THE LANDSCAPE URBANISM appendix

The Landscape Urbanism Appendix is a theoretical appendix to Chapter 1: Imaging Landscape. Here supplementary writings on specific landscape urbanist aspects are elaborated on. First the concept of processes and James Corner's surface strategies are introduced and expanded upon. Secondly, landscape urbanism is given perspective through a comparative study with other contemporary positions that make up the urbanism of our time. Thirdly, contemporary approaches and landscape urbanism are accounted for in a historical perspective.

CONTENTS

PERFORMATIVE PROCESSES

The notion of performativity which this project applies is based on a notion of ecology based on processes, both social and physical, local and global. Performativity in this sense relates to a process-based stance to planning that aims for adaptable and dynamic solutions rather than a fixed and static design.

"Thus performance shifts the focus of interests from essence to effect. The question is not what something is, but what it does." Andreas Ruby (Gausa, p. 476)

The word *performative* actually derives from the world of linguistics as a categorisation for the type of words known as speech acts, utterances that can perform an act in the very moment of being uttered, e.g. the utterance '*I promise*', thus performing the act of promising. (www.wikipedia.com; www.dictionary.com)
When transferred to the world of architecture and planning, this definition offers a new understanding of space. Standing in contrast to representative design, performative design can thus be said to actively acknowledge and perform in the world and processes it is a part of. This approach acknowledges the fact that spaces are living entities of a greater system, and will never be finished, but always be in process. Not to be mistaken for simply performance events or interactive devices (although these are also methods of engaging social processes), performativity in this sense is thus lifted to a higher level of understanding.

The following is a discussion of the way these processes can become physical space, and how an overall planning must collect these processes.

PROCESS CYCLES

In landscape architecture, the surface is not a flat lifeless plane, but rather a thick section of characteristics and behaviour, described by Stan Allen as a thick 2D. (Allen 2001, pp. 124 - 125) Soil has permeability and plants have height and growth rate – all characteristics that make the surface a living carrier of flows and processes. The term processes may connotate a wide spectre potentials: architectural and planning processes, urban processes, social processes and even biological processes.
To clarify this, the term *process cycles* in introduced. This is inspired from Graham Shane's use of the term 'performative cycles' as a way of describing the processes and their time-frame that design can and must engage. Here he differentiates between different scales of cycles, long-term and short-term, that a design must take into account. (Shane, p. 33) Engaging biological and social cycles at different scales also enables a more bottom-up approach, where small-scale cycles such as flea markets and street fairs can transform a space for a short span of time, or local clubs and associations can contribute to a design process. Here the potential of the local comes into play, and can be connected to the otherwise dominant global tendencies. According Shane, combining top-down and bottom-up approaches is a way of interconnecting the different performative cycles.

This view is supported by Jens Kvorning's ideas of *resistance* and *responsiveness* of a place. He argues that a place, and thereby the design, must contain a resistance towards the universality of global tendencies, and that this resistance

is found in the local. Simultaneously, the design must also incorporate a degree of responsiveness towards these global tendencies, which is the means by which the place can interact and perform at lager scales. His terminology emphasizes the importance of engaging both local and global/regional processes. (Kvorning)

By perceiving public space and architectural form as performative and as a process cycle, new meanings emerge regarding the experience of programmes, the nature of landscape and the significance of global and local connectivity. It also encourages new connections between different processes thus shaping new comprehensive process cycles that link across social and biological fields.
These ideas call for a clear understanding of which processes we are dealing with, both with regard to overall planning processes and concept for implementation, but also more concrete processes which can be engaged actively in a design. Let us first take a look at the latter of the two.

PROCESSES ENGAGED IN DESIGN

Processes can be perceived as space happening over time. This is why processes pose such a great potential to design, as the art of space-making cannot ignore the context it is connected to. Here we will look into different categories of potential 'space-making' processes, whether biological, urban or social. Activating such a wide range of processes that do not spring from the world of architecture necessitates an interdisciplinarity, a sort of expert knowledge in technical and biological know-how which landscape urbanism calls for.

Biological or natural processes are what traditionally characterise the landscape, and two main arguments support the use of this type of processes. Firstly, if engaged in planning, as Graham Shane also pointed out, the natural mechanisms of a place are utilized as space generators. Secondly, our relationship as humans to the environment is changing, and sustainability is key word of the 21st century. From an ethical point of view, architecture needs to reflect this and promote environmental awareness. When working with landscapes, either as part of vast open lands, in urban parks or even urban landscapes such as suburbia, it is interesting to note that we do not have framework sufficient enough to comprehend the complexity of these situations. We have theories based on ideas of art and history and we have environmental models which exclude visual and spatial representations of culture. (Berrizbeitia, p. 117)
If we take a look at current studies in ecology we find that they are increasingly beginning to involve spatial investigations and the importance of patterns and patches on biodiversity. (Hill, p. 94) In this view, the disciplines of design and of ecological studies are already intertwining, as our biological environments are influenced whenever we alter our physical environments. The fact that an encouragement of biodiversity and a support of ecological corridors are directly linked to spatial parameters presents in itself an almost design strategy that could be grasped in urban design. Of course, the situation is not as simple as this, as many more processes, their dynamics and the way they influence each other must also be taken into account. However, it is a potential that urban design can use as a means of promoting biological sustainability while also providing "*a profound window into our humanity, simply by teaching us that we are not all there is to life.*" (Hill, p. 100)

Continuing in these tracks, a biologist would also teach us that openness and flexibility are necessary conditions for survival. (Berrizbeitia, p. 120) Ecological productivity and viability, not only biological but also social and cultural, must be included by ensuring possibilities for self-renewal and variation by accepting the design as a permanent process of transformation. This clearly implies that traditional masterplans are too static and pre-decided to incorporate the dynamics of the landscape.

Urban residual processes are also biological of a sort – at least the process through which they live is a biological one. To exemplify such a process, one could name waste water treatment, waste disposal or phytoremediation of soil. These processes also put focus on environmental sustainability and especially have potential of emphasising the relationship between humans and our environment, perhaps even more that biological/natural processes. Here we are dealing with the treatment of our own waste and its effects on our environments. Ironically though,

these are processes often hidden away from the public eye, a process to be found latent in the functions of the city, but never actively confronted. Activating these urban residual processes and opening the potential of their interaction with other processes, especially social processes, is a way of provoking awareness and debates surrounding our cities and the part they play in the rest of the world.

Lastly we have social processes, which differ a great deal from the two first. Activating these immaterial and abstract social processes in a design can be achieved by working with programmes. Social processes can never be directly controlled or predicted, but through thoughtful and deliberate programming, an attempt can be made to guide these social processes in certain directions.
One such direction would be to secure open and accessible public spaces, which diverse programming can help ensure – programmes that invite different types of people into the same space. Programming can also be used to encourage the confrontation between social processes, the human, and the biological and urban residual processes, the environment. This confrontation should occur in the public space, but also has potential in the more private sphere of the home.
Programmes especially become interesting when seeing their potential as layers and as a way of creating hybrids. Just like other processes, these too are dynamic as they breathe in and out over time, varying in both timeframes and space consumption. The event character of some programmes, having a very short time span, can be used to create hype and excitement, whereas long-term activities can help encourage a feeling of belonging and ownership of a place.

A DEMOCRATIC URBAN ENVIRONMENT

Engaging processes, whether material or immaterial, natural or cultural, into a combined system leads us to the realm in which they meet: public spaces. But what type of public space can truly engage a variation and the unpredictability of processes on the terms of our democracy? In other words – how do we design democratic public spaces?

According to Iris Marion Young, public spaces should be open and accessible and a place to encounter differences. (Mitchell, p. 104) Public space is where humans are confronted with the unknown, a place where we are engaged into a form of dialogue from which we cannot escape. (Brændgaard, p. 18) These dialogues can be with other people, similar or dissimilar to ourselves, with our environment and urban landscape or perhaps with direct anarchy itself. However, tendencies indicate that such open public space is in fact threatened by an increasing privatisation, control and surveillance of the spaces. Such a public space is no longer democratic, as it is not accessible to all.

In an article assessing the Downsview Park competition, Don Mitchell and Richard Van Deusen present three normative visions of public space in relation to their design and use. (Mitchell, pp. 105 - 106) The first approach argues that public spaces can only flourish if they are open to their own subversion, e.g. where activists or demonstrators seek to transform the use of the space for political agendas. The second approach counter argues this by claiming that residents need to be allowed to come together to bask in each other's company. Therefore they must be protected by the threat of anarchy. The third approach puts focus on the ideal of the market, where public space historically always has been structured in accordance with the market. Ironically, the market involves consumer-driven spaces, which yet again gives rise to spaces of exclusion as seen in the mall phenomenon. Mitchell and Van Deusen argue that in this light, public spaces should be seen as dialectical spaces where the pressures between control and appropriation are negotiated. They therefore put focus on the fact that publicness cannot only be encouraged through design itself, but also though the implementation and administration of the design.
These are the aspects through which the public are allowed to leave their own trace upon the space and can participate in shaping it themselves, and where the processes of the space confront each other and interact. A democratic public space thus becomes a space of learning and tolerance, not only of other human beings, but also of the world in which we live.

PROCESSES OF PLANNING

When zooming out to look at the overall planning process of negotiations, implementation and administration of a design, a whole new range of processes are brought into play: economic and political processes and also social processes again – all quite immaterial processes that may be difficult to grasp, but still play a prominent role. Social processes materialize here not through programmes as before, but through aspects such as public interest or participatory planning. Economic and political processes imply the forces that reign in a planning process: the market forces, the power of the municipality and of the state. Engaging these processes together entail a sort of 'agent management', where stakeholders and interest group – both private and public – are considered and activated in and around the design.

This agent management is seen as extremely vital and as the means through which an open-ended planning can successfully be implemented. Without a means of administrating the design or invoking interest and responsibility from citizens, businesses or authorities, the plan may never come to life.

SURFACE STRATEGIES

An interesting conception in landscape urbanism is Corner's three surface strategies, suggested as a way of working with open-ended planning in the contemporary city. His three surface strategies refer to his perception of the contemporary city as a horizontal surface constructed in three layers: demarcation, infrastructure, and adaptation.

These layers are only briefly described by Corner. "*Land division, allocation, demarcation and the construction of surfaces constitute the first act in staking out ground; the second is to establish services and pathways across the surface to support future programmes; and the third is ensuring permeability to allow for future permutation, affiliation and adaptation*" (Corner, 2003, p. 60) The surface strategies hence work with preparation of a given site and simultaneously work with incorporating the ability of adaptation to future demands.

The two first layers, demarcation and infrastructure, can be directly related to conventional physical planning, i.e. the traditional creation of building plots and the establishment of infrastructures to supply the building plots. The third layer adaptation, however, presents an extra dimension in comparison with the conventional approach to planning, as it incorporates a ecological and processual dimension which calls for more dynamic and flexible planning. The third layer can therefore be seen as the conceptual layer which embeds the most important aspect of landscape urbanism. Likewise, it is also this third layer that inserts the notions of processes and dynamics in the two other layers, because the third layer adapts, moves and decomposes the demarcation and infrastructure over time. This means that Corner's third layer embeds elements which both secure an overall architectonical frame and allows for transformation and adaptation over time. The main distinction in comparison to conventional planning thus lies in the fact that the surface strategies incorporate and activate a possibility of adaptation in the structural plan which has direct impact on the design. In other words, the surface strategies accommodate mutual relationships between the three strategies, with the result that a project can vary programmatically without compromising the overall architectonical concept.

Corner expresses potential of the surface strategies in the following quotation: "*These surface strategies permit the creation of more or less coherent fields that allow an almost infinite range of varied and flexible arrangements. As vast organizing fields that establish new conditions for future development, these horizontal matrices function as infrastructures.*" (Corner, 2003, pp. 60)
Corner thus engages an open-endedness and the possibility of adaptation in his three surface strategies, which is a way of incorporating and working with the dynamic of the contemporary city. The quotation also points at the understanding of infrastructures as a broader definition than just roads and pathways, and thus implies a perception of infrastructures as being both material and immaterial processes which operates on a site. In this view the second surface strategy seems dynamic in itself due to the engagement of several of processes and flows at work on the site. The processes and flows are thus orchestrated into new matrices of interrelationships with the potential of stirring new relationships on the site. By unfolding the concept of infrastructures to encompass processes and flows somehow separates the second layer from the traditional perception of infrastructure, as the third layer of adaptability seems to be incorporated in the second layer.

This view is supported by an analysis of Corner's surface strategies in a Ph.D. paper by Rune Bach, who argues that the third layer of adaptability needs to be incorporated in the demarcation and infrastructure layer because the third layer introduces permeability and adaptability in relation to demarcation and infrastructure. (Bach, p. 8) This means that demarcation and infrastructure have to be embedded with the possibility of adaptation. As such, demarcation needs to be capable of absorbing new programmes over time, meaning that demarcation is the creation of surfaces which can adapt to different uses in time without neglecting the overall structure embedded in demarcation. Acknowledging that adaptation has to be incorporated in both infrastructures and demarcation, the surface strategies are highly challenging to conventional planning as the plan will take form as an operational tool constantly working with stimulating the processes working on site. This indicates the move

vii.

from static masterplans towards more fluid plans which acknowledge each of the processual stages of a site from existing conditions, to construction, to erasure or revitalisation. Such a plan works actively with stimulating potentials in each stage. Here the Corner's surface strategies bring forth a refreshing elaboration on conventional planning tools by reversing them to dynamic structures that work with the establishment of new interrelationships of mapped potentials, which constantly influencing the plan.

The surface strategies also pose a risk, however. Rune Bach points at the danger of creating too loose a framework that proposes too many unknown parameters. It can thus be argued that projects inspired by Corner's surface strategies might experience problems with the consolidation of the projects. The more a project is consolidated, the more it freezes the frame of the project and its ability to adapt and transform. This point to the probability that surface strategies are most appropriate when operating either on a very large scale with a wide time perspective where the design slowly consolidates or on a small scale, such as park design, with a low degree of consolidation. (Bach, p. 9)

Even though projects inspired by Corners surface strategies are at risk of being either too "loose" in their design or too fixed with reduced ability of adaptation, the surface strategies seem to be capable of working with open-ended planning in nature of the three layers mutual relationships. In spite of the criticism of the lacking consolidation of open-ended projects, Bach concludes that the three surface strategies are qualified for the preparation of a landscape urbanism project on the premises that the surface strategies are designed to absorb changes over time without comprising the underlying architectonic and conceptual basis. (Bach, p. 10)

CONTEMPORARY POSITIONS

Landscape urbanism, together with similar contemporary approaches, represents a new attitude towards planning and architecture in the contemporary world reflected in the acknowledgement of the rising complexity of the urban realm. To obtain a comprehension of the similarities and differences between the approaches, landscape urbanism is outlined as a distinct position through a comparative study with two other positions: *new pragmatism* and the *network city*, which are presented below.

These positions are categorises conceptualised to describe certain planning trends, and although overlapping on certain areas or almost non-comparative on others, it is thought that these categorisations can offer an insight into contemporary approaches and a means of unfolding the theory of landscape urbanism in relation to other contemporary approaches.

After the following presentation of the network city and new pragmatism, the comparative study will subsequently examine each position in relation to three themes: philosophy, design media and planning.

NETWORK CITY

"As an adjective, the term "network" is quite successful in negotiating the multi-dimensionality of the city….. The innumerable parts of the city…. are recognized and then connected to a larger whole – the network. Such a rhetorical move has theoretical power, making it one of the more attractive metaphorical constructions currently present in urban theory, if not (yet) a new paradigm."
Beauregard (www.metropolitanstudies.de/fi leadmin/fi lestorage/Network_City_Series_Stand_02-20-07.pdf)

"If the city is to survive, process must have the final word. In the end the urban truth is in the flow." Spiro Kostof (Graham 2001)

The network city position should be viewed as an understanding of the contemporary urban condition rather than a concrete planning method. This understanding is unfolded by a range of theorists such as Stephen Graham, Saskia Sassen and Ann Markusen, who all seek redefine our perception of cities and urban regions in the age of globalisation, network society and virtual technologies. The position thus represents a greater discussion not only relevant for architects and planners, but also sociologists, geographers, economists, politicians and investors, as it proposes a whole new understanding of our cities in all aspects. With regard to architecture and planning, many contemporary projects indirectly grasp this understanding to different degrees, although not advocating a network city stance directly. The expression 'network city' is therefore a term in this project given to the tendency to collect these writings and theories under one title.

The main focus of the network city is on networked infrastructures – transport, telecommunications, capitals, energy, water and streets – that make up cities and urban regions, and contemporary urbanism thus emerges as a complex and dynamic sociotechnical process, the contemporary city is therefore viewed as ecosystems of competing networks. (Graham 2001, p. 8)

This prompts an additional layer of understanding to the urban realm, signalizing that the contemporary world is composed through numerous points and lines with hierarchal value, defined by the number of links in the global system. According to this position, the traditional perception of the urban realm as composed of solely physical forms, buildings, streets, parks and public spaces, no longer applies to the contemporary city. Instead the urban sphere, as suggested by Jürgen Habermas,

should be understood as the assembly and dialogue that it is constituted of, this being through media as much as through any physical infrastructure. (http://varnelis. net/books/networkcity/proposal)

Graham describes these urban processes as constituted through many superimposed and interconnecting infrastructural 'landscapes', which rely on each other and co-evolve with urban development and urban space. (Graham 2001, p. 8) These different landscapes are exemplified by Graham as the 'electropolis' of energy, the 'hydropolis' of water and waste, the 'cybercity' of electronic communication or the 'autocity' of motorised roadscapes. (Graham 2001, p. 8) Planning the contemporary city must therefore consider the ever changing character of the city spaces, while simultaneously looking at the architectures of these physical and virtual systems that connect and mediate the urban spaces and lives in order to understand how place, space, power and technology interweave to shape the contemporary urban condition.
This perspective brings architecture and urbanism together with issues surrounding the social and technical make-up of mobility systems like the internet and transport systems, which calls for an interdisciplinarity that draws on sociology, planning, geography, sociology of technology and urbanism – an interdisciplinarity that acknowledges the co-dependency between the different 'landscapes' of urban processes. (Graham 2002, p.120)

In the discussions of the network city, attention is given to issues of identity, place and geography, issues of great importance in the architectural world, but also issues which may seem threatened by the tendencies of the network city.

According to Graham, of special interest here are especially the hubs – or the points – of the network city. He pinpoints that leading distribution hubs for road, rail, sea and air logistics seem to emerge as mini-cities in their own right due to their connecting flows, while also delinking from the immediate spaces around them to a certain extent. (Graham 2004, p. 165) This is a tendency where physical place begins to lose its meaning, connecting to the global in neglect of the local scale, defining themselves by the power of their connections elsewhere – a splintering urbanism. Graham describes how these hubs, be they manufacturing spaces, logistics enclaves or airport zones, remove themselves from the surrounding social worlds of the city with an amazing ease through subtle and invisible but nonetheless highly powerful technologies and social practices. (Graham 2004, pp. 180 – 181)

The fact that globalisation and social and spatial fragmentation are complementary processes have likewise been shown by authors such as Saskia Sassen and Manuel Castells. A global network of interconnected nodes has been created, Sasssen's so-called 'global cities, which most often are defined as large scale areas of high density and concentrations of power. This leaves a huge number of fragmented and increasingly powerless local zones – a disintegration of what we traditionally know as urban space. (GUST 2002, p. 19) Simultaneously, the global city spawns its own contradictions. As downtown business centre grows, it becomes increasingly expensive and congested, while the outlying areas in response grow farther and farther removed from the global city core, hereby generating their own secondary business centre. (http://varnelis.net/books/networkcity/proposal)
Ann Markusen describes this tendency through the terms sticky and slippery spaces. Sticky places are the high valued centres of control, research and innovation and the slippery spaces are the decentralised places, where lower valued activities are established. The tension between concentration and deconcentration are at all scales embedded in the relationship between urban and network architectures, resulting in a much more fluid and fractured urban form, where the urban periphery can be the centre and the centre can be the margin. (Graham 2002, p. 111-112)

Here it is important to notice that the virtual networks are not replacing the physical need of place.
Sassen emphasises that globalisation and 'the digital' has entailed a major transformation, but not a neutralisation of the built environment or the city. "*Rather than being neutralized, these emerge with renewed and strategic importance…*" (Sassen p. 46) In fact she stresses the importance of seeing the links between global and local networks, where local entities which are sited materiality also are part of global digital networks.
The cities are here seen as communications system or media, and media is in this sense viewed as fundamental in the transmission of information. Just like a newspaper or a blog, a city enables ideas, opinions, attitudes, and messages to

spread rapidly. Additionally, investigations also reveal that physical face-to-face meetings still matter in terms of business, and therefore the global metropolitan areas also seems to centre in the global cities. The globalisation has, however, not neglected the importance of the local dimension. The network is a structure in which both local and global order exists. The two are equally important to the perfect functioning of the system. Investigations prove the need for local dimensions, seen in the facts that people tend to settle in neighbourhoods where they feel comfortable. Factors such as education possibilities, work, history of the place and housing types matters. Simultaneously, virtual communication often occurs between people located at close distance, which further proves that the network city operates on both the global and the local scale. (http://varnelis.net/books/networkcity/proposal)

NEW PRAGMATISM

The essence of new pragmatism is its anti-ideological approach to the world that states a necessity for starting with the realities and understanding the existing conditions before moving further on and starting a transformation. New pragmatism thus differs from other tendencies by embracing the reality with all the layers that this involves. It searches for solutions grounded in the reality and needs that exist at this moment instead of creating a society based on new ideologies and ideals. By not only focusing on the specific building site or specific materials but also incorporating the context in which to build, the world complexity and composition, pragmatic solutions often settle with standard conventions and ideas. It thus acknowledges that it is no longer possible to plan the city on the premises that the city will follow the plan. New pragmatism operates with analysis of the underlying problems as form parameters, which leads to new solutions on each specific problem. (Kleis, p.7; Nielsen, p. 14)

xi.

One of the main advocates of a new pragmatism approach is Rem Koolhaas. Along with his theories and projects from the 1990's, pragmatism became an actual 'paradigm' within architectural discussions. However, new pragmatism is not to be understood as a particular architectural style, but more an approach and a method of perceiving and operating within the contemporary city. Rem Koolhaas has been an inspiration to many architects and theorists over the years and his thoughts have been modified into many different planning approaches. James Corner is one of these, as he uses many projects of Rem Koolhaas as an inspiration for new projects and thoughts.

The term '*new pragmatism*' derives from the classical pragmatism formulated by the American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce in the late nineteenth century. It came to fruition in the early twentieth-century philosophies of William James and John Dewey. Their attempts to reconcile the rationalism's interests for principle (what *should be*) and the empiricism's interests for proven facts (what *is*) are fundamental for the contemporary way of thinking within pragmatism.
The epistemology of pragmatism settles with metaphysical ideals concerning understanding as something that can be acknowledged independently of observations, as the approach challenges the assumption that knowledge and operation are two separated spheres. Accordingly, pragmatism invalidates ideologies and theories of the future by instead focusing on what is here and now; '*Things in the making*' as William James formulates it. The pragmatic approach contains a fundamental principle that a theory about knowledge (how things should be) only is valid if it has consequences – if it makes a difference. If an idea or a theory does not have any effect, it is from a pragmatic view not real. (Nielsen; Mortensen, pp. 123 - 124)
This understanding of the world becomes relevant in the contemporary world of unpredictability and constant changeability, why architects such as Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown already in the 1970's bring this way of thinking into life within architecture. With their studies in Learning from Las Vegas they are some of the first architects who operate within the field of pragmatism. While the critique of modernism often resulted in historical architecture and centralised pre-modern cities with basis on ideals and principles, Venturi and Scott Brown took starting point in the specific solution based on individual desires and needs of the users. (Nielsen) Both are positive for the pragmatic ideas formalised by Charles Sanders Peirce, especially because it is anti-ideological, and states that the 'world' cannot wait for the architects' completion of utopia. The most important business for the

architects should be not to worry about what should be, but instead of what already is – and how to immediately improve this. They state that this is a more humble role for the architect that the modernists would accept; but artistically it is more promising.

It was not until Rem Koolhaas in the 1990's re-actualised the approach started by Venturi and Scott Brown that pragmatism became an actual 'paradigm' within architectural discourse. With his theoretical works the pragmatic term was developed into a position. (Nielsen)

The American philosopher John Rajchman was in 1997 the first to formulate the term 'new pragmatism' as a notion with roots in the classical pragmatic ideas but based on the realisation that the classical pragmatism no longer could embrace the new conditions with a dynamic and unpredictable future. (Nielsen, Rajchman, pp. 212 - 213) New pragmatism primarily operates within the same field as the classical pragmatism, but as pragmatism responds statically to alteration and unpredictability, new pragmatism seeks to incorporate these tendencies. Rajchman described new pragmatism as concerning the forces that operate within the urban realm as unpredictable, but as forces which we can articulate and experiment with as "things in making". "*It is about forces that we can't predict, with which we can only experiment. It supposes a relation to a future that we can neither program nor project. – About what William James once called 'Things in the making'* ". (Rajchman, p. 212)

Thus Rajchman places architectural discourse in a new category of pragmatism where architecture gets a more active role in development of the society by designing the physical framework for the unpredictable needs of the society. Hereby architecture is no longer an active physical construction but also an active social, ecological and mental construction

The methods within new pragmatism are based on Rajchman's definition of the term as "*a pragmatism of diagram and diagnosis*". (Rajchman, p. 212) New pragmatic strategies take, with diagnostic methods, the existing city as their starting point, and are open for the changeability of the city. These methods hereby replace the cognitive modernistic approach which seems to be condemned to failure as it does not *diagnose* the city – it does not take starting point in the actual conditions of the city but instead predicts the city as a constant territory with permanent functions and a predictable progressive act. There is no assumption of truth or positivist methodology; instead, the pragmatic planner reveals new possibilities latent in a given field simply by framing the issues differently.

New pragmatists diagnose the existing conditions and operationalise the collection of numbers, quantities, facts and pure data. By describing these in diagrams they become form parameters in relation to a specific design. The term 'diagram' thus gets a new meaning within new pragmatism as something that can function as an active, operational tool rather than just a passive, graphic presentation of already known conditions. (Rajchman, pp. 215 - 217)

The diagram is thus the architect's tool - an operational method which pragmatically handles the situations that occur in the contemporary, changeable city. The diagram is an open plan, working with all the complex layers of the contemporary city, not programmed or predetermined, but with space for transformation and unpredictability; a plan that visualizes the real world as dynamic and constantly producing new unpredictable opportunities.

COMPARATIVE STUDY

In this comparison the distinctions between the three approaches of landscape urbanism, network city and new pragmatism are revealed, indicating a new attitude towards working more processually and dynamically in the attempts to integrate the complexity of the contemporary city. Thus in all three approaches we witness a shift from a dualistic philosophy to that of world complexity, from a figure-ground media to an ecological media and from static to dynamic open-ended planning, and a discussion of these themes will cast light on the potentials that each of the approaches holds and how they can supplement each other.

PHILOSOPHY OF WORLD COMPLEXITY

In regard to their perception of the world, all three approaches recognizes the complexity of the contemporary city as a system of interrelated dynamic forces and do away with the previous dualistic conceptions of the world into centre-periphery, city-countryside or urban-suburban. They all merge these concepts in favour of viewing the contemporary city as a place of change, unpredictability and potentials.

Their approaches are similar as they all try to do away with traditional dichotomies in their world perception, although evolving around different parameters.
The network city approaches puts great focus on the acknowledging the dynamics of global and local flows and merging these into a combined system. Globalisation therefore becomes a key concept here.
New pragmatism concentrates around the dynamics of the layers constituting the contemporary city, not only defining them as part of an overall network, but also as possible pieces to be set into play. This often revolves around a quite programmatic approach where architecture is almost defines through programmatic organisation, and thus architecture and programmes merge.
Landscape urbanism views the world as an ecological surface, containing and absorbing the different layers, immaterial and material flows of the contemporary city, signalizing that the points and lines are just some of the factors, which constitute the contemporary city. Of importance here is especially the merging of nature and culture into one coherent system that are interdependent of each other.

ECOLOGICAL DESIGN MEDIA

Seemingly, all three approaches evolve around the notion of *ecology*, albeit in a variation of ways.
The Network City approach describes the world as an ecosystem of competing networks. The landscape urbanism approach seems to expand this definition of an ecosystem by perceiving the world as a thick living mat of accumulated patches and layered systems, thus including the 'networks' of biology and nature into their perception. Here they operate with the term 'processes' to signify this, and these processes can be social or physical, natural or cultural. New Pragmatism recognises the complexity of different operative layers and dynamics of the contemporary city, but the approach does not use the exact term ecology to describe their philosophy. However, its notions can be elaborated into an ecological system of different influential layers with regard to especially programmes.

These different ecologies are also linked to their perception of landscape and architecture, i.e. the design media, which is the aspect in which the three approaches seem to vary the most.
The Network city approach concentrates around the dynamics of material and

immaterial networks, where the points and lines of the network are in focus, as they signalize the flows and the hubs of the contemporary city. For the network city, architecture is hubs of embedded programme and material and immaterial flows. Here architecture can be seen as points in the overall network. The landscape, however, does not even seem to be present here, which probably is due to the focus on globalisation and its influence on the urban fabric, where landscape neither presents points or lines in the global network.

New pragmatism acknowledges landscape as analogous to architecture with its diagrammatic nature, and landscape is here viewed as a space and identity generator. Architecture is thus a diagram, or a diagram that is constructed. The composition of different influenced layers is the generator of the physical shape of the architecture, which becomes the media through which the diagram is brought to life.

For landscape urbanism, architecture is thus a landscape of accumulated layers, thus joining bridge between landscape and urbanism, which in a broad sense integrates the dynamics at play in the network city and new pragmatism. But in contrary to the other approaches, landscape urbanism views landscape as a dynamic process just as complex and dynamic as cities and even boosts it by using the lens of landscape to define the contemporary city as landscape with the ability to absorb changes over time, both programmatic, infrastructural and natural changes. In this way the traditional views of landscape, architecture and the city are elaborated into a total concept of landscape, which once and all moves away from the dualistic view of nature versus city.

PLANNING

As a result, all three approaches also have their views on the art of planning and the process this entails. They all put focus on the importance of interdisciplinarity in order to incorporate the complexity of the world. Planning is no longer about the architect acting as a heroic master and designer of fixed masterplans and should no longer be viewed as the sole discipline of creating the physical shape of cities. This not only encourages interdisciplinary teams and drawing on expert knowledge, but also questions the role of the architect in itself. If the architect is also to act as an informer or organizer, the goal of the development is not only focused on a design proposal, but also procedures that must be undergone on the way, e.g. political and participatory processes.

Thus the three approaches also present an attitude towards process oriented planning - again in slightly different ways. The network city represents the integration of networks, constituted of points and lines, with an architecture or urban planning which involves flows and the connection between the local and the global parts of the network, indicating the importance of keeping the network society intact. In planning, the network city will therefore typically put focus on strong identity and branding strategies and attempt to link local programmes to global market tendencies as a means of connecting the two scales, e.g. by using local potentials as a catalyst for the experience economy, thereby linking the place to the global network.

New pragmatism works processually by using statistical and empirical facts actively to stimulate existing potentials with the aim of creating new futures, programmatic collisions and hybrids, thus working with the unpredictability of our cities.

Landscape urbanism also operates with a sort of open-ended, perhaps taking this even further by engaging natural ecology and biological processes, which for a fact are unpredictable. This involves the design proposal having a degree of adaptability incorporated, where the different processes have an effect on the design, which may change over time. For landscape urbanism, change is thus an intentional part of the design.

EVOLUTION OF PLANNING IDEALS

Landscape urbanism, as with other contemporary approaches, is a progression from preceding planning approaches and may at times seem like an opposition against these past approaches, due to the fact that the arrival of new approaches is often based in a critique of past approaches. Here the perception and practice of landscape urbanism stands in great contrast to the modernistic planning approaches from which it has evolved. A historical perspective on the evolution of planning ideals from modernism to cotemporary approaches give an insight into how contemporary planning ideals spring from modernism itself, and although they seem to contrast on many points, they also share certain understandings.

FROM THE MODERN TO THE CONTEMPORARY

Modernism was a trend of thought which embraced change and the new, therefore rejecting historical styles and tradition as a basis for architectural form and instead adopting the requirements of materials, functions and technology as design parameters. Architects and designers such as Le Corbusier, Walter Gropius and Mies van der Rohe brought modernist ideas into everyday urban life. Le Corbusier thought that building should function as "*machines for living in*", analogous to cars which he saw as machines for traveling in. These modernistic architects were rejecting historical styles and tradition as a basis for architectural form and instead adopting the requirements of materials, functions and technology as design parameters. Modernism thereby also adopted a "machine aesthetic", where beauty was found in the design that worked according to its function. (Tietz, pp. 66 – 67)

In Danish planning, modernism equalled functionalism and rationalism and planners sought to design cities as efficient machines, which are seen in the zoning principles and standardised dwelling typologies resulting from mass production. The modernist city plans aimed at separating functions in the city and creating a hierarchical traffic system that could separate the different transportation types. The city would no longer be clearly demarcated from the landscape – instead large green areas were drawn into the city as common areas that could offer fresh air and sunlight to the citizens. (Tietz, pp. 66 – 67) As such modernism brought forth a planning tradition in Denmark with the functional demarcation of urban functions within the city and landscape.
However, towards its end modernism was strongly criticised for focusing only on the large scale and technological rationality while neglecting local identity, public spaces and social relations. It was claimed that no real urbanism could grow from modernistic planning which sparked a longing for the vitality and mixed functions of the historical city and its components. (www.dac.dk; Tietz, pp. 66 – 67)

As a reaction to modernism, the post-modern movement was a rejection of modernistic planning and the lack of experience and aesthetic within the city. Instead post-modernism proposes an architectural stance based on traditional values and the historical city, aiming at outlining principles for the beautiful and eventful design.
A concrete example of post-modernistic planning, which is still applied today, is the *new urbanism* movement. New Urbanism is an urban planning movement that arose in the 1980's in America. The movement is a reaction to the problems surrounding urban sprawl, suburban development and traffic congestion by using planning and architectural principles to create human-scale walkable communities, celebrating the slowness of the old historical cities, creating an environment far from the dynamic and complex reality. Also known as traditional neighbourhood design, new urbanists therefore suggest a planning approach for the contemporary city that focuses on pedestrian friendly communities with a diverse range of housing and jobs, thereby encouraging mixed use. Many new residential communities in America are beginning to follow new urbanist principles and more than 600 new towns or neighbourhoods in the U.S. are currently planned or under construction.

Examples of new urbanist neighbourhoods are Seaside and Disney's Celebration, both located in Florida. Both of these towns have become internationally famous and are visited each year by masses of tourists. New urbanist notions can also be recognised in a Danish context, where the urban development of Høje Taastrup applies many of the same principles. (www.cnu.org)

New urbanism can be seen as a post-modernist movement in its rejection of modernist ideals and a search for the traditional "European" city model as promoted by Leon Krier, who has had great influence on the new urbanist ambition. However, this resort to the classical city is also criticised by many for simply being another type of sprawl due to the fact that most of the planned projects are built on previously open space. Environmentalist claim that new urbanism is nothing more than conventional sprawl dressed up with superficial traditional styles - sprawl under disguise. In this view, new urbanism is not at all sustainable as it still relies on the automobile for transport and supports the single family housing market. (www.wikipedia.dk)

Thus post-modernism can be described as a purely architectural response not answering to greater planning questions or world perceptions. Not until the 1980's and 1990's did planning truly begin to break with modernism and its dualistic perception of the world, and planning tendencies began to integrate the complexity of the contemporary city by working in more processual and dynamic ways, resulting in a new 'urbanism of our time'. This paradigm shift marks the emergence of positions such as landscape urbanism.

THE RISE OF LANDSCAPE URBANISM

Through a presentation of two projects from the 1930's and 40's, Charles Waldheim accounts the early emergence of an 'organic urbanism' which can be seen as early versions of landscape urbanist principles. His account here becomes the basis for a brief look into the rise of this organic way of thinking – the rise of landscape urbanism.

The emergence of the semi-urban phenomenon was in fact predicted as early as 1902 by the English writer H. G. Wells in his book Anticipations, signalized in the sentence "*these coming cities will not be, old sense, cities at all; they will present a new and entirely different phase of human distribution*." (Sieverts 2003, p. vii) He continues "*the city will diffuse itself until it has taken up considerable areas and many of the characteristics, the greenness, the fresh air, of what is now country, (and this) leads us to suppose also that the country will take to itself many of the qualities of the city. The old antithesis will indeed cease, the boundary lines will altogether disappear; it will become, indeed, merely a question of more or less populous*." (Sieverts 2003, p. vii) Here Wells is very close to describing the exact condition of the contemporary urban structures. It is remarkable that this prediction is prophesied in a time where most cities were still highly compact and created a clear distinction between country and city.

In the same way, two theoretical projects from the mid 20th century, Frank Lloyd Wright´s Broadacre city (1934-35) and Ludwig Hilberseimer's New Regional Pattern (1945-49), were ahead of their time by advocating an organic urbanism for the midsection of North America. Both Wright and Hilberseimer aimed towards an organic urban form appropriate to the North American context. While Broadacre City and The New Regional Pattern were produced a decade apart by very different architects, both foretell the decentralization of American urban form that was to come and the present-day interest in landscape urbanism.

These projects advocated a dissolution of the dichotomy that opposed nature and culture. Both projects proposed a radical decentralization and dissolution of the traditional urban figure by reversing buildings, avenues, squares etc. into landscape. The dissolution of figure into field rendered the classical distinction between city and nature irrelevant, and was thus replaced with a suburbanized regionalism. Wright's and Hilberseimer's projects were hence very foresighted in proposing a new approach to the planning of the contemporary city and in portending the future decentralization of cities by dissolving the fundamental

distinctions between city and countryside, village and farmland and "urbanism and landscape" into the third term of landscape urbanism. (Waldheim 2007, p. 293) Both Broadacre City and the New Regional Pattern offer new ways of responding to the negative impact of the industrialized city with its economic injustice, social pathologies and unhealthy conditions, by advocating a meaningful relationship between work, family, food and civic life. Characteristic of both projects are the reduced role of architecture as the medium for structuring the conditions between extant natural environments and engineered infrastructural systems, which redefined the role of landscape in the organic ordering of public and private space. The definition of landscape is by Wright and Hilberseimer interpreted to involve more than just a beautiful picture or an environmental issue. Introducing a broad concept of landscape makes it able to work across scales, rendering the relationship between larger regional environments and social conditions visible. Especially the conception of public life is evident in the interpretation of landscape, where the public landscape for Wright is the productive agricultural land, and according to Hilberseimer, the public landscape is generated through occupied and programmed parklands. Each of the two projects points towards the contemporary approach and practice of landscape urbanism as they inflect local conditions such as individual dwelling and the public realm of infrastructures toward a set of relationships with the natural world. (Waldheim 2007, p. 301 - 302) Additionally, both Wright and Hilberseimer reveal the significance of representations such as maps, plans, diagrams and aerial views as tools to understand large-scale relationships across urbanized areas – tools which are now highly used in the landscape urbanism discipline with the aim of decoding project sites. Here the diagram casts light on planometric aspects of multiple media, hereby visualizing normally imperceptible relationships across scale and between ecological and infrastructural systems. (Waldheim 2007, pp. 302) However, both projects are still limited in their resemblance to landscape urbanism, significantly in processual ways of thinking which we see in contemporary urbanism. Neither Broadacre City nor New Regional Pattern incorporated the pace of social, cultural or technological change that are characteristic of the contemporary city, and the projects do not have the ability to absorb changes over time. Another aspect is the absence of ecological thinking, which only is dealt with in a simple and diagrammatic way. (Waldheim 2007, pp. 302 - 303)

The two projects shed light on the contemporary practice of landscape urbanism, where it is clear that they have helped towards shaping a new perception of landscape. They have in this aspect formed the practice by initiating a landscape approach to the planning of the contemporary city.