas in Modern Landscape Architecture is the title of the conference, and the questions asked are: “Is landscape architecture meeting the requirements of modern society and have we forgotten about the true character of landscape architecture to provide a service to other disciplines?” My answer lies in the title. It is my statement that the true character of landscape architecture is to be found in the art of transforming, in what I call the art of cultivation.

A dilemma is the Greek term for two options that exclude one another. We have to choose or at least attach importance to one of the options. I have focused on the following dilemma for the discussion: “Society wants diversity and sustainable development and yet we see transformations which result in the opposite, uniformity, to a considerable extent.”

Many people have pointed this out before me. Robert Smithson and Rem Koolhaas ascribe it to entropy, which aims at levelling and uniformity, Jean Nouvel wants us to fight back. In his Louisiana Manifesto he writes that today’s architecture is destroying places and making them banal. We should fight against the kind of urbanism which blurs the identity of cities on all continents, regardless of the climate. We should reject blind rules and replace them with a practice based on a structured analysis of a living place and then establish rules which are sensitive and poetic, rules that talk about colour and character, about specific situations tied to climate.

At present, Danish society is surrounded by bans and violent confrontations, wars abroad and at home. Metaphorically, the same confrontation takes place in the urban landscape. Gardens, landscapes and open spaces fall into disrepair, and buildings and grounds are pulled down without any feeling for historical context and significance. New constructions are built on the pretext of the needs of urban life, entertainment, movement and health. Instead of a violent confrontation, we need a “carnation revolution”, like when the Portuguese people bloodlessly brought down a dictatorship in 1974 by putting red carnations in the soldiers gun barrels.

Most of today’s transformation projects are the result of the fact that the industrial society, with its working class culture, is changing, although we try to keep the life that production created in the city. The authentic drama that the industrial town offered is no longer there, when we forget about beggars and homeless people. Nevertheless, public space is still important.

According to the German-American philosopher Hannah Arendt, the existence
of a public space, the ability to step into the world arena and make your own story visible in participation with others, plays an important role for individual self-knowledge. Arendt takes Thomas Jefferson’s concept of “the pursuit of happiness” from the American Declaration of Independence and makes it into the right of the citizen to enter the public space. It is tyranny that bans people from the public arena and locks them into the domestic sphere. Thus the American dream is not simply about cultivating your own private happiness, but is also about cultivating what concerns the wider community.

The American architect William McDonough and the German chemist Michael Braungart have written a manifesto called “cradle to cradle”. As the idea of a no-growth society, as the British economist Tim Jackson pleads for, this lifecycle development-inspired model lies in the continuation of environmental strategies from the 1970s. And yet it is a striking change of paradigm. To minimise the human footprint on the planet, McDonough and Braungart have been replaced by the wish to leave an intelligent imprint. Waste must be transformed into nutrients and reused in an economical and profitable way. The artistry is to have the model used for more than designing products — to help sustainable urban development.

We have admirable transformation projects. I have selected 4 projects: a gravel pit in Barcelona, an iron plant in Duisburg, an industrial district in Bordeaux and a botanical garden from the nineteenth century built on a fortification in Copenhagen.

The natural landscape was not recreated in the Duisburg North landscape park in a green corridor along the re-established Emscher River, but rather ecologically stabilised by allowing cranes, coalmines, gas containers, railway lines and canals to be invaded by exotic plants from the ore. Dirt, smoke and noise from production, which was the basis of modern society and the prosperity of the German working class, have been restored to favour.

We can transform the urban landscape more or less musicologically and narratively, or we can transform it into new landscapes that do not betray the old ones. Nothing has been forgotten and nothing smoothed over at the Iqualada Cemetery in an old industrial area with derelict quarries and gravel pits. Everything is irregular according to an order, apparently created by a force of nature. The material is witness to the passage of time. Steel rusts, trees whiten, concrete crumbles and plants wither. This is a construction as if created by a process of nature around a sequence of movement, an erosion furrow
that cuts through the landscape. Aided by the quarrying, Enric Miralles was able to excavate the landscape faster than by means of natural erosion. He could fill the gash with tree crowns and recreate the original level of the landscape. It is expected that the whole cemetery will disappear into the ground and form a kind of common grave covered by a green gravestone. I find the Iqualada Cemetery one of the best examples of transforming according to a new complex of problems, new use and a new aesthetic with the art of cultivation as an approach.

The other part is a so-called environmental gallery. In fields retained by concrete walls, plants are cultivated in a pastoral landscape in the same way as on the mountains outside the city. Towards the river, the garden terminates in a pool with beds for water-plants. The garden lies in a potential flooded area and the language talks about a flood which has withdrawn and left a puddle and rugged islands of earth and plants. The garden is surrounded by a grass border and a deep ditch, which looks as if it could absorb a huge amount of rainwater, and a wall of piled oak planks. The wall was constructed of fallen trees from a storm in 1999.

In Bordeaux, a former industrial district was transformed into a neighbourhood with modern dwellings and commerce. The plan of the architect Dominique Perrault follows the structure of the cultural landscape. Long, narrow parcels, a bit crooked, are fitted into each other. Rebuilt stations, factory works and small suburban terrace houses bear witness to the time when the district was inhabited by workers. Now the buildings house sports clubs and restaurants. The longest parcel has been transformed into a park created by Catherine Mosbach, who won the competition for Bordeaux’s new botanical garden.

The botanical garden belonging to the University of Copenhagen today looks in broad outline as it did in 1874. It can be classified as a landscape garden in its late period. The mixed style consists of features from the romantic gardens as well as the formal garden. The foundation of this garden was the rational fortification work, which was meant to create a protecting wall around Copenhagen. In spite of landscape gardener Flindts attempt to erase it, you can still see the directions of the fortification underlined by the siting of the Palm House. The moat is transformed into an amoeboid lake between the bastions. Work buildings and greenhouses remind us of industrialisation and the establishment of the natural sciences. Together with the botanical garden, they tell us about the linkage between art and science. A recent competition was about fitting in a new natural history museum in the most respectful way according to the great cultural value of the place: the project that received first prize
verifies that this difficult assignment could be done with respect to the vulnerable and unique character of the garden. It is specific about the way the relationship between building and landscape are integrated in order to obtain mutual enrichment, also about how apparently modest and common buildings on closer inspection have exciting and complex rooms. Furthermore, it is remarkable that the project is able to lift the concept of sustainability to a level where it is not only about resource responsibility and low-energy consumption, but also about a lifecycle idea based on economy of place and means.

From the gate you look directly towards the Palm House and the new entrance building. It has the same lightness, colour, profile and materials like glass and lists, but quite a different modern look.

Arriving from the garden, you encounter a building let into the sloping ground that opens onto a terrace and garden. A rose garden is established on top of the roof. It has twelve small garden pavilions around the overhead lights covered with espaliers. In the evening, they stand like tempting Chinese lights. The understanding of the place appears from its aesthetic language, which describes something light, undemonstrative, banal, common and garden-like. The feeling of stepping into something small and bashful, which opens up and turns out to be a whole world, infuses the entire project.

The Bievre River is the only water supply for the Seine and therefore of a certain importance, but the following story could be told about most of Europe’s rivers. In the Middle Ages, the river was transformed into a channel and its meandering and delta disappeared. It was heavily polluted at first from crafts like the manufacture of cloth, laundry, butchery and tanning, and later by modern industries like paper and chemistry production. In Paris, it was covered in the 19th century and in the suburbs in between the great wars. Two parallel pipes were added: one for local wastewater and one for water from industry and farming. The main pipeline was transformed into a rainwater channel. Now the Bievre was becoming dangerous with its death-bringing floods. In 1984, it was decided to change this situation, and an ambitious plan was accepted that the Bievre should be opened, cleaned and reintegrated into the urban landscape. The idea was to uncover the river in a 15-meter-wide green riverbed within 25 years. This rather utopian solution was given up and thanks to Alexandre Chemetoff another decision was taken. The Bievre’s main course was kept, and where possible, open spaces were added directly connected to the pipeline. By walking along the river, Chemetoff had discovered a landscape with traces from the history of the water engraved in the topography. The strategy was to uncover and wake up the river.

This idea of unravelling can, at small scale, be studied in the garden of Alexandre Chemetoff’s studio on a slope in the Bievre Valley in Gentilly. A building from the late 19th century was located between walls that used to enclose an orchard. When tearing down the old house he discovered walls made by the same limestone as the garden walls. They turned out to come from a former quarry on the site. The wall at the end of the garden was a Roman aqueduct built by Maria Medici that brought water to the Jardin du Luxembourg. What seemed to be a firewall was part of a greater network. After this discovery, the project went from building a house to becoming a way to take up a site. The transformations which had taken place earlier on became the dynamic in the new transformation project.
Chemetoff has made it his strategy to spend less to obtain more; now we cannot “work more to earn more” as Nicolas Sarkozy said in his presidential campaign in 2007. By “more” Chemetoff refers to diversity and in this way is in opposition to the specific understanding of ecology and sustainability, which strives towards purity and wants connected with a lifestyle. This purist ecology has led to urban development which renounces history and refuses to acknowledge the necessary filth and chaos and distances from ambiguity, all of which are fundamentally necessary.

Chemetoff defends an “ecology of memory” because new projects are unthinkable if they are based on a programme formulated independently from the place and the special situation, which has to do with the historical origin and its production. Each phase of the project must be autonomous and the layers of transformations visible. He talks about a kind of sustainability which has nothing to do with whether benches are produced of wood coming from such-and-such an origin or grown in such-and-such a way. It is a simply a way of managing the collective heritage, a relation to what exists and a relation to the means. The model implies that you see the landscape as it is – not as it looks in paintings and schoolbooks. Chemetoff criticises the current way of not focusing on the landscape, as it also is a story about former attempts to introduce other models and languages than those we revere today. He points out the danger of taking away buildings and motorways from the 1960s and 1970s, even though we find them ugly and “old school”. Architectonically uninteresting buildings and constructions can add diversity to a regular composition. Instead he proposes to retain surplus pieces of roads and slip roads and let them enter into new situations. Instead of talking about nostalgia, you can turn the perspective forward and see the possibilities of progress in the transformation process. Tomorrow’s city builds on the legacy of the industrial city and sustainability, and therefore also economises on the use of places.

Chemetoff derives an image of cultivating differences from wine production. Bordeaux is known for its wine, which is produced in many varieties because of the different soil conditions and production techniques. This culture of diversity can be used as a model for city development. As Carl Theodor Sørensen ascribed the origins of garden art to soil and watering techniques, Chemetoff uses the art of cultivation to help the city move to greater sustainability through multiplicity based on conserving places and by using gardens as experimental fields. Gardens and landscapes in this way become not only places for experiences and pleasures, but part of the city’s foundation. Moreover, Chemetoff dissociates himself from the mainstream opinion that landscape architecture and landscape planning are two different disciplines and therefore is close to the opinion of Sven-Ingvar Andersson, who read the city as a garden and the garden as a city. To go from the centimetres of architecture and garden art to the kilometres of city planning for Chemetoff is solely a question of a change of scale.

Chemetoff was educated as a landscape architect at the Ecole Nationale Superieure du Paysage in Versailles. He is now certified as an architect, as required in France to practice, but his approach is still the landscape architect’s. When he builds his buildings, he considers first the views from every floor and the light coming through bathroom windows. He assigns greater importance to the design of an underground parking garage and parking ramp, where you move every day, than to the proportions of the façade, and in this way contributes to an important extension of architecture from being more than the art of building walls to the art of cultivation.
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LANDSCAPE DESIGN AND HAPPINESS

Robert Schäfer

Happiness is a state of mind or feeling characterised by contentment, love, satisfaction, pleasure or joy. Philosophers and religious thinkers often define happiness in terms of living a good life, or flourishing, rather than simply an emotion. Christ the Redeemer, the huge statue on Rio’s Corcovado, stands for the Catholic belief that the ultimate end of human existence consists in felicity. When it comes to design, from suffering, the Eightfold Path leads practitioners to Nirvana, a state of everlasting peace. In the Kingdom of Bhutan, all planning must be checked to see if it will increase the happiness of the population. Gross National Happiness is an attempt to define the quality of life in more holistic and psychological terms than the Gross National Product which we normally use. The term Gross National Happiness was coined in 1972 by the former king, Wangchuk and forms the basis for the kingdom’s five-year planning process. It is a statement at least and it would definitely be interesting to see if and how it works. Let me quote from the coronation address of Bhutan’s new King Khesar on 7 November 2008: “As the king of a Buddhist nation, my duty is not only to ensure you happiness today, but to create the fertile ground from which you may gain the fruits of spiritual pursuit and attain good Karma.”

Many planners are fascinated by birds-eye-views and their plans quite often show a certain aesthetic quality. Unfortunately the user, walking or cycling, will not notice those ideas. A wise decision on the part of Munich’s city parliament transformed the former airport in Riem into three development areas. The Munich Fair was built on one third of the site, housing and business took the second third and a park was planned on the third part. A competition for this 200-hectare site on the periphery brought a striking park concept by the French landscape architecture office Latitude Nord. Long axes and geometric groves as well as a 10-hectare lake for swimming dominate the huge park, whose design is not really accepted by citizens. Who likes to walk on straight axes? But who tells us that a park is made for walking? What are people really asking for?

The German city planner Albert Speer published a “Manifesto for sustainable city
planning”. He asks for “keeping spaces open”. He says: “I do not imagine that we can plan and determine the sense of well-being in a city, but we can provide a framework that admits enough freedom and scope for the individual to take the initiative.”

Another graphic plan: Parc Central de Nou Barris in Barcelona on the city’s periphery forms the nucleus for an organised development with social housing and many cultural and social institutions. The landscape architects called their design a “Cubist landscape” in homage to Pablo Picasso, who once lived in Barcelona and in Catalunya, and invented the Cubist painting style. The park, on a slope with a lot of technical infrastructure underneath, shows different elements, playing with the design idea. This is the second largest park in

Barcelona, heavily used, but due to lack of money badly maintained.

Maintenance is a big issue, not only in Barcelona, whose modern open spaces have been praised for the last decades. But so many of them are ruined now and witness architects’ dreams which are not necessarily users’ dreams. Nevertheless, Catalanian landscape design found its way up north into HafenCity Hamburg, where the landscape stimulates through its shape and material and the richness of unusual forms.

Alain de Botton wrote the best-selling book The Architecture of Happiness. In it, he argues: “...The architects who benefit us
most may be those generous enough to lay aside their claims to genius in order to devote themselves to assembling graceful but predominantly unoriginal boxes.”

Mostly the city is suffering from missing or inappropriate equipment, the Swiss landscape architect Dieter Kienast once said. The problem is the improper relation between buildings and open spaces. If there is no network of everyday use, green is only “stuff”. If you have a fitting environment, our job is easy, Kienast said: “Some trees in the right place, a place to sit in the sun, a bench in the shade, some water, a protected corner, possibilities for play, work, idleness.”

David Witty, dean of the Architecture Faculty at the University of Manitoba, stated recently: “It is design which will solve the cities’ social, ecological and economic problems.” Design in Witty’s sense is environmentally friendly sustainable development, integrated processes with the participation of all planning disciplines.

A masterpiece in this respect is to be found in the heart of the busy and wealthy city of Munich: St. Jakobs-Platz remained as a leftover space after the war. Many competitions failed until the idea came up to rebuild the synagogue with adjoining buildings on this very site. The result is a high-quality urban open space which was accepted instantly by citizens and visitors. Nowadays, St. Jakobs-Platz forms an outstanding city ensemble in Munich.

Architecture is not only the product of architects, but of the people who use it. Form and material alone do not make good architecture. It is the same with landscape architecture. The German sociologist and city planner Wulf Tessin claimed last year in his book Ästhetik des Angenehmen that modern landscape architecture does not appeal to the very citizens for whom the squares and parks have been designed. People neither want to be bored nor annoyed by minimalistic, formal and geometric design, Tessin argues.

Astonishingly there was no big debate about this critique. Most landscape architects might think like the German Till Rehwaldt, who sees design as a matter of taste and asks innovative and inspiring designers to be ahead of the general public and have the courage of their convictions.

Alain de Botton calls for the development of previously ignored materials and forms – the status quo should not be the divine order. The Dutch landscape architecture firm Karres en Brands, for example, are using recycled materials in their projects and are used to delivering a project over a long period of time. They say: “Landscape architecture is top-level sport. Endurance is what you need. It’s not a job – it’s a passion. Nothing
will stop you!” On the other hand they plead for abstinence: “Sometimes designing is very tempting. Sometimes not designing is the answer.”

On the occasion of the Topos Award presentation to the firm in 2004, Bart Brands said: “A good design creates opportunities for various forms of land use without designating specific areas or elements for particular ends. People can discover the meaning of a place in their own way. The design not only determines uses, it’s determined by its users.”

Foto: Karres en Brands
Federation Square, Melbourne, Australia
“People can discover the meaning of a place in their own way. The design not only determines uses, it’s determined by its users as well.”

Good design is not only determined by aesthetic criteria. Sami Rintala, an environmentally sensitive Finnish architect who operates from Norway now defines the work of the architect as follows: “One task of an architect or artist is using sensitivity to reveal, to unveil again and again the hidden, hard centre of beauty in everyday life. This is done by creating fruitful situations on sites where important, forgotten, inspiring, reassuring and beautiful material from common memory meet, whether in collage or in collision.”

Recently opened: The High Line Park in the meatpacking district in New York. On the tracks of a disused elevated railway the first part of a new type of park is now open to the public. Perennials and trees complement the existing vegetation which grew up on the derelict industrial structure. Thanks to a very influential pressure group called Friends of the Highline, this park came into being. It will help change the view of many other post-industrial leftover spaces in the United States.

The Oslo opera house by Snøhetta is a functional sculpture which serves as a plaza in the centre of town. Snøhetta has conjured up an architectural masterpiece in Bjørvika which attracts international attention. Already on the first open-day during its construction in the summer of 2007, 12,000 people came to see the building, and it became evident that the opera on the former harbour site would be a success. Snøhetta chose white materials, Carrara marble, for the roofscape, which projects slab-like into the sea, where
driftwood collects and algae grow. It forms a mountain of computered and precision-cut and finished marble slabs, accessible via steps, ramps and balconies that provide ever-changing views towards the city and the sea and, of course, space for lying in the sun or enjoying the sunset. The fact that the “walk-on” building with very few railings was granted planning permission is probably a Norwegian anomaly, and reminiscent of times when life in the capital city was not yet urban and evenings after work and weekends were spent out of doors, exposed to all the risks of nature. “The opera house is a reflection on form, equally remote from pompous post-modernism as it is from naked functionalism,” says Kjetil Thorsen, describing

probable the largest building development in Norway since Trondheim Cathedral in the Middle Ages.

To bring this text to a happy ending, I may quote Sami Rintala once again: “The new ecological ethics and consensus that is being born currently around the globe necessarily needs an aesthetic dimension.”

The clue to happiness in landscape design is to bring sustainability and comfort together.

Foto: Robert Schäfer
The Oslo Opera by Snøhetta architects forms a walk-on-building as a contemporary contribution to urban life.
“It’s really frustrating,” a student recently mentioned in a discussion on landscape conceptions in my seminar: “These ideas of landscape as an artificial, dynamic system of manmade spaces by John Brinckerhoff Jackson, or the homogeneous, total landscape by Rolf Peter Sieferle – this is too abstract and in no way beautiful. I don’t want to see landscape like this, it’s almost demotivating.” This spontaneously articulated dissatisfaction expresses a dilemma which has occurred in recent decades between our common understanding of landscape and contemporary landscape theory. On one side we find the conventional ideas of a harmonious, green landscape opposing built-up areas, and on the other side there are new ideas that avoid any oppositions and try to integrate the strange mixtures of our peripheries or the web of infrastructure lines which are the landscapes of our contemporary culture. What does this dilemma mean for the profession of landscape architecture? Does it express a crack in our identity, or could it be a productive trigger for new ideas and approaches?

Classical Landscape Concept

In his repeated and extensive tests in linguistic psychology (Hard 1970; Hard/Gliedner 1978), Gerhard Hard found out that landscape has a stable meaning in everyday colloquial speech. He summarised: “A landscape (...) is quiet, beautiful, rural, green, healthy and recreative, harmonious, varied and aesthetic. Moreover, it continues to be accompanied by a cluster of Arcadian associations: happiness, love, leisure, peace, freedom, security, home... It symbolises mature, firmly rooted culture as opposed to the illusion of progress and the emptiness of civilisation, and at the same time it is the object, the ideal counterpart, for the experience of nature by a modern subject who possesses soul and feeling” (Hard 1991: 14; italics in original).

This meaning is the result of an age-old cultural process which started, according to many authors, with Petrarch’s ascent of Mount Ventoux. According to Joachim Ritter’s seminal essay on landscape (Ritter 1962), Petrarch’s letter of 26 April 1336 is the earliest documentary evidence of the contemplation of nature from a purely aesthetic point of view. While in the past there might have been religious, military and strategic reasons for climbing a mountain, what counted for Petrarch was “just the desire to acquaint myself, through my own eyes, with the exceptional height of this part of the earth” (Petrarch, quoted in Piepmeier 1980: 12). Ritter interprets this aesthetic view of landscape, described here by Petrarch for the first time, as philosophically representing a new form of “theory”, meaning a holistic view of the cosmos. For Ritter this view of landscape is essential compensation for a phenomenon that is associated with a degree of loss at the dawn of the modern era.
With increasingly scientific objectification, nature comes to be classified in terms of its individual parts, while at the same time the metaphysical “putty” that held the parts together up to the end of the Middle Ages disappears. This distance from nature caused by objectification can be compensated by presenting the totality of nature aesthetically in the form of landscape. The coldness of the scientific perspective of nature as an object is compensated by the warmness of the holistic view of nature as landscape. This “warm view” has two conditions according to Ritter: first, it has to be purposeless, because natural elements only become landscape “when human beings turn to them without any kind of practical purpose, in a ‘freedom of contemplation’, to find themselves in nature” (Ritter 1962: 151). Second, the landscape view can only relate to “surrounding nature” (umruhende Natur), literally “nature that rests around” – meaning nature that has not been appropriated for human purposes. This relates to the highlight of Ritter’s interpretation of the landscape view: “The cleaving of society into an ‘objective’ nature and a ‘surrounding’ nature is the condition of freedom” (ibid.: 161). You are able to distance yourself from nature, but at the same time you can reconnect to nature as a whole by the aesthetic landscape view – this is a manifestation of human freedom. This argumentation by Ritter is quite fascinating, as it expresses the utopian potential of the classical landscape concept as an aesthetic, scenic view. Its plausibility is further confirmed by the applicability to post-industrial sites. Only because they have lost their purpose and have become a surrounding nature, not appropriated by man, could they be seen as landscape – before, they were just industrial areas.

In summary, this aesthetic landscape concept allows landscape architects to design areas that serve as counterparts to cold, technical modernity. Its utopian potential becomes plain: the more dissatisfaction we find with “appropriated” nature, with the rectilinear rationality of modernity, the greater becomes the longing for its opposite – “surrounding nature”, as the only possible setting where the Arcadian ideal of a harmonious relationship between nature and humanity can be recovered. And finally, the common understanding of landscape as green, harmonious, quiet, etc. also underscores this meaning.

Given the force of the idea, and the altogether positive associations of the concept, wouldn’t it seem almost absurd to criticise or remodel it?

**Contemporary landscape concepts**

Since the early 1980s, critique arose against the “scenic” strand of meaning from the Romantic period, which sees landscape as an Arcadian counterpart to a technically dominated environment. For example, in 1980, the German philosopher Rainer Piepmeier wrote an article with the unmistakable title “The end of the aesthetic category ‘landscape’”. Following the lines of Ritter’s argument, he finds that the aesthetic concept of landscape necessarily demands the city, or appropriated nature, as its correlate, while itself referring to the city’s counterpart, the “free” nature that surrounds it. In view of the completeness with which nature had been generally subjected to appropriation by 1980, the very existence of this relationship, which is constitutive for the aesthetic concept of landscape, can be questioned: “The aesthetic function of bucolic fields as an evocation of free nature is (...) obsolete, when the fields of nature and humanity can be recovered. And finally, the common understanding of landscape as green, harmonious, quiet, etc. also underscores this meaning.

Given the force of the idea, and the altogether positive associations of the concept, wouldn’t it seem almost absurd to criticise or remodel it?

**Contemporary landscape concepts**

Since the early 1980s, critique arose against the “scenic” strand of meaning from the Romantic period, which sees landscape as an Arcadian counterpart to a technically dominated environment. For example, in 1980, the German philosopher Rainer Piepmeier wrote an article with the unmistakable title “The end of the aesthetic category ‘landscape’”. Following the lines of Ritter’s argument, he finds that the aesthetic concept of landscape necessarily demands the city, or appropriated nature, as its correlate, while itself referring to the city’s counterpart, the “free” nature that surrounds it. In view of the completeness with which nature had been generally subjected to appropriation by 1980, the very existence of this relationship, which is constitutive for the aesthetic concept of landscape, can be questioned: “The aesthetic function of bucolic fields as an evocation of free nature is (...) obsolete, when the fields of...
the present day have become a sanitised tractor landscape or even, for that matter, recreational landscape – itself just another instance of appropriation. This means that the separation of city and country as landscape, fundamental to Ritter’s idea of landscape, has in principle been abolished. The moment of ‘going out’ has been deprived of any possibility of realisation” (Piepmeier 1980: 34).

Without a correlate, without an opposite, the aesthetic concept of landscape collapses. Piepmeier therefore calls for a “reconstitutive turnaround”, and develops a definition of landscape that is no longer dependent on a conception of ideal nature but rather focuses on the process of appropriation, taking into account the fact that nature has in the meantime been transformed into an “artifact”: “Landscape is the space of human life that has been appropriated by human work and human activity. It is the natural space in which human beings live and which comprises the nature resources on which they depend. This idea of landscape thus conceptualises the fundamental natural circumstances and the effects of historical conditions whereby these resources come to be appropriated to human needs” (ibid.: 38).

This definition is value-neutral and does not incorporate any ideal to be aspired to or any kind of Arcadian utopia. Landscape is “not the place of happiness per se; it can equally be the place of unhappiness” (ibid.: 39). It comprises the entire space of human life, which as the product of human activity must repeatedly be refashioned in the interest of “unfolding human possibility” (ibid.: 39).

At the same time in America, J. B. Jackson developed a critique of the aesthetic landscape concept which he calls “Landscape Two” (“Landscape One” means landscape as a political unit, an understanding which has existed since Medieval times). Jackson criticises the stubborn persistence of the Arcadian Landscape Two: “In matters having to do with the natural environment, we are most of us children of Landscape Two. From that parent we have learned not only to study the world around us but also to lavish care upon it and bring it to a state of lasting perfection. It was Landscape Two that taught us that the contemplation of nature can be a revelation of the invisible world, and of ourselves... But it was also Landscape Two that impressed upon us the notion that there can be only one kind of landscape: a landscape identified with a very static, very conservative social order, and that there can be only one true philosophy of nature: that of Landscape Two” (Jackson 1984: 155).

This exclusive, static concept of landscape has little to do with the accelerating cycles of change in the landscape, especially in America – fast food restaurants demolished after just one year, fields where crops change constantly in response to world markets and economic subsidies, caravan parks that disappear at the end of the vacation, tropical landscapes in shopping malls that get changed from year to year, and so on. In Jackson’s view, confronting this situation is a new and important challenge for those with a professional interest in landscape: “I would like to think that in the future the profession of landscape architecture will expand beyond its present confines (established by Landscape Two) and involve itself in making mobility orderly and beautiful” (ibid.: 155). It is illuminating that what is involved here is not the preservation of nature as it is at present, but rather the design of a new nature, a new kind of beauty.

As this pragmatic and processual view of landscape no longer has any point of contact with Landscape Two, in view of the latter’s dependence on past forms and ways of life Jackson finds himself compelled to develop a new definition of contemporary landscape, one that he calls “Landscape Three”: “Landscape is not scenery, it is not a political unit; it is really no more than a collection, a system of man-made spaces on the surface of the earth. Whatever its shape or size, it is never simply a natural space, a feature of the natural environment; it is always artificial, always synthetic, always subject to sudden or unpredictable change. We create them and need them because every landscape is the place where we establish our own
human organisation of space and time. It is where the slow, natural processes of growth and maturity and decay are deliberately set aside and history is substituted. A landscape is where we speed up or retard or divert the cosmic program and impose our own” (ibid.: 156).

The opposition to the aesthetic landscape concept could not be greater. Landscape is neither a surrounding nature, a counterpart to built-up areas, nor something that has to be viewed as purposeless. In summary, the concepts of Piepmeier and Jackson deprive Ritter’s aesthetic concept of landscape of its central pillars, without which it collapses – because there is no longer a counterpart for which it can serve as compensation, and there is no ideal state left for it to embody. Instead, the new view of landscape as a “dynamic system of man-made spaces” (following Jackson, see above) now represents the entirety of space, and constant change is seen as constitutive (rather than progressing towards an ideal state). This pragmatic and broad understanding of landscape also becomes evident in the European Landscape Convention from 2000 with the following definition: “‘Landscape’ means an area, as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors.”

**Landscape Two or Landscape Three?**

If we juxtapose the two landscape concepts, the dilemma becomes apparent: Landscape Three seems to correspond to the way things happen, like the blurring of the oppositions between natural and artificial, or between landscape and the city. But its extensive and systemic character contradicts the common understanding, which for example became evident in the student’s comment quoted above, and its broadness is almost unbearable – if we take Landscape Three at face value, would not any ensemble of objects on a fairly well-used desk become a landscape, a dynamic system of man-made spaces?

On the other hand, the aesthetic concept of landscape (Landscape Two) is still firmly fixed in people’s minds and functions at the level of everyday discourse, but is untenable when confronted by real processes.

**The dilemmas of second modernity**

To cope with this dilemma, it is helpful to extend the perspective towards society in general. According to Ulrich Beck, professor of sociology at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität Munich and the London School of Economics, our era is characterised by dilemmas in principle. This is a result of the shift from first to second modernity. First modernity, which ended in the late 20th century, was characterised by clear borders and definitions, for example strong national states, the nuclear family, a society of classes, the welfare state, a clear separation between nature and society, and the belief in objective science as the provider of reliable knowledge versus the subjective realm of values.

For many reasons, these clear categories of “either-or” have vanished. Beck analyses many dilemmas in second modernity. For example: Where do we draw the border between life and death? When does life start? Where do we draw the border between natural food and gene-modified food? Is there a human fingerprint on climate change (although politics seem clear about this, science is not)? None of these questions have a clear answer. But unlike postmodernists, who say: “Everything is liquid now, everything is relative”, Beck stresses that second modernity needs to find new ways to define borders. Existing categories cannot simply disappear; instead they should be connected with new elements in different forms. He describes this as a shift from “exclusive differentiation”, e.g. nature vs. culture, to “inclusive differentiation” in which categorising is plural and ambivalent (Beck/ Lau 2005: 122).

Coming back to landscape, this could mean that such a general understanding as expressed by Jackson’s Landscape Three or the definition of the European
Landscape Convention is too vague, but a simple differentiation between city and landscape, or red and green, wouldn’t do, either. In Beck’s words: “There is no clear limit that separates; hence, it makes no sense to speak of ‘either one or the other’, but rather of diverse forms of ‘both one and the other’” (Beck 2007). So instead of facing a dilemma between two opposing concepts of landscape, could we consider a combination of both Landscape Two and Landscape Three as fertile ground, a ground of plural differentiation?

One of these plural and ambivalent categories which might be stimulating in this context is landscape urbanism. In the first publication on the subject, Moshen Mostafavi described the potential of landscape: “As a framework for the imagination, landscape produces new insights in response to the contemporary urban situation. It allows one to describe that territory in terms of an equal, although artificial dialogue between buildings and landscapes. Yet this dialogue is not limited by the traditional definition of the terms ‘building’ and ‘landscape’; it allows for the simultaneous presence of the one within the other, buildings as landscapes, landscapes as buildings” (Mostafavi 2003: 7). The idea that landscape allows us to describe the dialogue between buildings and landscapes, as developed in the first two sentences, is not really convincing in logical terms, but the potential of this hybrid approach is already visible in the final sentence of the quote. Charles Waldheim, who coined the term “landscape urbanism” in 1997, was more precise when he wrote: “Landscape urbanism describes a disciplinary realignment currently underway in which landscape replaces architecture as the basic building block of contemporary urbanism. For many, across a range of disciplines, landscape has become both the lens through which the contemporary city is represented and the medium through which it is constructed” (Waldheim C. 2006: 11).

This hybrid approach towards landscape proposed by architects is not really new to the profession of landscape architecture (one might argue that Peter Joseph Lenné’s design for the Köpenicker Feld from 1840 or Olmsted’s Emerald Necklace from 1879 were already landscape urbanism projects), but its current power in a larger transdisciplinary debate allows for new possibilities for landscape architecture. I would like to illustrate the potential of a hybrid, inclusive approach towards landscape by presenting a recent project of Michael Van Valkenburgh Associates (MVVA). In their winning proposal “Port Lands Estuary” for the Lower Don Lands competition in Toronto (2007), their presentation was dominated by four panels, each containing just one large perspective. Two of them were pure Landscape Two images, representing natural scenery against the backdrop of the city.

![Figure 3: MVVA perspective for Lower Don Lands](image1)

![Figure 4: MVVA perspective for Lower Don Lands](image2)

A spontaneous reaction could be that this is a conceptually outdated proposal. Yet, these rather traditional situations were just a result of a sophisticated, complex construction. A detailed, 105-page project report describes...
how parks, buildings, streets, bridges, light rail lines, habitat types and hydraulic flows were orchestrated to produce not only pastoral, but also urban scenes (MVVA team 2007). MVVA worked from a systems perspective of Landscape Three, but did not hesitate to weave in Landscape Two scenes. For me, this is a perfect example of inclusive differentiation in the sense of Beck. The profession of landscape architecture has extraordinary potential for these hybrid, inclusive types of design. In MVVA’s Don Lands proposal, the power of the profession becomes evident in the organisation of the project team: it consists of urban designers, architects, river hydrologists, regional ecologists, microecologists, climate engineers, bridge engineers, traffic engineers and civil engineers – and the team leader is the landscape architect!

Not many landscape architects have such a responsibility yet, but by progressively approaching the conceptual dilemmas in the hybrid field of landscape with inclusive, plural concepts, this number will grow – and we have every reason to be optimistic ...

References
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The title of this paper may sound in a way alarming. And perhaps it should be such, when the current development of urban landscape is considered. A large part of the recent production of landscapes seems to be stuck in labyrinths of formal experimentation which often yielded astonishing outputs. This statement refers to a period of the several last decades. The intention of this contribution is to point to some trends which, in the authors opinion, are detrimental to the societal interest, and consequently also to the profession of landscape architecture.

Since the modern movement in the first part of the 20th Century, landscape design has been carried along by the same current of ideas as in plastic arts and architecture. Such a sharing of ideas has made a far-reaching and positive impact on landscape design, both in terms of developing new fields of activity and renovating its formal language. American, English, Scandinavian and German landscape architecture schools have made a great contribution, especially in terms of man-oriented landscape design. All this in the spirit of the slogan The Landscape of Man. For the first time in history urban landscapes have been created for people under consideration of other interests than demonstrative representation of the dominating social power.

Surprisingly enough, towards the end of the twentieth Century, new tendencies in landscape design have appeared, largely under the influence of land-art and other visual disciplines. This evolution has resulted in a liberal understanding of form and an underestimation of content-function aspects. Thus, what Theodor Adorno said in his aesthetic theory “From now on nothing will be as it used to be” has materialised. This has anticipated drastic changes, deeper than the abstract art has generated earlier in the century.

During the recent decades, plastic arts have evolved into activities that can not be shared by landscape design. Umberto Ecco has diagnosed such a situation by saying that the “Contemporary art is no longer interested in creation of aesthetic works, but rather in producing forms of a provocative nature. The dividing line between the beautiful and the ugly has disappeared also in daily life. Nowadays we coexist with that
contrast, because the beautiful and the ugly are no longer aesthetic categories, they are merely two possibilities”.

When discussing such a timely topic as dilemmas in landscape architecture are, we should make a clear distinction between the issues in landscape planning and those at the design level. Problems in planning take place at the higher societal level and concern decisions about land-use and landscape management. On the other hand, landscape design is faced with the structural definition of landscapes which implies an inseparable relationship of function and form. The tendency to put forward a form underestimating or ignoring other aspects or requirements in development of urban landscapes, has always proved to be counterproductive.

Linearity which is often used in an exaggerated scale has made a main imprint on the layout of the park Riem in Munich with the extremely long paths. Longitudinal planting along the paths adds another emphasis to the linear character of the whole.

This feature has become a common denominator in a large part of what nowadays is called modern landscape design. To the best of my knowledge no theoretical foundation of this landscape category exists, neither a serious effort at ontological interpretation of this phenomenon has been made.

My intention today is very modest: I would like to articulate some relevant aspects of contemporary evolution in what is called modern landscape design and thereby to draw our attention to the progress of courses that in the longer range inevitably leave undesirable consequences for landscape policy in cities and damage the reputation of our profession. It is beyond any doubt that in doing so I am moving on the terrain of speculations that escape the objective criteria of judgement. Yet, I shall make every effort to put forward some ideas and opinions that reflect my subjective standpoint, but with due explanations. In doing so I also intend to apply certain objective criteria. In the case of urban landscapes the prime criterion undoubtedly is: how far do they satisfy people’s needs. This is valid also for architecture, interior and other kinds of design. And, last but not least, in the case of landscape design that is a conditio sine qua non - inseparable aspects.

If the landscape artefacts that we generate, did not meet people’s requirements and expectations, they have missed the point. We are not dealing here with a piece of furniture or an interior arrangement which in case of mispurchase or wrong choice one could replace. Parks or squares are costly long-range investments. And not only that. If they fail in the multitude of their functions they usually are never replaced. Which implies that people are deprived of a very important, irreplacable urban facility.

The ancient Greeks have widely accepted, and wherever possible also applied, Protagoras’ maxim - man is the measure of all things. In this context the question may be raised: is this statement still valid today? Can it apply to contemporary music, poetry and visual arts? For the greatest part they have become hermetic and thus alienated, inaccessible to the general public. Hence the Greek maxim, still extrapolated by Le Corbusier, practically can not refer to them. A further question, relevant to landscape design: can these areas, in their state of far-reaching alienation, serve as an inspiration for the creation of public places? Though this pattern has been efficient in the last century, in our time the answer could hardly be positive. And yet it looks as if that is the case in the large part of the so-called modern landscape design. Due to
possible implications this issue is of crucial importance both for the profession and for society, specially for the urban population.

On the other hand, the maxim of Protagoras has been pursued also in the sphere of the landscape by the environmental psychologists Stephen and Rachel Kaplan. Their well-known and important book on landscape perception bears the title: With people in mind! which is synonymous with the already mentioned ancient Greek principle – man is measure of all things. Symptomatically, about at the same time was published a book with similar title People Places: Design Guidelines for Urban Open Spaces by C. Cooper Marcus and C. Francis.

It is natural that we are, socially and psychically, different people today when compared with people in earlier periods. It is also beyond any doubt that we shall keep changing and become different again in the future. However, with at least one exception, - The experience of past centuries has shown that designed landscapes, as a mediator of the natural, even when processed in various ways, will remain to be, in one form or another, an indispensable component of our urban environments. It is also from this point of view that I am discussing the recent man-made topia.

Why is this matter so important? The process of urbanization is in a constant progress. Not long ago a group of experts has predicted that within the coming 50 years there will be built as much as was built in the entire history of human civilization from the beginning to our time. Another prediction announced that within the next two decades there will live five billion people in cities. A partial illustration of such development is a plan of the Chinese government to build several dozens of new cities for some 300 million inhabitants. Another example is France where President Sarkozy has recently announced a large-scale plan for the extension of Paris by 130 square kilometres with one of the development goals - to make it green and environment friendly! It is not difficult to imagine the gravity of problems that the plannings, urban, traffic, landscape and others, will have to solve within the implementation of such a grandiose enterprise. And the same level of demands is awaiting also landscape design.

In the early seventies the well known French architect Emile Aillaud declared that he is planning a new town for 5000 inhabitants (Chanteloup-le-Vigne, above) without any green spaces. The result is a typically inhuman environment as the outcome of such an arbitrary reasoning based on the lack of understanding for the proper needs of people.

Not much wisdom is needed to anticipate that such a perspective requires clear ideas about the social role of our profession and, closely connected with that, the socially responsible design philosophy. If these predictions would materialize even at a much lower rate, it will still imply enormous consequences that are difficult to foresee, among other things at two levels, relevant for our profession:

- first, the problem of urbanizing new land at an unprecedented scale
- second, no less important: an organisation of the new urban environments through design of public spaces, parks, play- and sportsgrounds, squares etc.

While preparing this talk, I have studied a design output, also by looking at more than
one thousand designed landscapes all over the world, mainly in the west. Many of them I have myself seen and documented on the site. This production came from three professional, partly also from non-professional areas as a work of:
- landscape architects,
- partly architects,
- land artists and a few others, among them even literati.

These observations have provided a number of relevant conclusions:
- Throughout the large part of these designs a more or less consistent deviation from social requirements could be identified. The designs paid attention primarily, sometimes exclusively, to formal aspects rather than trying to establish a logical relationship between the content/function and form. Such an approach is naturally immanent in land art where the main intention is the artist’s message. Needless to emphasize how wrong such an orientation is in the work of landscape architects. An outstanding example of a form-dominated layout is the Park Citroen in Paris.
- More or less a consistent application of regular, geometrical patterns.
- In numerous cases a repetitive approach strongly dominates.
- Comparatively little organic, nature-like patterns are applied.
- In general, projects display a modest participation of plant material.
- An insufficient knowledge in design processing of plants.
- A congruence of form and function is very often missing.
- Lack of both structural, and consequently also visual, complexity. This refers particularly to cases with repetitive patterns.
- Both, the structures and the design descriptions demonstrate in very few cases a deeper approach; there is obviously a lack of design philosophy where verbalizing and the physical reality of the work would speak the same language as well in the vocabulary as in the syntax.
- It was disappointing to see that often little or no meaning behind the structures could be identified.
- In spite of much verbalizing about the so-called ecological design or ecological approach, there were comparatively few materialized achievements of that kind.

In the meantime, a real booming of all kinds of ecologisms (ecological aesthetics, ecological landscaping, cultural ecology, ecological urbanism etc.) is going on. - For the time being with few tangible results.

On the other hand, when contemplating the ecological design, it is often forgotten that urban landscapes are structures dedicated to people with an ultimate goal to provide for a variety of functional and experiential opportunities to many users with different expectations. By the way a short reminder:
had landscape design not been acting ecologically (i.e. considering environmental conditions) would our city parks survive so long, even centuries long?

The above critical statements need some substantiation. For this purpose some better known examples will be commented in continuation. They were chosen as symptomatical, due to their approach as well as to their structural definition. Some were as pars pro toto mentioned already earlier in this text.

The Park La Villette in Paris. As is well known, it was subject to the biggest ever held international park competition. Among more than four hundred entries, a project by the architect Bernard Tschumi won the first price. Afterwards it became a long and great expectation announced to become a model of the urban park for the future.

Unfortunately, it turned out to be the greatest delusion in the history of urban parks. The main problem of the park is that it can offer little to people. Visitors stroll through the large structure, now and then stopping for a while to look at one of the numerous curiosities, and then going further. How distant La Villette is from the concept of a ‘park for people’ demonstrates the small area with trees and a lawn which is the only place in the entire park where people, especially with children, can stay for a longer time.

Obviously, the architect has used the park as a showcase for his extravagant architectural experiments about which he himself declared: “I decided to move from pure to applied mathematics and the result is antiarchitecture”. And further, specifically about the park: “The park has become architecture against itself: desintegration”. He could not be more right! (These quotations were published in: Charles Jencks, Deconstruction in architecture. Academy Editions, London 1988).

There is an even spicier disclosure by the architect Bernard Huet, author of another park in Paris - Bercy, who said: “I hate landscape”! Or, still more eloquent, the Dutch landscape architect Adriaan Geuze with his famous slogan: “F...ck the park”. Curiously enough such a viewpoint did not deter him from producing several parks (Both quotations are from Modern Park Design. Ed. by Knuijt, M. et al 1995).

Another green space of recent origin in Paris is the Park Andre Citroen. To a great surprise it presents an astonishing anachronism in the second part of the 20th Century by being designed as an axial composition!

Such a neobaroque historicity was even more enhanced by the large clipped geometric walls from the Renaissance design vocabulary. The result is a vast grassy

A section of the park La Villette with one of 41 structures in a gaudy red colour. They all are merely visual objects without any content (Top). At the far end of La Villette a comparatively small green area offers a single opportunity to enjoy a park lawn for sitting, picknicking and children play (Bottom).
parterre. Thereby the effect of a large emptiness defined by lateral paths and large volumes is generated - as if the design intention was to develop nothing more than merely a look at the large-scale scenery.

Curiously enough, Paris boasts yet another structure with an underlying baroque concept - Park Bercy. This was developed as an adjoining green space to the famous hall of sports. The layout was superimposed on the older green space and is therefore scarcely perceivable. Like Citroen also Bercy offers some small interesting sections.

After this - far from complete - glimpse at the recent activity of landscape design, I feel the necessity to emphasize one more aspect in this sphere. It seems appropriate to remind also of the principle that has been an intrinsic feature of every design discipline throughout history. - What I have in mind is the unity of good/practical/functional on the one hand and beautiful/harmonious on the other hand. This has been consistently an underlying concept in architecture, industrial design (including the folk handicrafts) and should, naturally, be also built into the design philosophy of landscape architecture.

Against any expectation, in a number of recent outputs of landscape design, there are trends towards ignoring that integrity.

It seems that such an inclination is inspired by contemporary visual arts, painting, art installations or land art which is due to the inappropriate understanding of arts and their social position. A product of art is an expression of the artist’s personal vision and experience of the world and as such, is highly individualized. In such role, art is independent from the society and not bound by any practical function, even when it aims at surprising, astonishing, provoking or even shocking.

The position of landscape design is entirely opposite by being in the service of the society. The practicality is by definition an inseparable component of all design disciplines. This essential distinction should not be forgotten when eventually efforts are made to find inspiration for form in visual arts of our time.

With this cognition in mind it becomes clear that the slogan Landscape as art is nothing more than a verbal play and for several reasons. Most importantly, a product in no visual discipline, be it painting, sculpture,
architecture or landscape architecture, could be in advance given a status of art. Such a quality can be achieved with an award only ex post, after a complex process of evaluation. In other words, to programme a certain landscape design as an artistic product in advance is an illusion. In this context the idea of Landscape as art turns out to be only wishful thinking.

What landscape design should aim at is to maintain the concept of Kalokagathia as was formulated by the ancient Greeks. It was understood as a synthesis of kalos, beautiful, and kai agathos, good. In the case of landscape design there should be added a third aspect - naturalness! For, in the societal perception the idea of the most important urban landscape - the park - is associated also with - nature. How familiar in this context sound the two thousand years old principles of Vitruvius: Utilitas, firmitas, venustas (Function, Durability, Beauty).

With this cognitions in mind it is possible to draw the following conclusion:

regardless the individual designer’s understanding of what future urban landscape should look like, it will never be possible to ignore the everlasting diagram - triade:

```
Good/function     Form/harmonious
        \                     \      
          Nature/neutral
```

Two examples of a landscape ‘With people in mind:

Parc de Reuilly in Paris built at the end of the 20th Century represents an example of a people-friendly green space amidst the densely populated city quarter (Above, top and bottom).

The 200 years old Bryant Park (Top) situated on the 5th Avenue in New York. In the course of time it has somewhat changed its structure. However, as one of the most visited parks of the city it functions most successfully - in spite of its extreme structural simplicity.
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