

Análise e representação em contextos diversos: projeto, técnica e gestão do ambiente construído

Criando imagens da Cidade Imaginada: Representação e Processos de Projeto da Paisagem.

WATERMAN, Tim (1); WALL, Ed. (2)

(1) Arquiteto e paisagista. Professor da Writtle School of Design, Inglaterra.

(2) Arquiteto paisagista. Professor na Kingston University.

RESUMO

Tratando de arquitetura, Michel Foucault afirma que é "de certo modo arbitrário tentar dissociar a efetiva prática de liberdade pelas pessoas, a prática das relações sociais e as distribuições espaciais nas quais elas se encontram. Se estas se separam, se tornam impossíveis de serem compreendidas. Cada uma pode somente ser entendida através da outra" (1982). Para ele, não é o espaço, mas sim o seu uso e apropriação que são ou o receptáculo ou a contestação do poder político. Protesto e resistência são táticas de grupos marginais, 'contrapúblicos subalternos'; que expressam a linguagem espacial do poder como um discurso- muito como o 'ato de discurso da caminhada' de Michel de Certeau. Assim, o uso e compreensão do espaço permitem aos que projetadores da paisagem e do urbano que estes, através da representação, tenham acesso aos códigos, trajetórias, e táticas pelas quais os indivíduos e os grupos habitam o espaço. Embora haja disjunções reconhecidas entre concepção, percepção e uso, os que projetam não podem simplesmente sucumbir à batalha e continuar práticas projetuais e modos de representação sem uma problematização. É também vital reconciliar o ambiente construído e o seu uso a uma representação fundada na crítica e na teoria. Henri Lefebvre (1974) define claramente: "O conceito de espaço não está no espaço. Similarmente, o conceito de tempo não é o de um tempo no interior do tempo (...) O conteúdo do conceito de espaço não é o espaço absoluto ou o espaço em si mesmo, nem o conceito contém um espaço nele mesmo. O conceito 'cão' não late. Inversamente, o conceito de espaço denota e conota todos os espaços possíveis, sejam estes 'reais', mentais ou sociais. E em

particular possui dois aspectos: os espaços de representação e as representações do espaço".

Exploramos a interseção entre os espaços de representação e as representações do espaço, assim como as interseções de uma multiplicidade de públicos nos lugares urbanos contemporâneos. Modos de representação no processo projetual e no desenvolvimento conceitual são analisados por seu grau de abertura aos processos sociais e democráticos. Os processos imaginativos do projeto devem se adequar aos da criação de ficções através das quais os cidadãos navegam através da esfera pública e do domínio público. As ficções nos permitem reconciliar a representação com o onírico, e assim com a cidade real. Como Shonfiel (2000) diz: "O que acontece se aceitamos que a arquitetura concretamente existe, não como um todo primordial e inacessível, mas na percepção do observador?"

Muitos arquitetos da paisagem defendem novos modos de representação, porém este trabalho argumenta que nós simplesmente temos que rever o próprio processo projetual.

Palavras-chave: Representações, Projeto da Paisagem, Produção do Espaço

ABSTRACT

This paper will frame a conversation on landscape, representation, and production as process. Landscape both as and in representation through observation and recording, and landscape as and in representation through design and production are explored as seamlessly connected and inseparable processes. New paradigms for representation and design process are vital to ensure that landscape architecture has a future as both a culturally and ecologically significant practice. Through a conversation about landscape, design, and process, this paper joins a larger discourse, endlessly unfolding, linking, becoming.

Many landscape architects and urbanists have called for new modes of representation, but this paper holds that we simply need to reenvision the process itself.

Keywords: Representations, Landscape Architecture, Spatial production

Introduction: Landscape and Conversation

Landscape is a relationship.

Landscape only exists through our experience. It is both a system and a process which acts upon us and upon which we act. It is an idea and an image; an idea formed of this interrelationship, an image reflected between imagination and reality. Every landscape is thus unique, and each possesses a character that can only be understood through experience, comparison, testing, and representation.

Landscape can be defined as both something that is viewed and as something interactive. It is most important, though, for the purposes of this paper, that the landscape is seen not just as a view, but as an image, a relationship, consciousness. The term 'cultural landscape' must be seen to be redundant; that the full meaning of this construction has been absorbed into the word 'landscape'. This is the idea that landscape is both man-made and that it makes man. It is both shaped and shaping. It is a process of the location of oneself in one's surroundings - and the surroundings locating themselves within. This is how landscape may be seen in one way as a relationship. Another sort of relationship that is crucial for this paper is the relation between cityscape and countryside. In contemporary urbanism the distinction between the two has been erased and they no longer exist as polar opposites (if indeed they ever did). The two have always been interrelated and interdependent. Which came first? Agriculture or the city? Or was each necessary for the other? We must see this relationship as fundamental to understanding urbanism and rurality, which cannot be seen to exist independently - both of which are a landscape condition.

Landscape must also be seen as a foreground for human existence rather than a background. As John Berger has stated, “When we see a landscape we situate ourselves in it” (Berger 1972:11). The lingering habits of the picturesque still dupe us into seeing landscape both as backdrop and as an arcadian ideal. While the maintenance of an ideal is not without value, the ideal in this case makes reality very difficult to perceive.

JB Jackson describes “...a new definition of landscape: a composition of man-made or man-modified spaces to serve as infrastructure or background for our collective existence.” (Jackson 1984:8) Therefore landscape can be understood as an infrastructure that surrounds us – although not necessary background, but foreground.

Landscape is action.

Landscape is often described as an act of viewing from a site, through a frame; a vista that changes the viewer's consciousness. It is, however, important that landscape is not just this single action, but many actions. These actions might arise from the social and cultural, from historical impetus, from the biological and ecological, climate, geology, growth, decay.

In human terms, the action most often described as contributing to the construction of landscape is work, and this has been commented upon by such keen landscape observers as D.W. Meinig, J.B. Jackson, and James Corner. It is certainly this, but it is also certainly constructed through play, conversation, and conviviality.

Landscape is a system.

There is an archaic sense of the word landscape that it makes sense to recapture. This is that the latter half of the word, *scape*, describes a system rather than a view. Land - unmediated environment - and its physical forms and spaces are moderated and modified by the human *scape* - system.

Patrick Geddes introduced the idea of landscape as a system where social process and spatial form were related. This position breaks from the picturesque tradition that was prevalent at that time.

Landscape is a conversation.

Conversation is many things. Like landscape, it is a relationship, a system, an action. As communication, conversations overlap, loop back. They are reiterative, and contain multiple hypotheses, multiple conclusions, multiple interconnections. They may at times become simple dialogues, or discussions held across a whole society.

The nature of a conversation has no beginning and no end. It may be framed, but always extends outside of the frame. It is never entirely discrete; it always references other conversations.

Conversations are mutual, as are landscapes – this is beyond merely collective.

Gardiner - Critiques of Everyday Life p. 18 " . . . how do we encourage the realization that the social and natural worlds are *processual* in character, complex amalgams of positive and negative forces that resist any tendency towards stasis and fixity."

Representation

Corner states that "landscape and image are inseparable. Representation is to stand in for. If one person represents another, they are empowered to act on their behalf, or perhaps more, they are empowered to *be* that person in their absence - a sort of ontological substitution.

Conversation is representational - because of its back-and-forth nature, it is rarely presentational. You're not speaking to a room, you're engaged in a process. Landscape design has been scenographic and cinematographic rather than process based - thus it has been explicitly presentational and stiffly symbolic. "I am wealthy and powerful", "I am wealthy and sophisticated".

The frame of viewer/view... Landscape design is about conscious change of a set of relationships – redirecting, repurposing, rearranging.

If the design is cinematographic, it is often a linear narrative, which is still a univocal mode.

Not just this, but that by using 3D or 2D images of a site, the designer aid their imagination to reconstruct a site or to test versions of their design onto a site without having to build it at full scale. Especially in landscape design, there is rarely the luxury of prototyping at actual size, as is often feasible in industrial design.

The landscape image is never neutral, just as the process of designing the landscape is never innocent. “Just as there is no innocent eye, there is no neutral or passive imaging, meaning that landscape too, as image, is neither inactive nor benign. It is through styling, of course, that one imbues the landscape with allusions to regional and cultural identity, enabling its occupants to believe that they are actually part of a collective, refined, and enlightened society. This is often an illusion because the only real participation is that of the little consumer.” James Corner.

Designing Landscape

“The landscape construct is inherently unstable, an indeterminate dimension that can be opened up through artistic practices and made to reveal alternative sets of possibility.” (James Corner, 1999:158). Landscape design must operate in these indeterminate modes, and designers must become reconciled to accepting outcomes rather than concrete outputs.

Like conversation, it has no beginning and end, which is not a state of indeterminacy without closure, but a simple lack of fixity and stasis and a condition of pleasurable expectation - what will come next?

A conversation is about testing, which is key to the design process.

This is in contrast to Repton’s Red books, where he establishes a scenographic stage set that is more or less intractable. Repton and picturesque as a presentational mode . . . again "I am wealthy and powerful" or "I am wealthy and sophisticated" - this works in a single frame; it is a product.

This is much easier to represent than a process that extends outside the frame - a process is not a tableau. Representation needs to employ

techniques of montage and collage for superimposition and overlap - a way of framing multiply and simultaneously - an open system.

Open systems are both natural/ecological and democratic. They are unbounded and generous. Mapping of site dynamics, modes of experience are all more involved than simple mappings of circulation (Directed by Ludovic Houplan & Hervé de Crécy, 2002).

No Product but Process

Landscape is not itself a product, but rather a productive process. Landscape design may be seen as the production of productivity. Production of objects for consumption is simply production of waste. How do we re-envision the process - create a new frame- conversation as new paradigm for both process and product. Landscape centred design processes are not putting an object in a frame - understanding the field – they are not object focused, as is conventional.

Influence of systems outside of the frame. Foreground or background – both foreground and background moving in/out and through. The idea of landscape can become the driver for design processes universally. A richer definition of the word ‘landscape’ means raising the bar for the landscape profession and all other professions and disciplines that act within it or upon it.

The idea of landscape changes our conception of everyday life fundamentally. Because landscape posits a constantly shifting context . . . design can cease to be object focused, allowing design process and landscape process to merge seamlessly.