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6. Future outlook

6.1 The end of an era?

In September 2008 Lehman Brothers went bankrupt. [1] It took quite a long time before the realisation came that this was by no means a problem exclusive to the financial world.

In that same autumn of 2008 a proposal for this research was prepared. Initially, it focussed on representation only, motivated by a lecture on drawing(s) developed for a series on design methodology at the Amsterdam Academy of Architecture. [2] A second inspiration came from taking part in the Artist in Residency program in 2006 with Krisztina de Chatel, a choreographer whose work has a strong relationship with space and architecture. This collaboration between dance and (landscape) architecture brought the issue of notation to my work. [3] [Fig. 6.1] How far, in comparison to the case of a building, can dance be represented in a drawing, and how do such drawings operate? A third starting point was given by earlier research into the work of Dutch landscape architect Alle Hosper. A publication on his work motivated both an interest in the specificity of landscape architecture as a profession between architecture and urbanism, and in Dutch landscape architecture as a regional culture. [4] Hosper had experienced a diverse range of professional settings since the beginning of his career in 1967. Therefore, his work spans a huge variety of drawing types and drawing media. Both the nature of his work and his drawings can be seen as rather Dutch. Landscape is seen as a system, in which the landscape architect intervenes to create a new starting condition, and provides his expert knowledge on what the outcome might be in due time. It is in this observation that landscape architecture must be distinguished from architecture. Products of landscape architecture are realized over time, and change over time. The research at that moment found its working title Drawing Time, a title that later evolved into Drawing Time. The representation of growth, change and dynamics in Dutch landscape architectural practice after 1985.

In 2010, when this study officially started, the profession of architecture in the Netherlands seriously felt the consequences of this financial crisis, but it was still unclear if, how, and when Dutch landscape architecture would be affected. In the end, the economic crisis eventually hit Dutch landscape architecture severely. There is some irony in the fact that this body of research is about time, and nevertheless the effect of time on the research itself was not anticipated; the economic crisis fundamentally changed the profession. The offices that participated in the research are not the same today as they were in 2008. All interviewed offices still exist, but many of them have had to cut back severely, to move to more affordable locations, to let staff go and to adapt their strategy towards clients. In so far as the effects of these changes can be framed at this instance, both a negative and a positive interpretation seem possible. The negative one is that space to manoeuvre became more restricted, and space to manoeuvre is an important aspect of drawing. The sheet of (virtual) paper is the designer’s
Fig. 6.1 Example of a notation of a dance performance. *Twist* by Emilie Gallier, 2013.
experimental space, but today there is less room for disagreement with the client, just as presenting unexpected discoveries or proposing diverging new insights is less appreciated. The positive interpretation is that the crisis forces all parties to opt for slow and careful transformations. One could say that many developments during this period became more ‘landscape’ in their character. Instead of aiming at one final image by a complete and quick realization, developments start to be spread out over time, step-by-step, with in-between stages, temporary uses, and open ends. I assert that this is a strong invitation to landscape architects to be more explicit on the specific contribution their profession can give, and to address and exploit the issue of time. Seen from that point of view this research is very timely.

In ten years time, will we look back and speak of these years as the end of an era? That remains to be seen, but there are reasons to assume we will. If we look back at the mid eighties, and specifically the years around 1985, key in this study, we can note that the Netherlands recovered from years of economic stagnation, resulting in positive stimuli for landscape architecture. Will the same happen now? There are similarities between now and the mid eighties, in terms of landscape architecture development. Again, a substantial shift in organization can be observed. [5] In contrast to 1985, today it is not so much the office that is the new organizational unit, but the independent landscape architect, operating in networks or offering his services to larger offices. [6] Many offices sought their fortune in other countries, and tried to conquer terrain in other fields, just as adjacent disciplines hoped to take a piece of the remaining landscape architectural work. Disciplinary borders became less clear, and national cultures faded. The acquisition of design work changed drastically, both due to European rules and to the new economic reality. Already in very early stages convincing descriptions of the final product are now required, stimulating a large production of seductive visualizations. More and more frequently design processes are broken down into phases. This could be an interesting development, as it would fit with Ingold’s critique of the project, but that is too optimistic. [7] What we see instead are attempts to control design processes in their organizational and financial aspects. Generally, the position of the designer has become weaker. The larger political and cultural context with its emphasis on avoiding risks demands from designers the certainty that their design works, and is safe. To some extent that could stimulate time drawings - but it only did so in some cases. Clients expect a clear message, no uncertainties. However, the new era about to start may suit landscape architecture, if slow transformation, temporality and stepwise development become mainstream. The expansion of texts that speak about time, representation and landscape supports such a reading. Also looking at the larger context it seems that landscape architecture has entered a new phase, as for example expressed in the word ‘Anthropocene’. This term had been used before, but it only recently came into the spotlight due to the work of scientists Paul Crutzen and Eugene Stoermer. [8] It suggests that human influence on the earth’s geology, ecosystems and climate became dominant enough to address that with a new geological period, and obviously, that is quite a statement. This reflects the extent of dynamism we have to face, but also a radical change in our perception of the world we live in. Perhaps this asks again landscape architecture to make an ‘emancipatory jump’.
Fig. 6.2a-c  *Planet Texel*, 3 out of 9 visualizations for a seasonal camping site. Project by La4sale and Faro architects.
6.2 The future of drawing

Innovations within architecture—generally preceding changes in landscape architecture—and new approaches in adjacent professions, ranging from the arts to gaming to geography, caused drawing to evolve at a rather high speed, these years. In what way should the actual state of representation in (landscape) architecture be described? In 2014 the professions of landscape architecture and architecture shared their recent production at three biennales: those of Rotterdam, Venice and Barcelona. [9] Biennales in these professions have a role comparable to competitions and yearbooks: They present an overview of the production, nominate best practice and indicate trends. Although the events may be very different in nature, they provide a cross section of ways in which design projects are conceived and drawn today. Issues of time are explored in a substantial number of the projects presented at the Venice and Rotterdam biennales. The Rotterdam biennale is a point in case, if only because landscape architect Dirk Sijmons was asked to curate this traditionally very architectural event. His motto Urban by nature implied a perspective on our urban surroundings that is by definition engaged in issues of time, as processes, spontaneity, growth and change were implicitly part of this maxim. In Venice, curator Rem Koolhaas asked participating countries to present ‘the history of their modernization’ between 1914 and 2014. [10] This revealed how, over time, the Modernist tradition lost its pureness and opened itself for adaptations in space and time. Insofar as the decades of Modernism have been an impediment to the inclusion of change and developments in landscape design the Venice biennale seems to mark the end of such an impediment.

One of the projects presented at the Rotterdam biennale was Planet Texel, design research focussing on the Dutch island of Texel as a self-sufficient, sustainable landscape. [11] Planet Texel is strongly time-oriented in its thinking. Both in terms of climate and in terms of a tourism-based economy, seasons are the rhythm of the landscape, and now this rhythm is taken as the basis for a future perspective. Participation of inhabitants of the island is seen as essential. Therefore, the design was not communicated with traditional means only, such as maps and sections, but also by means of a multimedia presentation for which a ‘pavilion’ was built. [Fig. 6.2a-c, 6.3] In terms of representation, this illustrates the rapidly growing influence of related fields such as film, gaming, industrial design, information design and geography. This can also be experienced in a Venice contribution, Sales Oddity:

[11] Projectatelier Planet Texel was made by a team consisting of La4Sale (with students of the Academy of Architecture Amsterdam), Texel municipality and IABR.

Fig. 6.3 Presentation of Planet Texel in pavilion at IABR Rotterdam 2014. Pavilion by Event Architecture in collaboration with La4Sale.
Milano 2 and the Politics of Direct-to-Home TV Urbanism. [12] In this piece, traditional architecture drawings - plans and sections- mingle with collages, advertisements and photos in a documentary form, presented on a screen that in itself is three-dimensional. These two projects highlight important on-going changes. The growing influence of representational approaches from other fields is not new: We only have to look at the history of collage to see precedents. As new way of creating art works in the early 20th century, collage slowly entered architecture, as can be seen in the work of Archigram, before becoming manifest in landscape architecture, for example in the work of West 8 and B+B. [13] Such cross disciplinary influence also happens today. These examples from Rotterdam and Venice show that the (landscape) architectural project today seems to be immersed in a broad range of media and presentational techniques. A second change is the evolution in technical terms. Mixtures of moving images, sound, installation and real-time production allow for sophisticated multimedia ‘events’. A third change is the character of the event. One could go so far as to state that it is presentation that changed, more than re-presentation. The classical architect’s presentation (a set of panels containing plans, sections, diagrams, visualizations and text, combined with free-standing models) is now integrated into complex installations. This is a dramatic shift in the interface with clients and the public, and it will certainly affect design education. It is a development that urgently needs a theoretical framework. These biennales have learned that projects presented through such complex installations seem to be both more and less accessible. In terms of the public’s interaction with the projects, the use of very different media and the attention given to the different senses of the spectator means these projects certainly are more accessible. At the same time, clear information on basic facts, such as what exactly the scope of the project is, who commissioned it, and what is its current status, easily get lost within these intuitive documentary settings, making it much more inaccessible.

The Rotterdam biennale presented the Sigirino project by Atelier Girot. [14] This project concerns a hill made of waste material from a new tunnel in the Swiss Alps. The latest GPS techniques, visualization software and computer numerical control (CNC) milling to make models, are used to visualize the project but even more so to be able to conceive the project within complex topographic conditions. Italian limes, a Venice biennale project, also shows the new possibilities offered by satellite based GPS and the real time rendering of such information in and on a terrain model.


[13] As noted in Chapter 3, the role of collage in (landscape) architecture has never been documented very precisely, but its role in the visual arts is presented in Klanten and Gallagher 2011 and Taylor 2004.


Italy. Intellectually, its background argument can be related to an essay on the instability of coastlines by Carter, as mentioned in Chapter 3. [16] Coastlines, and borders, seem by their cartographic depiction steady and secure. But they are not, in reality. The Italian border seems to be defined forever by mountain peaks, but the glaciers at these mountain tops have changed substantially, and are still changing. Measured with GPS technique the actual border can be represented on a mountain model, and drawn on a map that is given a very precise time tag. [Fig. 6.6] These projects show the influence of techniques from adjacent disciplines, the on-going innovation in question and the changing concept of what (re)presentation is, or should be.

A crisis in representation?

These examples do not so much prove anything - they mainly suggest. Torres, in 2009 in the Australian journal Kerb, claimed that there was a crisis in representation. [17] In contrast with that article, I would say that the examples mentioned above, and elsewhere in this research, show that the scene is rather vivid. Discussing drawing, in an article in the Spanish journal Paisea, some of the conversational partners declared that ‘drawing is dead’, because of, for example, the rash development of the so-called Building Information Model (BIM), GPS techniques and 3D printing. We might conclude that we can do without drawings, and interact more directly with the process of making. [18] However, as a drawing by Txell Blanco Diaz shows, drawings can also be used to efficiently guide 3D printing. As an effect, such drawings tend to lose every connotation to three-dimensional space. [Fig. 6.7] Indeed, in the future, drawings, and particularly drawings on paper, will not be

---

Fig 6.6  Installation by Folder for Italian Limes, drawing the real time border of Italy, 2014-2016. Photo by Delfino Sisto Legnani.
Fig. 6.7 Working drawing by Txell Blanco Diaz as an instruction for printing individual parts of a model, 2013.
Fig. 6.8 Time lapse of sun exposure for the Wave Garden project at 9th Chines Garden Expo, Balmori 2012.
the sole intermediate agents in the production of landscape. But instead of becoming obsolete, drawing seems to be integrated into new collaborations with other media-productions. As Balmori puts it, landscape architecture changes profoundly due to the current acknowledgement that nature is ‘heterogeneous and constantly changing’, and this has ‘a profound impact on the forms of representation in landscape architecture’. Yet in this, drawing still is ‘its main tool of expression’. [19] If we should diagnose a crisis, it is the confusion on what exactly is part of the repertoire of architectural representation, and what is not. Should landscape architects make films or develop games to represent their designs? To some extent, that problem has been ‘solved’ by Lipstadt. The ‘psycho-social conditions governing the production of the object’ are essential to ‘differentiate representations by architects from other representations of architecture’. [20] In other words: A drawing, even if very different from our traditional understanding of the word, belongs to the repertoire of architectural drawings if it is made part of the production of architecture. Conventional drawing types will be integrated in ‘media productions’, as shown by the 2014 biennales. Remarkably, these biennales reveal that the visualization as a type is not as dominant as it was a few years ago. In recent decades the visualization became the most present drawing due to the rapid innovation of CAD and Photoshop - but its taxonomic position became unclear: Is it a reliable perspective drawing and simulation of reality, or mainly an instrument to seduce? This problem will now concern new presentation forms such as films and games. It is up to the profession itself to define its intentions with all drawing means and drawing techniques available. However, if it is about aspects of time, these new options will without doubt enlarge the scope in an interesting way. Even if instructional drawing might become redundant in the production of landscape due to innovations in measuring and making, the role of representation in exploring, communicating and debating the new landscape will continue to be essential. And, even if the role of representation changes and a drawing is of less importance, the understanding of the issue of time still has to be addressed.

6.3 Outcome
Two sets of questions guide this research. One set addresses landscape architecture in general: What exactly is the role of time in landscape architectural design, what is the nature of drawings in landscape architecture, and can aspects of time be conveyed via such drawings? The other set relates to today’s practice: Are aspects of time present in drawing in today’s landscape architecture practice, and in what way? And if they are not, then why not?

Concerning the role of time in landscape architectural design, the most striking outcome of this research is the deep ambiguity in both the theoretical foundation of landscape architecture and current landscape architectural practice. For many practitioners today, it is obvious that landscape is understood in terms of change, process and dynamics. This is also confirmed by recent literature, such as the publications of Amoroso and Balmori. [Fig. 6.8] Yet such an understanding is not reflected in the theory that frames drawing in landscape architecture, and it is only occasionally visible in drawings made by today’s landscape architects, except for certain offices and certain fields, such as landscape...
urbanism. It may be that landscape architectural projects are approached implicitly as developing over time, as is the case in a number of projects taken into account here, but formally, if seen via drawings in project publications and on websites, landscape today is predominantly approached statically, as a ready-made final product. Landscape architecture’s strong tie to the system of representation as developed in architecture is one explanation, given that in architecture issues like growth and change have a less important position.

Next to this, both a professional culture, strongly related to architecture, and an implicit idea of what is expected by clients and the larger public seem to strengthen this absence of aspects of time. Although Ingold never spoke about landscape architecture, his analysis makes sense: Designers predominantly think in terms of projects with a clear starting point and a well-defined end. That may be correct in organizational terms, but the nature of landscape is different - it changes during the project, and after the project ends. In that context I very much value the concept of actuality as put forward by Leatherbarrow. [21] That concept suggests that during the process of becoming something it is intended to be in future, there is always the reality of the ‘now’, and in landscape architectural plans, taking decades to mature, such actualities define our daily awareness of landscape. I also value the concept of afterlife as proposed by Hunt. Although my interpretation of the concept is a bit different from Hunt’s original intention, the concept makes us realize that even if a landscape architectural plan has become sufficiently mature to fulfil its original intentions, it does not stop evolving. The landscape will be evaluated by its future users, and in that evaluation design intentions certainly will be less important than the landscape’s actual meaning. A conclusion of this research is therefore that the strong orientation of landscape architectural drawing on the architectural tradition has been very helpful, but a widening of the focus is necessary now, in view of the tasks ahead. One could argue that the profession of architecture should also integrate change into its thinking and drawing more often. That may be true, but I leave that point to architectural theorists, and it must be acknowledged that architecture contributed substantially to the debate, as the work of Leatherbarrow and Mostafavi shows. [22]

Concerning landscape architecture, I arrive at the conclusion that the lack of attention paid to the representation of time is simply a weak spot in landscape architectural theory that has to be repaired. If we accept the premise that landscape changes, both cyclically and progressively, quickly and slowly, on a large and on a small scale, staccato and legato, regularly and irregularly, this should be reflected in its thinking and drawing. To do so, a vocabulary that integrates the dimension of time in a systematic way is necessary. I have shown that Zerubavel, and also Lynch, offer a useful set of terms, and provide a starting point for such a vocabulary, to be integrated into the theory of landscape architecture. Obstructions to the depiction of time today are mainly situated in the nature of practice. That at least is revealed by the interviews held in this research. But the history of ideas as given in Chapter 3 suggests that there are other areas of disciplinary development that are not solely dependent on transactions with clients, like research, education, workshops, and competitions. In certain periods of history in such areas explicit attention to the subject of time was given, helping to nurture daily practice with

[21] As discussed in paragraph 5.3.
innovative, efficient, and realistic solutions. The design experiments conducted in this research give an initial indication of new options that may enrich the palette.

The representation of time
The abstract question if aspects of time can be present in landscape architecture drawings is easily answered with yes. The fundamental idea of representing time has been dealt with in the arts, and since then, it has been done in many different ways in several disciplines. The more difficult part of the question shifts the attention to types of representation, and to current practice. Chapter 4 has shown that it is done in current practice, and at the same time that it is still a rare phenomenon. With regard to types of representation as they are currently in use, and the question of if these types are sufficient for the representation of time, the answer is ambiguous. In taxonomical terms the system of types of representation in (landscape) architecture is incomplete and not on a par with recent developments in both drawing technique and presentation, as there is no specific type (or group of types) dedicated to this important topic of time. Entirely solving this problem exceeds the scope of this research, but the road to take has been pointed out. On the basis of the work of Halprin, I put forward the score as, potentially, a very complete solution. [23] Preceding a formal definition of this new type of representation, I propose to understand the score as a drawing type additional to plan, section and visualization (what and where), inviting designers to be explicit about moments in time (when), and about agents that act at such moments (who). This is very instructive both in the conception of designs and in the information on designs. But the score is not the only option, as became clear. Timelines, animations, comics and other comparable drawings are also suitable for the representation of time. Therefore, the point of departure is a division at the highest level of abstraction in between spatial and temporal types of representation - the latter being absent in the system as it was. We might conclude that there is no urgent need to fix it, as landscape architects work with today’s types of representation to represent time and do so successfully and pragmatically. As has been argued, such a pragmatic view neglects the core issue, which is the lack of specific representational solutions for the aspect of time, and the integration of such solutions in the presentation of landscape architectural work. Awaiting such a structural change in the taxonomic system, the representation of time seems possible, and within the current taxonomy. Indeed, that makes the fact that it only happens once in a while even more astonishing. Solutions can be utterly simple, like the repetition of plan, section or visualization in series connected to specified moments. For some, this may be an almost too simple solution, but such a qualification neglects that the drawing is a carrier of knowledge. Organizing drawings in sequences requires the consideration of evolution in time and forces the appropriate choices to be made for whatever moments and processes are relevant. Therefore, such series can be very clarifying for both the designer and the client or public. The presence of solutions deriving from animation, comics, gaming and such domains in the drawings as collected in this research was poor. However, events such as the 2014 biennales suggest that that may be a problem of timing. If a survey like this one is to be repeated in a few years’ time, the outcome might be fairly different. We will probably see more installations, films, games and other crossover productions. Trying
The position of drawings
In its original inception, this research implicitly gave drawings a dominant position, in accordance with the general approach to drawings, at least by members of the design community themselves. However, the role of drawings is more complex. Better said: A conclusion of this research is that drawings are important in the production of landscape, but they are only one means among others. To properly see this complexity, landscape architecture must be looked at from the perspective of other sciences, such as anthropology and ethnography. Interviews help to do so. To study drawings in the broader realm of the humanities helps to show that drawings tend to be overrated by designers as the sole medium in which designs are represented and in which design considerations are laid down. At the same time it can be concluded that drawings are underestimated in their autonomous power to transport and convey messages, and to be a realm of innovation. Therefore, in the course of this research the thinking about time and its role in landscape architecture design became an independent area of study. Apart from being present in drawings, attention to aspects of time may be taken care of in very different ways of communication, ways of acting and moments of acting. That is to say that text can represent issues of time very well; time issues may also be addressed within the field of management and they may be taken care of decades after the design has been drawn and executed. Both the interviews and the literature make clear that such ‘silent’ ways of caring are hardly visible and not traceable if not fixed in drawings or text, and therefore they are generally not a part of a shared body of knowledge. So, even if it seems like landscape architects can do without these records, drawing as a verb and the drawing as a noun could be looked at as a cultural responsibility to archive the change of landscape.

It can be concluded that a lack of drawings depicting time is not the same as an absence of thinking about time. This again points out the ambiguity in landscape architecture. Drawings are not the only means in which stances are taken or approaches are reflected. Texts offer an alternative source, but the interviews show that without exploring the ‘hidden thinking’ and the implicit considerations, we only know part of how designs are conceived. It is true that this confronts us with the difficulties of the interview, as a research strategy, but even if this strategy sometimes meets reservation, for its qualitative character (in certain circles of scientists) and for its ‘truth’ (in circles of designers) it is a ripened and valid instrument in research. This research shows that it is not so much reliable truth in statements of designers that is the important thing, but coherence between approaches, drawings, realized projects and statements.

Professional history
Concerning landscape architectural theory, an important outcome of this research is a new reading of professional history. Both literature and interviews reveal that often the history of landscape architecture is defined as a rather recent history, referring to the introduction of the word ‘landscape architecture’, as manifest
in names of educational programs, offices and organizations, at some moment between 1900 and 1960, and in the Netherlands shortly after the Second World War. As a consequence the realm of garden architecture, generally considered as preceding landscape architecture, is looked at as ‘prehistory’, meaning that immediate links with our time seem to be absent. Even if it is acknowledged that steps forward were taken in previous centuries there seems to be an enormous distance from these early forms of landscape architecture to today’s practice. This study did not intend to rewrite a professional history, but in a search for the role of time and its relation to representation, this perception of the professional history should be reconsidered. The example of Humphry Repton comes to be seen in a new light. His writings in particular show an engagement with time, landscape, drawing and professional practice that is still relevant today. A conclusion from this research is that a revised view on his role in the development of the profession is necessary. The same can be said in a different way for Frederick Law Olmsted, whose writings are hardly known in today’s design community, and yet again show a surprisingly modern engagement with issues of time and professional practice. Such examples offer a new and fresh perspective on both the issue of time and of representation, remarkably relevant for today’s practice. Therefore, the perception of the history of the profession should be reconsidered: The 19th century seems to be crucial for a basic understanding of landscape architecture, and more than that, in this basic understanding coming from this period aspects of time are important. Such reflections on the history of the discipline also address Modernism. The research makes it clear that the Modernist era did not support a time-based approach. Precedents such as Repton and Olmsted lead us to the tentative conclusion that the age of Modernism must be positioned as merely a temporary neglect of the issue of time.

6.4 Future challenges

This study raised as many questions as it answered, thus offering a wide array of appealing starting points for future research. Some of these questions expand on theoretical or practical issues in this research, others are chance discoveries: I stumbled upon many subjects that invite our attention. The issue of Modernism with which 6.3 ended is a good example: It seems that the specific topic of time invites a new way of understanding Modernism in landscape architecture. Issues related to nature and ecology challenge the general reading of this movement or style. As already remarked, the 1991 Danish version of the biography of C. Th. Sørensen carried the subtitle Havekunstler, to be understood as ‘garden artist’. The English version from 2001, however, was C. Th. Sørensen – landscape modernist. Ann Winston Spirn explains this shift as a conscious claim that several landscape architects were clearly Modernists, a fact neglected for a long time. At the same time, a reading of Modern landscape architecture. A critical review reveals how ambiguous American landscape architects from the early Modernist period were in describing their position towards landscape and architecture. As the 2014 biennale of Venice also suggests, a precise study of the role of Modernism in landscape architecture may even suggest a more nuanced reading of Modernism in general. In contrast to the discourse in architecture, landscape seems to oppose a strictly purist application of Modernist principles, and as such, a study from the landscape
Fig. 6.9 Jederman Selbstversorger, diagram by Leberecht Migge, 1918.
perspective could deliver a much more pragmatic reading. Such observations only provide a few threads with which to start to unravel the complex and highly ideological debate on Modernism in order to arrive at a more nuanced reading of the specific position of landscape architecture.

Again the word landscape architecture is mentioned, but which landscape architecture? Building upon an interest in Dutch landscape architecture, and framing that in an Northwest European perspective, this study only briefly touches on the very different situations in other landscape architecture cultures. Perhaps the most intriguing area to explore is that of Chinese and Japanese garden art, with a fundamentally different approach towards both time and drawing. More familiar in cultural terms is American and Australian landscape architecture, but the development of landscape architecture in these countries and Europe has diverged in recent decades, and more particularly in relation to the landscape urbanism debate. In this context, the issue of time has gained a more important place. North American and Australian landscape architecture practises deserve to be studied as separate relevant areas, if we are discussing time and representation. This is a challenge for future research. The focus in this research on the Netherlands is legitimate from the perspective of a restricted research capacity, and even more so as I claim a specific Dutch tradition. At the same time, the example of C. Th. Sørensen suggests a particular Danish tradition, and characteristic engagement with time and representation. The same applies to the French tradition, in relation to engineers educated in the tradition of the École des Ponts et des Chaussées, and to French practice. There are slight but meaningful differences between national histories.

In my focus on the Netherlands, I have taken 1985 as an important year, and this is most likely not such a significant year for other European countries. Of course, one should be careful about using exact years when speaking about processes of change, as they tend to happen gradually, and over a number of years. Even more important than the varying pace of change is the fact that the agents of such changes can substantially differ among countries. The shift in professional organization from civic institutions to private offices can certainly be read as a manifestation of the international phenomenon of privatization processes, although this is more likely to apply to the Netherlands than to Germany or France. In the same way, the re-establishment of the ENSP Versailles as a leading school by Michel Corajoud in the early seventies is vital for French landscape architecture - but as an expression of a very French narrative. The research also taught me that these traditions share a body of precedents and have, at the same time, their very own identities. The German tradition, for example, offered the particular view of Hirschfeld on issues of change in landscape, and the remarkable work of Leberecht Migge - a very modern and interdisciplinary contribution decades before Dutch landscape architecture found its own identity. [30] [Fig. 6.9] It would enrich the understanding of landscape architecture if a comparative study of the European traditions were undertaken. Within these slightly different traditions, an undisputed shared point of reference is the 1984 Parc de La Villette competition. It is striking that interviews in this research reveal that Parc de la Villette, as an actual park, but even more as a representation of thinking about parks, is still key for many practitioners in their understanding of the disciplinary development in the recent decades. Today, 30 years later, it is time for a reflection on how exactly this competi-


[29] Corajoud was introduced at the ENSP Versailles by Jacques Simon in 1976. Together they reformulated the landscape program. This is generally seen as the starting point of a new era.


Fig. 6.10ab  Parc de La Villette, situation 2014. Photograph by Céline Baumann and Vesna Jovanovic
tion shaped the development of landscape architecture after 1984. It is a typical example of the theory of the ‘twinned body’ by Goffi. The park is there: we can experience it in reality, as it is now. At the same time, the thinking about the concept of parks and the specific drawings of Tschumi and OMA are still influential, independent of the actuality of the park. Even if today we probably do not experience La Villette as very remarkable in terms of what we see on site, it is as an event, as a type and as a point of reference of unequivocal importance. Drawing is a particular aspect of this importance. The way OMA represented their Parc de la Villette in ‘layered diagrams’ has been very influential. Less known on a global level, but relevant for the Dutch situation are the drawings of B+B; this office clearly ‘defined’ itself by its La Villette drawings, and renewed ideas on landscape architecture in relation to urbanism and architecture using specific aspects of these drawings, such as the colour green, and the way trees were drawn. A study into the significance of Parc de la Villette, the competition as a vehicle for disciplinary innovation and the novelties in drawings for La Villette would be a great contribution to the theory and history of landscape architecture.

Following Patricia Leavy, this research has ‘knitted and weaved’ threads coming from very different disciplines. Being a first overview of the related issues of time, representation and landscape architecture, it is very broad, and a number of issues have not been covered in depth. This research shows for example that an ethnographic or anthropologic perspective can generate important new insights into how designers think, how design processes run, and how design operates. We only have to mention Emily Gomart’s work, which so far is about the only precise anthropologic survey into landscape architecture, to claim that there is work to do. This study especially points out the many smaller and larger differences between landscape architecture and architecture - the discipline that attracts somewhat more attention from anthropologists. A lack of drawings depicting time is not the same as an absence of thinking about time, as discovered in the early phases of this research. Drawings are not the only means in which stances are taken or approaches are reflected. Interviews show that without exploring the ‘hidden thinking’ and the implicit considerations, we only partially know how designs are conceived. This research shows that ‘truth’ in statements of designers is not the important factor, but coherence between approaches, drawings, realized projects and statements. The perspective from ethnography, sociology and anthropology can be very valuable. Any interest shown by these disciplines in landscape architecture should receive a warm welcome. Chapter 5 provided starting points to re-assess the history of the discipline via a number of precedents such as the work of Repton and Olmsted. It also proposed to strengthen the theoretical foundation by deepening and implementing very relevant concepts such as actuality and afterlife, and, in the concept of design processes, backtalk. In the context of this research they serve to construct an argument on time, representation and landscape, but it is easy to see that they can be agents to innovate the theory of landscape architecture itself.

By far the most important conclusion of this research is in itself a challenge for the future: I intend to define a realm of temporal types of representation and to experiment with the score as an example within that domain. To define a realm of temporal representations in addition to a realm of spatial representations
is crucial, and here only the first outline could be given. It is crucial, as it solves structural weaknesses in the taxonomy of types of representation and as it marks a definitive liberation from the architectural system, in which this division is absent. It inevitably leads to a fundamental renewal of the representational system, and that is a task that largely exceeds the boundaries of this study. The first area in which such a theoretical renewal should find its application is landscape architecture education. Most landscape architecture schools teach their students the basics of representation in the tradition of architectural representation, and therefore the specific demands of landscape in terms of representation are not explicitly addressed. This research inevitably asks for a change. It has been pointed out that regardless of opinions on the exact boundaries of landscape architecture, the absence of a proper theory on the representation of time can no longer be neglected. In the tradition of the École des Ponts et des Chaussées, schools of landscape architecture should be aware of their important position with regard to the innovation of both theory and practice.

[36] See the discussion in Chapter 3.

[37] See Ingold 2013, Hunt 2004 and the discussion in paragraph 5.3.
ing. In general the collaboration between the areas of design and maintenance is fragile. Seen from the point of view of the issues in this research, these subjects should be theoretically linked - as the afterlife unavoidably connects design considerations, usage and management. But primarily the challenge for education is to implement in terms of theory and method this idea of spatial and temporal representations, and to experiment with the different temporal options such as the score. That will support an on-going innovation of drawing itself, but will certainly also help reflection on the nature of landscape. A drawing by - notably - an architecture student shows how a simple sketch can contribute to knowledge of time. [Fig. 6.11] Students must be able to reflect on the dynamic character of landscape in their drawings, and they must be able to communicate it in a convincing way to their teachers, their clients and their public. There is a strong chance that noting specific aspects of landscape – like time – in a conscious and innovative way will influence not only their designs, but also the position of landscape architecture as a design discipline facing a challenging future.