

Zeitschrift: Trans : Publikationsreihe des Fachvereins der Studierenden am
Departement Architektur der ETH Zürich

Herausgeber: Departement Architektur der ETH Zürich

Band: - (2000)

Heft: 6

Artikel: Trans-plant : landscape as human nature

Autor: Girot, Christophe

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-919116>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 11.07.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Trans-Plant

Landscape as Human Nature

"Nature knows nothing about what we name Landscape"
Mels Van Zutphen1

HUMAN NATURE

What is the part of man and what is the part of nature in a garden? It is rather difficult to answer such a question without sinking into muddy philosophical polemics about the degree of human intervention in nature and its aesthetic grounding. Landscape architecture is a recent activity, born out of the Industrial Revolution, which is specific to our culture. Landscape is meant to symbolise a human relationship towards nature, rather than nature itself. It encompasses the *a priori* idea and practice of nature which is already inherent to any culture. When I say culture, I mean Western culture, where both the local and the global coexist, and where specific identity in a landscape results essentially from a balance between these two realms.

We are at an epoch where landscape authenticity has a price. But the idea of authenticity should not be misconstrued and transformed into a systematic bastion of nostalgia against any change in the present. Authenticity is also the result of a particular balance between custom and change, between tradition and innovation. Landscape is, therefore, about a deeply human form of nature, a nature, which results from our very own selections and convictions. Landscape is literally the imprint of a culture on its immediate surroundings, through a selective spectrum of choices and inclinations. It is also about nature transplanted into our everyday realm. We are the landscape's naturalists, agronomists, architects and artists each with our own goals and limitations, seeking through some fragment, to speak about a greater whole.

"As a modern invention, landscape does not exist in and of itself. In spite of that, it becomes meaningful through ourselves, which contemplate it, and the deep exaltation that is felt comes from the powerful and confused sensation that we are making it happen. For us, landscape is a constructed object, shaped by a controlled operation of the senses, a fragile emotional concretion, a fleeting consciousness deeply internalized which, however, could almost be the simmering memory of one's

*own native place. It is fiction, and it questions the relationship of man to the earthly realm. Of this landscape which I admire, I am the predator. It has come into being as dreams do, and as such, subsists from now on in the words that I use to evoke it. Therefore, landscape does not distinguish itself from a subject to which it necessarily refers. Hence its ambiguity..."*²

The Swiss historian Paul Zumthor argues that landscape is and has always been a deeply human construct. If that is true, what are the implications of such an understanding on the choice and practice of landscape design? Landscape is an aesthetic construct based on the apprehension of nature by a given individual, within a given culture at a given time in history. Unlike architecture, landscape does not refer to the object, but rather to the subject and its surroundings. Therefore, it is not a closed system, but an open system with diffuse spatial, temporal and cultural implications. One could almost say that landscape architecture, more than any other field of design, tends towards the fourth dimension within a complex alchemy of space, time and life. In this instance, landscape whether ecological or not, should be primarily thought of as a form of natural growth, man made and man maintained, which envelops and sometimes organises objects within a city. Whether it is the city and its edge or the open country and its villages, landscape encompasses a variety of realms where the extent of time and its cycles becomes just as important as space. What are the methods and tools at our disposal which translate time and evolution into pertinent design thinking? The unending natural processes of sedimentation, growth, fragmentation and destruction orchestrated by man, are also inherent to landscape thinking. Without playing on words, I would argue that landscape is first and foremost the result of a contradictory attraction to nature, a deeply human nature, where attachment to place is more often than not confronted with displacement, where layering and memory often attempt to fight inevitable transplantation and change. What if this friction between past and future states was recognised as the heart of the operating field of landscape architecture? Paul Virilio in his writings on landscape takes us out of the visual realm, into the realm of time – a time which



is fully understood and somewhat masterminded by man himself:

*"Everybody agrees to say that the 'components' of our natural environment compose and combine relative durations which man has learned to perceive and master over time: seasonal periods, cyclical systems, specific durations, etc."*³

What if landscapes were simply the permanent theater of change? Whether induced by nature or by man, whether voluntary or involuntary, whether soft or violent, this idea challenges the concept of immutable stability in nature - an almost static image of landscape that we have inherited from both the French Baroque and English Picturesque traditions. Recent natural upheavals like the Lothar storm of December 26th 1999 in Western Europe, have shown how nature can completely annihilate entire stretches of landscapes in a matter of hours. The mangled groves of trees become the symbol of a lost humanity and order in the landscape. Should we blindly accept this storm as a heavenly fatality, or seek to restore the damaged landscapes back to the image of what they once were? Is this not the opportunity to question and challenge old landscape ideals in light of a natural evolution for which we are still not quite prepared? This opens up questions about our cultural hang-ups concerning sudden environmental change; ironically we tend to accept more readily the brutality of human change on nature, than the brutality of natural change on the landscape. In the latter case there is a sudden loss of control which we would like to avoid altogether, and whether we want it or not, our landscapes always reflect a specific degree of human control over nature. Even the wildest natural parks like Yosemite in California, are the result of a very precise aesthetic control of man upon nature's portrayal; Simon Shama illustrates this point most eloquently:

*"...Even the landscapes that we suppose to be most free of our culture may turn out, on closer inspection, to be its product...Would we rather that Yosemite, for all its overpopulation and over representation, had never been identified, mapped, emarked? The brilliant meadow-floor, which suggested to its first eulogists a pristine Eden was in fact the result of regular fire-clearances by its Ahwahneechee Indian occupants. So while we acknowledge (as we must) that the impact of humanity on the earth's ecology has not been an unmixed blessing, neither has the long relationship between nature and culture been an unrelieved and predetermined calamity. At the very least, it seems right to acknowledge that it is our shaping perception that makes the difference between raw matter and landscape."*⁴

The French philosopher Alain Roger would argue that landscape is a pure invention of 18th Century aesthetic theory. In this context, our understanding of nature is not scientifically based, but rather individual and artistically based. Roger refers more specifically to the lost Arcadian emblems of the Golden Age as part of our fundamental heritage. It is important to understand the roots and the cultural grounding of our own landscape thinking. Landscape always conveys the cultural value of nature along coded lines. Whether it be through praise of the outstanding, or neglect of the banal, these coded lines in turn reflect a set of given attitudes about our environment. Never has landscape been as human and unnatural as it is today. What has changed is not so much the natural stuff itself - a tree is still a tree with its specific form and development, but the way we as individuals look at it, and integrate it in our daily lives. Similarly to Paul Zumthor, the French Writer Michel Collot explicits the fact that landscape is an incredibly subjective construct centered on the individual rather than on the object:

*"Landscape is not a pure object in front of which the subject can situate himself in a relationship of exteriority, it reveals itself in an experience where both subject and object are inseparable; not only because the spatial object is constituted by the subject, but also because the subject in turn is englobed by space... After all, the world is all around me, not just in front of me."*⁶

This statement confirms nature rather as a tool of the mind than as a gift from the heavens. This point is of particular interest to us because, it leaves open the possibility to question and inflect the current grounding of landscape aesthetics and ecological design aesthetics which still rely heavily on an Arcadian model dating back to the 18th Century. I would hope that in our day and age, we would be able to move towards a more original and genuine search for meaning in the landscape. Ever since the Romantic Period, landscape has been used as the aesthetic counterpoint to science and reason. André Corboz would even go further in insisting that during the 19th Century:

*"The hypertrophy of Reason was matched by a hypertrophy of Sentiment. Those who worked to instrumentalize science with the goal of achieving even more effective control over the land were opposed by those who sought to create an intersubjective relationship with nature."*⁷

Landscape is, therefore, a deeply emotional form of nature. It results from a mix of societal practices and beliefs about nature, which in turn yield a particular kind of space called the park, the promenade or the garden. In this instance landscape becomes the emotional transplant of man's relationship to nature.

LANDSCAPE NATURE

Today everybody is worried about the systematic devastation of the environment by urban development, agriculture, industry and more generally globalisation. Modern dwellers see in landscape a sublime palliative for all these ills. And this is precisely where ecological doctrine applied to landscape design becomes all too often misconstrued. Ecology is much too serious a subject to be taken lightly. Like many other scientific fields, it needs to reach a systemic level to become really operative. Ecology needs a "field" with a critical size and mass, it needs continuity both in time and in space, to allow for the seral stages of succession to take place effectively. The ecological "style" transposed directly to some limited urban fragment without congruent links to a broader biotic realm, remains more often than not completely inconsequential. This is why the current campaign in some European cities, to replace certain "foreign" plants with better "native" plants under some pretence of ecology, is so seditious and dishonest. The goal in such a case is probably much more ideological than strictly ecological, since it plays on the deep chord of popular identity through nature, rather than on some really effective urban ecosystem taking into account land, air, water and biotic resources.

There are regions in Europe, where people under the pretence of ecology, are trying to eradicate such harmless plants as common lilac, a plant which by the way has been with us since the earliest Antiquity. Despite its very ancient presence and significance in our culture, lilac has been identified as an exogenous plant that is detrimental to the European environment. Ecological dogmatists want to replace it with indigenous varieties of shrubs that are supposed to belong here. The negation of certain plants in favour of others is not a new phenomenon in and of itself. Each period in history has favoured the use of certain plant materials over others. The newness here is this self-righteous will to eradicate "foreign" plants under some pretence of ecology. The return to a purely native environment is completely utopian, and to say the least, totally contradictory with the entire evolution of Western civilisation. Such native environments have probably existed only in the most remote times, between the time of the dinosaurs and the last ice age of the mammoths. Just recently, researchers in France discovered termites in bits of amber at Creil on the river Oise. The 50 million-year-old specimen of termite is now completely extinct in Europe, but can still be found alive in Australia. Mankind has evolved and moved around countless times and it has always carried seeds together with the wind and other animals from one place to the next. Landscape has, therefore, always been a place of continual exchange. The ayatolas of ecology should think twice before applying such heretic models of environmental exclusion to the urban landscapes of today. For instance more than half of our trees, and particularly fruiting and flowering trees, come from Asia, and more specifically China. And if one were really to implement such a return to "original" landscapes, one should be a little more systematic, and do away for instance with an herbaceous specimen brought in from the Middle East two thousand years ago, which has gradually invaded our countryside, namely wheat. The same logic could be applied to thousands of domestic plants, with social and ecological consequences, which we obviously can't imagine. Even *Vitis vinifera*, the common grapevine would, in this case, have to be completely removed from the Atlantic coastal vineyards of Bordeaux, since the plant is only a true native of the Mediterranean. Thus depriving humanity of some of its most delicate clarets. To drive my point further here is a quote by Simon Shama, which sums it all up:

*"Objectively, of course, the various ecosystems that sustain life on the planet proceed independently of human agency, just as they operated before the hectic ascendancy of Homo sapiens. But it is also true that it is difficult to think of a single such natural system that has not, for better or for worse, been substantially modified by human culture. Nor is this simply the work of the industrial centuries. It has been happening since the days of ancient Mesopotamia. It is coeval with writing, with the entirety of our social existence. And it is this irreversibly modified world, from the polar caps to the equatorial forests, that is all the nature that we have."*⁸

Landscape is a process of organised transplant or fortuitous manipulation. Local identity through landscape must and can be achieved in a variety of ways, and I would advocate the broadest possible diversity in plant choice irrespective of their origins. Therefore, the real limits are simply those of natural adaptation. For instance, what would the Côte d'Azur and the town of Nice be without its famous mimosa? The mimosa which has spread endemically across the coastal hillsides of the French Riviera, has come to symbolise a whole way of life. The shrubs bloom a golden yellow haze in the heart of the French winter. Mimosa originates from the Southern Hemisphere and more particularly Australia. No one on the Côte d'Azur would think of these plants as Australian intruders, because mimosa has become such a vital part of their local identity. And what if landscape had more to do with the taming and domestication of certain plants, no matter where they come from? One remarkable example of such a process is the Gleisdreieck experiment in Berlin. The old railway yard located south of the Potsdamer Platz, was completely abandoned at the end of World War II. The place was meant to become an example of applied urban ecology, where native vegetation could grow spontaneously through different stages of succession without the intervention of man. The surprise was immense when researchers recently discovered that an important share of the spontaneous plants growing there were not native to the Brandenburg region, but came from as far away as the Caucasus... The thousands of trains stationed there for decades had simply become the modern vectors of innumerable seeds... Whether voluntary or not, the choice of landscape always ends up being a human choice. Whatever the decision, be it even that of ecological *laisser-faire*, it will inevitably imply changes in the landscape that we are accustomed to.

In Germany the influence of the Dutch *laisser-faire* ecologist Louis Le Roy became predominant in 1970's and 1980's landscape architectural circles. The dogma of deductive analysis and *laisser-faire* implementation became so absolute that it almost decimated the profession of landscape design in Germany altogether. This situation is not unlike that which happened in the U.S.A. around the ecological theories of Ian McHarg at about the same time and on which Marc Treib comments here:


"The McHargian view was focused to the point of being exclusive, confusing and conflating two rather different arenas of landscape intervention. To be sure, it would be fatuous, if not dangerous, to manage a region without thorough analytical investigation; viable design begins with the study of natural parameters. But the planning process rarely requires the active form-making and innovation that is central to landscape architecture. Reams of analytical overlays might establish criteria for making a suburban garden, but they can hardly provide the actual design. McHarg's method insinuated that if the process were correct, the consequent form would be good, almost as if objective study automatically gave rise to an appropriate aesthetic. In response to his strong personality and ideas, landscape architects jum-

*ped aboard the ecological train, becoming analysts rather than creators, and the conscious making of form and space in the landscape subsequently came to a screeching halt."*⁹

It is precisely through the absence of articulation between a subjective and creative appreciation of a given situation and the formulaic answer given by ecological methods, that there remains a dangerous rift. In no instance can the individual interpretation of a landscape be substituted by an objective, albeit scientific method of analysis. Such a confusion of genres leads inevitably to inappropriate design choices, and points out the exclusive limitations of a universal method of ecological design.

In reaction to ecological orthodoxy in Germany, a series of events and publications in the 1990's gradually put environmental questions into perspective. In fact it brought the question of man's relationship to nature back to the heart of the debate. The conference entitled *Choreographie des Öffentlichen Raumes*, organised by Prof. H. Hallman and Prof. J. Wenzel in Berlin in 1991, asked the simple question of how to design public open space in Berlin in light of the recent German reunification. In such a complex social and political context, landscape ecology with its infallible answering method could hardly respond to all the unanswered questions, nor could it suffice as an all-encompassing environmental design method for this particular city. There were so many unanswered questions in Berlin concerning, for instance, the place of memory versus new identity that it was urgent for landscape architects to understand the real questions at hand and to define new orientations urgently. One of the main trends in this new orientation was the fusion of art and landscape design together with ecological thinking. In a recent book examining the relationship between landscape architecture and land art, Udo Weilacher makes a most convincing plaidoyer to reunite landscape design and ecology by proposing a stronger artistic and cultural vision of nature focused on...man.

*"One of the main issues of our age is the disturbed relationship of man to nature and the ensuing worldwide threat to ecological balance. Our society is still seeking a technological solution to a crisis generated by this same technology. The realisation that the crisis facing the environment is being caused by man, who is not just a 'factor' to be predicted by rational means and researched by science, but is also a being perceiving through his senses and often acting intuitively, is only very gradually gaining acceptance. It is slowly being acknowledged that using scientific objectivity to research the causes of growing destruction of our environment will be of scant avail unless accompanied by efforts to ensure that the established findings can also be understood and experienced subjectively. Ultimately, the question as to whether we can overcome ecological and social crisis is primarily a question of human behaviour."*¹⁰



I would advocate that it is rather the cultural handling of a plant, than its precise geographic origin, which really matters in the end. The appearance of the *Cedrela sinensis* on the Paris boulevards at the end of the 19th Century is a notable case in point. This tree named and imported from China into France by the great French botanist Jussieu, has undergone severe structural pruning, as only French plantsmen know how to inflict. Through successive cuttings over decades, the street tree has acquired a very specific architecture, which makes it stand out as one of the saddest and most contorted of trees against the Parisian winter skies. The twisted branches form zigzagging loops, which remind me somewhat of the tortured ink quill drawings of bare trees by Vincent Van Gogh. These Parisian trees are very expressive, and have probably nothing to do with the plant's original shape in its native Chinese habitat. When one walks up the avenue des Gobelins, the trees dance in a tangle of strange angular forms against the southern sky, and their silhouette embraces the emphatic deconstructivist tower of the Kenzo Tange multiplex that stands across the Place d'Italie. This notable tree silhouette has become an integral part of Paris landscape identity, an identity, which has been obtained through the specific, some would even say outrageous, cultural appropriation of a plant.

Cultural appropriation does not only belong to the plant world; there is also the climate, the light, the rain, the snow, which all have a deep effect on our perception of landscapes. During my inaugural speech for the Dieter Kienast exhibition in Zurich last December, I mentioned the importance of the foggy Zurich climate in his work. There are in fact two Switzerlands, one above the cloud mass in direct contact with the sunny blue heavens and the ever-white snow crests, and the other under an almost permanent shroud of fog, where the distance between things is really measurable in subtle scales of grey. Having seen this, I now understand much better the refined grey drawings of Dieter Kienast and the profound sense of space and spiritual emptiness in his projects. The distance between objects, which I never completely understood in his work before, was probably the direct result of this fog and the specific space, which it generates. One can witness the extraordinary subtlety of these 'grey' projects in Mark Schwarz's remarkable video entitled *Lob der Sinnlichkeit* on Dieter Kienast's

gardens. We are indeed all in quest of a more sensuous and emotional materiality to express our frail passage upon earth. And there are temporal dimensions in nature which sometimes surprise us and stop us along our way. Such moments often enhance a deep sense of belonging. In this instance, I would argue that landscape is not just a palimpsest; an accumulation of past and present traces rooted in the ground as André Corboz sees it.¹¹ Landscape can also be the recipient of ephemeral moments, visions and understandings. It can simply become food for thought. One of the most beautiful examples of liberated poetic thinking about landscape probably belongs to Gilbert Durand, who wrote a magnificent essay entitled the *Psychoanalysis of Snow*:

*"For us alpine folk, snow is always present and for that fact essential, since the essence, as explained in a phenomenology of the first instance, is the 'always' of what lasts. In the summer it only recedes without ever disappearing. It is 'perpetual snow' clinging to some névé during the blazing summer heat. From the onset of November, it infiltrates our life in blooms of frost. November is the springtime of snow, but January is its summer with an overabundance of frozen fruitions. Then comes the apotheosis and outburst until Mardi gras, with yet again the slow ebb and reascent up the peaks, leaving to the earth and to terrestrial life four to five months of respite. Snow is like a sea, which rolls in a slow annual and equinoctial tide, abandoning on some black and green beaches the stars of the edelweiss, and some earthly anemones. It holds, therefore, for us the eternal presence of matter, just like the earth, the air, the water and the fire."*¹²

HUMAN LANDSCAPE

I believe that we are at the beginning of another period in landscape design, which still has not established its bearings. It is about reinventing the urban landscape and adapting nature to the needs of future generations. But landscape architecture is in fact very poorly adapted to short term thinking, for it has all the inertia of nature behind it to push slowly towards specific goals. It is probably one of the only professions today capable of speaking about the long term concretely. This natural inertia makes landscape extremely vulnerable to sudden change.



The nature aesthetic of the future will have to contend with the fundamental questions of environmental transformation, in order to challenge the deeply rooted myth of a natural status quo. The myth of a static nature means that landscape architecture has often been understood more as a conservative doctrine, than as a dynamic field capable of generating new relationships within our living environment. This conservative attitude in fact forgets that it is often protecting older landscape models, which in their time were quite innovative.

It is often interesting to look at the artistic world for new forms of landscape representations, not only in the field of land art but also in the field of landscape perception. Such representations may in turn influence the way we operate. The American abstract impressionist painter Arshile Gorky found his inspiration late in life, in his father's garden in Sochi. The exploratory work, which he produced there, was liberated from any reference to conventional spatial landscape, as we know it; it is really an extremely personal, colourful and emotional reading of his father's garden. Gorky mixed freely on the same canvas his vision of the garden landscape, with the deepest inner memories of his childhood spent in Armenia. His thoughts collide in loops and bubbles on the surface, creating a dynamic and vibrant universe of their own. The peculiar shapes that occur in his paintings and drawings remind me strangely of the zigzagging shapes of the Cedrela branches against the Paris skies; it seems as if this uprooted man looked at the American

landscape with such distance that he couldn't help but reminisce, mixing in bits of landscapes from his most distant past. This particular attitude in Gorky's work produced an art which was a precursor of today's fragmentation and individualisation of gardens and landscapes. When speaking about Gorky, the American art collector Julian Levy explained:

*"His method consisted in linking all the distances between himself and the objects at an imaginary point; he would raise a matchbox in front of his eyes (literally and not figuratively) and from there he fixed a point which would link everything he had in front of him in spite of the horizon line."*¹³

Perceptual mixity between the landscape and the viewer's memories is best explained by Simon Shama's seminal statement:

*"...And if a child's vision of nature can already be loaded with complicating memories, myths and meanings, how much more elaborately wrought is the frame through which our adult eyes survey the landscape. For although we are accustomed to separate nature and human perception into two realms, they are, in fact, indivisible. Before it can ever be a repose for the senses, landscape is the work of the mind. Its scenery is built up as much from strata of memory as from layers of rock."*¹⁴

The landscape aesthetics that we accept today, and which vary from one culture to the next, are the result of an extremely complex set of constructs, that blend the natural sciences with the arts, the idea of progress with that of permanence, the idea of memory with that of vision. Landscape is first and foremost the product of a humanised form of nature, and I would overtly question the aesthetic limitations that are inherent to our practice, because they are neither adapted nor responding sufficiently to deep changes in our society. General public belief in the canons of 18th Century naturalist aesthetics hinders true landscape design innovation. Our cultural heritage should not prevent us from developing new questions on the place and role of nature in our hyper-modern cities. After all, is landscape solely meant to carry the nostalgic reference of a long lost Arcadian past, or can it adapt to change and engage in dynamic forms of nature for tomorrow?

Landscape is like morality, its needs and uses change roughly with every decade. The two old Cedars of Lebanon standing at the southern entrance of Roissy Airport amidst a tangle of roads and railway lines is a good case in point. This tree was brought to France at the end of the Renaissance, and was often placed as a landmark at the entrance of aristocratic domains. The noble house at Roissy has vanished, but the two trees still stand today, marking the entrance of the airport and the A1 motorway. Despite extremely radical changes in the surrounding landscape and topography, the original function of the two trees prevails amidst an unbelievable palimpsest of zooming cars and trains. Landscape transformation is either voluntary or involuntary. The case of the two trees of Roissy simply demonstrates that the prevalence of belief and taboo reaches even into the most modern engineering circles. The Cedar of Lebanon is considered a sacred tree in France, despite its 'foreign' origins. It is unthinkable to uproot it or cut it down. The Fondation Cartier building by Jean Nouvel in Paris with its boxed-in Cedar of Lebanon is another case in point. Why does the archetypal image of landscape and its sacred trees remain such an immutable icon in people's minds? Probably because we are touching here upon one of the most ancient taboos in Judeo-Christian society concerning the eternal representation of our Eden.

Landscape is the living mirror of our multifaceted and polycultural society. The field ranges from integrated ecological design, where natural environments maintained by man are kept in perpetual balance, to urban landscapes with fun and games, where society can improvise new modes of cultural interaction. To better reflect this modern society, we need to reach rapidly a deeper level of theoretical reflection about the adequate place and form of nature in our cities. Dieter Kienast emphasized this very point in his Ten Theses.¹⁵ I believe that we are still quite far from the innovative design ideas, which Kienast professed in his founding theses but, at least, he has cleared the way ahead for us. Given the cultural inertia surrounding landscape perception and beliefs, new forms of nature will undoubtedly take generations to evolve and adapt. The time is then right for us to think about the next wave in landscape architecture. It is a wave, which will finally allow us to integrate proper ecological thinking with innovative urban, architectural and artistic designs. A wave which will also help reconcile the garden with the most fundamental contradiction of our age, namely that opposing collective tradition with modern individuality.

Christophe Girot ist Professor für Landschaftsarchitektur am ORL Institut der ETH Zürich.



1 Mels Van Zutphen, painter from, Zumthor, Paul ; *La Mesure du Monde*, Seuil 1993, p. 86.

2 « Invention moderne, le paysage n'existe pas en lui même. Pourtant, il fait sens grâce à nous qui le contemplons ; et l'exaltation qui nous saisit alors provient du sentiment puissant et confus que nous avons de le faire être. Le Paysage est pour nous un objet construit, mis en forme par une opération contrôlée des sens : fragile concrétion affective, conscience fugitive mais profondément intériorisée, frémissante peut-être de souvenirs du lieu natal. Il est fiction, et qui remet en cause la relation de l'homme avec le réel terrien. De ce paysage que j'admire je suis le prédateur. Il est survenu comme le font les rêves et, comme ceux-ci, subsiste désormais dans les mots par lequel je l'évoque. Le paysage ne se dissocie donc pas d'un sujet auquel nécessairement il réfère. D'où son ambiguïté... » from Zumthor, Paul, *La Mesure du monde*, ed. Seuil, Paris 1993, pp. 86,87.

3 « Chacun s'accorde à reconnaître que les « composants » de notre environnement naturel composent et combinent des durées relatives que l'homme a depuis longtemps appris à percevoir puis à maîtriser : régime saisonnier, systèmes cycliques, durées spécifiques, etc. » Virilio, Paul ; *Un Paysage d'Événements*, Galilée, Paris 1996, p. 179.

4 Shama, Simon; *Landscape and Memory*, Fontana Press, London 1996, p.p. 9, 10.

5 Roger, Alain; "Histoire d'une passion théorique", *La Théorie du Paysage en France*, Champ Vallon, 1995., p.p 438 – 451.

6 « Le paysage n'est pas un pur objet en face duquel le Sujet pourrait se situer dans une relation d'extériorité, il se révèle dans une expérience où sujet et objet sont inséparables, non seulement parce que l'objet spatial est constitué par le sujet, mais aussi parce que le sujet à son tour s'y trouve englobé par l'espace... Après tout le monde est autour de moi, non devant moi. » Michel Collot

7 Corboz André, *The land as Palimpsest*, Dogenes 123, 1983.

8 Shama, Simon; *Landscape and Memory*, Fontana Press, London 1996

9 Treib, Mark, « Nature Recalled », *Recovering Landscape*, Editor : James Corner, Princeton Architectural Press, New York, 1999, p. 31.

10 « Eines der zentralen Themen unserer Zeit ist das gestörte Verhältnis des Menschen zur Natur, welches das ökologische Gleichgewicht weltweit bedrohlich ins Schwanken gebracht hat. Noch immer sucht unsere Gesellschaft einen technologischen Ausweg aus einer technologisch

verursachen Krise. Nur zögerlich setzt sich die Erkenntnis durch, dass der Mensch als sinnlich wahrnehmendes, häufig intuitiv handelndes Wesen und nicht einfach als rational berechenbarer, wissenschaftlich erforschbarer « Faktor » die Umweltkrise verursacht. Langsam wird erkannt, dass es wenig nutzt, die Ursachen der zunehmenden Zerstörung unseres Lebensraumes mit wissenschaftlicher Objektivität zu erforschen, ohne gleichzeitig darauf hinzuwirken, dass hinlänglich bekannte Forschungsergebnisse auch subjektiv begreifbar und erfahrbar werden. Schliesslich ist die Bewältigung von ökologischen und sozialen Krisen in erster Linie eine Frage des menschlichen Verhaltens. »

Weilacher, Udo ; *Zwischen Landschaftsarchitektur und Land Art*, Birkhäuser, Berlin 1999, p. 9.

11 Corboz, André; *The Land as Palimpsest*, Dogenes 121, 1983.

12 « Pour nous autres, alpins, la neige est toujours présente et par là essentielle, puisque l'essence, dans la phénoménologie de première instance, c'est le « toujours » de ce qui dure. L'été elle ne fait que reculer sans jamais disparaître. Elle est « neige éternelle » accrochée à quelque névé au cœur de la canicule. Dès Novembre, elle s'infiltre dans notre vie en des floraisons de givre. Novembre est le printemps de la neige, mais Janvier en est l'été aux surabondantes fructifications glacées. C'est alors l'apothéose et le déchainement jusqu'à Mardi gras, puis de nouveau le lent reflux et la remontée vers les cimes pour ne laisser à la terre et à la vie terrestre que quatre à cinq mois de répit. La neige est une mer qui ne roulerait qu'une lente marée équinoxiale et annuelle, abandonnant sur des plages noires et vertes les étoiles de l'edelweiss, et les anémones de terre. Elle a donc bien pour nous l'éternelle présence d'une matière, au même titre que la terre, l'air, l'eau et le feu. »

Durand, Gilbert ; *Psychanalyse de la Neige*, ed. Mercure de France I- VIII – 1953, Paris. p. 616.

13 Op. Cit. Michaud, Yves, *Les marges de la Vision*, Critiques d'Arts éd. Jacqueline Chambon, Paris 1996, p.225.

14 Shama, Simon, *Landscape and Memory*, Fontana Press, London 1996, p.p. 6, 7.

15 Kienast, Dieter, *Zehn Thesen zur Landschaftsarchitektur*, DISP 138, ORL/ETHZ, 3/99, p.p. 4 - 6.