

以景观为媒介

LANDSCAPE AS MEDIUM



琼·艾弗森·纳索尔
密歇根大学环境与可持续发展学院教授
《景观与城市规划》期刊联合主编

Joan Iverson NASSAUER
Professor of School of Environment and Sustainability, University of Michigan; Co-Editor-in-Chief of *Landscape and Urban Planning*
1572 Dana, 440 Church Street, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1115, USA
nassauer@umich.edu

您的论文《混乱的生态系统，有序的框架》^[1]虽然发表于20多年前，但至今仍广受赞誉，不断启发着当代景观设计师。其中关于生态设计与公共文化之间关系的论点尤其精辟，您指出：“健康的生态系统往往看似杂乱无章，而那些外表光鲜的生态系统却可能只是徒有其表。不论是生态学的科学理念与自然界的文化观念的差异，还是功能与外观的差异，都表明应用景观生态学本质上是一个设计问题。它需要将生态的景观转译为文化语言，将人们不熟知的、常常不受欢迎的设计形式置入人们所熟悉的、富有吸引力的包装中。”基于这一论述，您认为景观设计是否需要迎合大众的审美喜好？

琼·艾弗森·纳索尔（以下简称纳索尔）：景观应该，也必须满足人们的需求，因为景观关乎我们的生活空间。景观设计师创作的是具有实用意义的艺术。不论其生态

价值如何，具有美感的景观确实更易获得认可并得到持续保护。这也是为什么景观感知十分重要，我们应当让设计更为人们所接受，并关注景观如何影响人们的日常生活。同时，景观设计师还需要评估设计如何才能为人们所接受，即景观的市场性。

如何维持景观及其生态功能、如何组织场地中的材料和能量流动，以及由谁来维护，都是设计师进行设计构思并赋予景观以可持续性的基础，否则一切都是空谈。此外，诸如提高生物多样性和碳存储量、治理水体富营养化和污染以及雨洪管理等由生态系统为景观提供的支持服务也都是动态的。因此，景观可持续性的核心是维护。如果设计项目既美观又有益于环境，但却无法得到相应的维护或维护成本过高，那么这个设计本身就是不可持续的，也是不合理的。此外，原生生态系统和野生动物栖息地的外观常常与人类社会的文化价值观相冲突。显

<https://doi.org/10.15302/J-LAF-20170605>

采访时间 INTERVIEWED DATE / 2017-08-24

中图分类号 / TU986.2

文献标识码 / B

摘要

本次访谈聚焦于景观的媒介属性。受访人琼·艾弗森·纳索尔认为，景观感知十分重要，设计师应当让设计更为人们所接受，并关注景观如何影响人们的日常生活。同时，她强调景观可持续性的核心是维护。对于景观设计学科而言，实践和研究都非常重要，设计也能够成为科学的一部分。相比其他学科，景观设计学的核心竞争力在于景观设计师懂得如何运用想象力来改变看不见的社会关系。作为《景观与城市规划》的联合主编，纳索尔认为媒体应当更多地为学者和从业者服务，促进更多元的学术交流。

关键词

媒介；受欢迎性；维护；科学；研究；想象力

ABSTRACT

This interview focuses on landscape's role of being a medium. Joan Iverson Nassauer, the interviewee, believes that landscape architects should make designs plausible and care about how landscape influences people's everyday life since landscape perception matters. Meanwhile, she underscores that maintenance is key to the sustainability of a landscape project. She further argues that both practice and research are important to the discipline of landscape architecture, and design can be part of science. Landscape architects' capacity of imagination defines the power and uniqueness of the discipline what allows landscape architecture to change social relationships. As a co-editor-in-chief of *Landscape and Urban Planning*, Nassauer believes that media need to serve more scholars and practitioners and to encourage a broad communication with diverse communication forms.

KEY WORDS

Medium; Plausibility; Maintenance; Science; Research; Imagination

采访 田乐 余依爽

整理 田晓劼 田乐

译 孙一鹤 田晓劼

INTERVIEWED BY Tina TIAN Yishuang SHE

EDITED BY Xiaojie TIAN Tina TIAN

TRANSLATED BY Robin SUN Xiaojie TIAN

然，生态系统服务设计应该符合文化观念，否则人们就会通过各种方式自发地去改变已有的景观，而这些方式很可能有悖于其原有的生态功能^[2]。因此，符合大众认知的外观设计是对社会的一种尊重，因为维持景观长期的可持续性需得到社会的协助。

对景观设计学科而言，实践和研究都非常重要，您如何看待实践和研究之间的关系？

纳索尔：关于这一点，我的想法也在随着时间的推移而变化。我曾在1985年发表过一篇文章，名为《让科学走进景观设计》。在该文中，我认为设计本身就是一种研究。但是，行之有效的跨学科研究需要新准则的引导。如果缺乏独立的社会或自然科学准则来对项目绩效进行评估，设计师就很难从一个特定项目中学到足够的知识和经验，更不用说将其推广应用于其他项目。我们从实践中学习，但却没有足够的把握将在一个项目中学到的知识运用到其他地方。如若想要知道我们是否可以依靠自认为已知的知识进行设计，便需要运用科学的方法来加以验证，而非一味地重复设计。设计师需要采用一种有计划的、基于科学的方法，以尽可能地在设计实践中了解环境和社会。

我也曾认为，在景观设计中，如果科学工具过于复杂、指定性过强，对资源要求过高，抑或难以灵活应对特定场地的要求，那么研究本身就可能缺乏合理性^[3]。现在，我坚信设计能够成为科学的一部分。如果把景观设计纳入科学知识的创造体系中，我们就能够在科学与景观实践中找到共性，而作为纽带的设计环节既是一种成果，也是一种行为过程^[3]。

与其他学科相比，您认为景观设计学科的核心竞争力是什么？

纳索尔：景观设计既有赖于分析论证，也离不开实践经验，其最强大、最迷人之处便在于景观设计师懂得如何运用想象力：我

们可以创造性地构想一些不存在的事物。令人遗憾的是，我发现景观专业人士有时似乎会忘记自身所具有的这种能力是多么独特。不同于艺术家纯粹的浪漫想象，景观设计师可以基于可靠的分析论证来构想新的事物。尽管并非所有的景观设计师都精于此道，但在生态设计中常常需要运用这一能力，所以这是一片有待景观设计师探索钻研的沃土。以我自己为例，我最近刚刚参与了一个大型跨学科国家科学基金项目，该项目将在城市景观中引入高科技环境工程。作为一名拥有景观设计背景的科学家，我的任务是探索这一工程将对人们日常生活中的景观产生何种影响，以及人们将如何应对这项技术所带来的景观变化。景观是一种媒介：工程、生态、水文和地质学等方面的诸多问题及其对人类的潜在影响，以及人类对上述系统的反作用都可能出现在景观中。因此，景观是我们开展跨学科研究的媒介。

可能有人会认为，想象力并不是景观设计师独有的能力，工程师也可以发挥想象！然而，虽然工程师和景观设计师都从事设计工作，但是他们想象的方式大为不同：工程师善于思考确切的关系，而景观设计师则擅长思考如何通过景观设计来改变看不见的人际关系。当我们探寻景观应如何影响人们的生活或反之为其所影响时，我们就可以发挥景观设计师独特的想象力。

您对中国正在进行的国家生态文明建设持何种看法？

纳索尔：目前，中国的城市人口和GDP的增长幅度和速度都远超20世纪70年代的美国。当时美国颁布了多个基于环境保护的法律法规，如《清洁水法案》和《清洁空气法案》等，以减缓城市的快速发展并充分考虑城市建设对环境的影响。城市规划师、工程师和景观设计师也被要求放慢脚步，思考已有的设计方案是否可行，或是否需要提出新的方案。出台这些法律法规的重要意义在于它们建立了一种卓有成效的“高速刹车”机制，以推动社会经济基于环境要求而发展。

发展和保护往往很难两全。据我所知，在中国，如海绵城市建设等新政策的发布与项目落地之间的时间间隔很短。这意味着要在更短时间内完成规划以及众多干预措施的协调工作。未经长远规划的快速建设可能会导致一系列的后续问题。也许是时候放慢脚步，去重新思考如何发挥设计的作用，使之能够为人类和环境创造更加美好的未来。

作为景观设计领域高质量学术期刊《景观与城市规划》的联合主编，您如何理解媒体在行业交流中所起到的作用？

纳索尔：我从事编辑工作的时间并不长，初衷是想要为全世界的年轻学者服务，我希望世界各地的学者都能参与到学术讨论中——而不仅仅局限于美国、欧洲或澳大利亚——成为学术活动的切实参与者。编辑期刊也有利于我个人知识的拓展。每年，我都可以从数以百计的投稿中学习新的知识。即便是那些未被采录的文章，也让我对世界其他地方的景观和城市有所了解，我亦希望这些地区的学者的研究能够日益精进。

我也发现，对学术期刊而言，消除研究与实践之间的隔阂是非常重要的。美国的学术期刊在这方面做得还不够好。对研究质量的让步可能会削弱学术期刊的可信度，我们也不愿意看到这样的事情发生。但与此同时，这种双向盲审的审稿模式也有利于从业人员加入到学术讨论之中——这要求我们的期刊不仅要在内容上通俗易懂，而且在价格方面也要能够为从业人员所接受。

《景观与城市规划》是一本颇具影响力的学术期刊，它于1973年创刊，并于1986年推出了同步电子版期刊。虽然该期刊已发表过数千篇与景观设计和规划有关的科学论文，但从业者并未能充分了解到这些内容。很多从业者迫切地想要获知以下方面的研究成果：例如，规划城市绿地的有效手段是什么？有哪些可以有效降低城市热岛效应的景观形态？雨洪管理如何改善水质并减少洪流？屋顶绿化能否改善城市栖息地？居住在不同区域内的人们如何从城市绿地中获益？

基于这一现状，我个人未来5年最重要的目标之一就是让从业者更容易获取这些知识。

我不确定《景观与城市规划》的呈现形式对于从业者来说是否通俗易懂。我发现《景观设计学》是一本非常注重视觉传达的期刊。我最近为加拿大的景观设计期刊《景观与风景》^[4]撰写文章（图1），这本期刊也同样非常注重视觉传达。文章发表后不久，我得到了很多从业者的评论和反馈，其关注度甚至超过了我的那些被全世界学者广泛引用的论文。显然，不同的交流与呈现形式所带来的结果的确存在较大差异。

此外，对于已颇有学术建树的资深学者而言，通过撰写更多通俗体裁的文章，可以让他们接触到更多的读者群体，特别是年轻读者。这对于专业知识的普及亦大有裨益。LAF

注释

了解更多作者研究成果，请访问www.joan-nassauer.com。

1. 琼·艾弗森·纳索尔发表于《景观与风景》杂志上的文章

1. Joan Iverson Nassauer's article published in *Landscape PAYSAGES*

WHEN MESSINESS IS A CHOICE

CHOSIR LE DÉSORDRE

JOAN IVERSON NASSAUER

MESSINESS: COMMUNITY, CARE AND COMPLEXITY IN SUSTAINABLE LANDSCAPES



...OUR EXPERIENCE OF MESSINESS GIVES US REASON TO FEAR WHAT WE DO NOT KNOW.

> FR. LP+
LE DÉSORDRE : COMMUNALITÉ,
INTERMÉDIARITÉ ET COMPLEXITÉ DES
PAYSAGES DURABLES

EN.
MESSINESS IS A PRODUCT OF
APPEARANCE. By definition, messiness is
displeasing, and it is associated with disorder,
entropy, chaos, uncertainty, confusion,
dirtiness and ill health. Order, neatness and
tidiness – words that mean the opposite of
messiness – are associated with cleanliness,
health and safety, and these characteristics
are understood as essential to human
well-being. So, it would seem that messiness
has no place in healthy landscapes. However,
ecological designers know that some forms
of messiness enhance sustainability. What
do we need to understand if ecological design
the landscape?

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE VISIBLE
Messiness is a cultural interpretation of the
visible. To look messy, something must be
both visible and disorderly. While visibility

depends on optics, and consequently,
should look the same to all who have normal
vision and are viewing a landscape from the
same location, disorderliness depends on
the cultural connotations of what is seen,
which may be shared by members of the
same community.

Community norms and expectations
have great power to influence perceptions
of messiness. In this regard, landscapes
are an extreme case. Community norms
are intolerant of nearly any landscape that
looks messy. Unlike clothing, furniture or art,
much of the landscape is almost inherently
public, seen from public byways and always
regardless of whether it is privately owned.
Consequently, personal choices for the
design and maintenance of a landscape are
understood to affect all those who see it
regardless of whether they actually enter
or own it. In particular, those who live near
a messy landscape feel impinged upon by
its appearance.

MESSINESS WHICH IMPINGES...
Neighbourhoods are expected to look neat
as a mark of respect for neighbours.

Agricultural land is expected to look neat as
a sign of good stewardship. Even landscapes
like landfills or factories that function as
the “closets” of the environment, hiding
what is not being used, are expected to look
neat when seen from a distance. Where
neighbourhoods are challenged by pervasive
visible disorder, with vacant structures,
dumped garbage, fallen trees and weedy
lots, the stress of living with messiness even
can undermine the health of community
members. In this context, order and neatness
of the landscape are particularly valued.

WHEN MESSINESS IS A CHOICE
In neighbourhoods where community
members are assumed to have the capacity
to maintain orderly, neat landscapes, there
may be greater openness to integrate “messy”
landscape elements that are understood
to enhance sustainability. In such places,
“messiness” is a choice. But even in these
neighbourhoods, messy landscapes may be
temporary experiments that fail to capture
broader, longer-term community approval.
Only in landscapes that are large enough to
be perceived as wild places, where humans

are expected to be respectful visitors, are
community norms for neatness largely
set aside.

Neatness is expected in most community
contexts because it connotes adequate
human care. Care is attention and action
that respects the experience of others. It is
a deeply human act of empathy for others:
people, animals and plants. Care of places is
an act of deference to the values and norms
of others in our community. In times and
places where we are acutely aware of our need
for community, messiness may be interpreted
as disregard for others or, more benevolently,
as a lack of capacity to respond to community
norms and values. If a landscape looks messy,
those responsible for it may be assumed to
be overwhelmed, impoverished or ill. They
sometimes will be understood to be actively
anti-social or even criminal – hiding something
in the mess. A messy landscape is understood
as unclean and unsafe.

CONTRADICTIONARY CONNOTATIONS
These connotations of messiness, as well as
the connotations of orderliness, neatness and
tidiness, sometimes contradict deeper truths

about health or sustainability. For example,
some studies now suggest that childhood
exposure to the “dirty” environments of
backyard animals or household pets may
endow people with enhanced lifetime
resistance to certain allergies and diseases.
At the same time, it is known that childhood
exposure to “dirty” urban air and soil
pollutants, common in even the most orderly
urban neighbourhoods, is associated with
greater lifetime likelihood of some diseases.
Similarly, neat landscapes maintained with
pesticides can be toxic, and nutrient and
energy inputs used to maintain conventional
landscape neatness have significant
environmental impacts.

WHY ARE WE AVERSE?
So, why are we so averse to messy
landscapes? Because we know we do not
understand them, and our experience of
messiness gives us reason to fear what we
do not know. However, if we have deeper
knowledge about the environmental benefits
of a messy landscape, we may be willing to
allow messiness to exist as part of our orderly
world. I have argued that the reassurance

20 LANDSCAPES PAYSAGES

SUMMER | ÉTÉ 2017 21

© Joan Iverson Nassauer

Although published over twenty years ago, your highly received paper *Messy Ecosystems, Orderly Frames*^[1] is still inspiring for contemporary landscape architects, particularly the trenchant arguments on the relationship of ecological design and public culture. It states that “ecological quality tends to look messy.... What is good may not look good, and what looks good may not be good.... The difference between the scientific concept of ecology and the cultural concept of nature, and the difference between function and appearance, both demonstrate that applied landscape ecology is essentially a design problem. It requires the translation of ecological patterns into cultural language. It requires placing unfamiliar and frequently undesirable forms inside familiar, attractive packages.” Based on this argument, how do you think marketability of landscape architecture?

Joan Iverson NASSAUER (NASSAUER hereafter): Landscape should, and must, serve the needs of people, because landscape is where we live. Landscape architects make art to be used. Landscapes perceived as aesthetically pleasing are more likely to be appreciated and protected overtime, regardless of their ecological importance. This is why landscape perception matters and why we should make designs plausible and care about how landscape affects people every day. Meanwhile, designers need to anticipate how a design can be well received by people and be more marketable.

To build sustainability into landscape, the designers’ conception of how to maintain landscape and its ecological functions, how to manage the material and energy flows in the site, and who maintains it, is fundamental to the design — otherwise it is just a picture. Ecosystem services in landscapes, including support of biodiversity, carbon

storage, removal of excess nutrients and contaminants, and stormwater management, are dynamic. Thus the issue of maintenance is key to the sustainability of a landscape project. If landscape architects design something beautiful and environmentally beneficial, but those benefits require maintenance that will not be provided, then the design is inherently not sustainable and plausible. However, quite often, the appearance of indigenous ecosystems and wildlife habitats violates cultural norms. Designing in ecosystem services has to be done in a way that clearly is consistent with cultural norms. Without this attention to their cultural norms, people will change the landscape in ways that may or may not be consistent with its ecological function^[2]. Therefore, the philosophy behind recognizable appearance is not only one of the respect for society, but also a strategy for marketability, because we need society to help landscape be sustained overtime.

Practice and research are both critical to the discipline of landscape architecture. How do you consider the relationship between practice and research?

NASSAUER: My thinking about that has changed with time. In my paper *Bringing Science to Landscape Architecture*, published in 1985, I argued that we could think about design as inherent research. However, effective interdisciplinary research requires new norms. Without independent norms of social or natural science methods to evaluate the performance of the design, it is difficult to learn enough from a particular project to generalize to other projects. We all learn from what we do, but what we think we have learned from one project may not actually give us sufficient certainty to apply that knowledge to another place. To consider

whether we can rely on what we think we know, we need science — not just design. Designers need a kind of playful science-based approach to learn the most about environmental and social systems from our designs.

I once argued that in landscape architecture, research may lack legitimacy if scientific tools are considered too complex, too prescriptive, too demanding of resources, or not flexible enough to support place-specific decisions^[3]. Now, I firmly believe that design can be part of science. If we include landscape design as part of scientific knowledge creation, we have a common link between the science and practice of landscape change. This design link is both a product and an activity^[3].

What is the core competitiveness of landscape architecture compared with other disciplines?

NASSAUER: Landscape can be treated both analytically and experientially. What is so powerful is that landscape architects know how to use imagination: we can creatively imagine things that do not exist. Sadly, I find that landscape architects sometimes forget how special that ability is. Unlike artists' pure romantic imagination, landscape architects can imagine something new based on evidence that gives our design credibility. Not all landscape architects DO this, but it is the greatest possibility for ecological design, which can be a rich area for landscape architects' research. For example, I have just begun a very large transdisciplinary National Science Foundation project which employs high-tech environmental engineering in urban landscapes. It is interesting that my role, as a landscape design scientist, is to explore how the work is going to affect the everyday landscape of people and how people are going to respond to landscape changes possibly made by this technology.

Landscape is the medium: lots of questions in engineering, ecology, hydrology, and geology, the possible effects on humans and how humans are going to affect those systems happen with the landscape. So, that is the medium for our transdisciplinary research.

One may reckon that imagination is not a privilege of landscape architects — engineers can imagine too! However, they imagine in different ways: engineers are good at thinking about precise relationships, while landscape architects are good at thinking about how to change societal relationships with landscapes by design. When we consider how a landscape is going to affect people or be affected by people, we can use our special talent of imagination.

What is your insight on the national movement of ecological civilization currently happening in China?

NASSAUER: The absolute amount and pace of growth in urban population and GDP in China now are far greater than they were in the United States in the 1970s, when American laws and regulations based on environmental goals were adopted. All of the laws, such as the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act, were introduced to slow things down to allow for environmental implications to be considered. Urban planners, engineers, and landscape architects had to pause and consider the impacts of what was proposed as well as alternatives. Those laws were so important because they created a way of slowing down bad choices, and they worked.

Hurrying and protecting are difficult activities to put together. So far as I know, in China, there is a very short time between a new policy like Sponge City Construction being adopted and projects being built. It means that the planning phase and the related coordination of many interventions

are limited by an even shorter time. The rapid construction without long-term thinking could cause problems later. Maybe now it is a good time to slow down and think about how design can embody a more complete sense of future implications for people and the environment.

As a co-editor-in-chief of *Landscape and Urban Planning*, a high-quality scholarly journal in the field of landscape architecture, how do you understand the role that media plays in the communication of the profession?

NASSAUER: I started editing very late in my career. I do it as a service to young scholars all over the world, beyond the United States, Europe, and Australia, expecting everyone to be part of the conversation and to be reliable contributors to scholarship. Editing the journal also contributes to my own knowledge. I learn from reading hundreds of submissions each year. Even those we have to reject also teach me about cities and other parts of the world, where I would like to encourage young scholars to elevate their work.

I also find that, to a scholarly journal, to bridge the gap between research and practice is very important. We have not yet done this well in America. To compromise the quality of research might undermine its credibility. That is not a choice we want to make. However, we want double-blind peer-reviewed journals to be accessible to practitioners — both by making the content understandable and making the journals themselves affordable for practitioners.

Landscape and Urban Planning is a very high-impact scholar journal, which has been published since 1973, and the entire journal as digital files can trace back to 1986. The journal has published thousands of scientific papers relating to

design and planning but practitioners do not have access to it. One of my greatest personal goals for the next five years is to make this knowledge accessible to practitioners. Because there are so many practitioners who want to know what is the effective way that green spaces in the city are planned; what is the effective shape on reducing the urban heat island effect; how can stormwater management improve water quality and reduce flooding; can green roofs improve urban habitats; what are the benefits that people who live different proximities can get from green space in cities?

I am not certain that the way *Landscape and Urban Planning* conveyed is always understandable to practitioners. I noticed that *Landscape Architecture Frontiers* is a very visual document. I recently contributed to *Landscape Paysages*^[4], a Canadian landscape journal (Fig.1), which is also a very visual document. I heard from many practitioners soon after the article was published — more than I got from some of my papers that are highly cited all over the world by scholars. Obviously, there is a real gap between different communication forms.

In addition, doing more popular writing is a wonderful opportunity for senior scholars, who have demonstrated their credibility in science, to reach people, especially to reach different generations. It is of great advantage to popularize professional knowledge. **LAF**

NOTE

For more information about the author's research, please visit her lab website www.joan-nassauer.com.

REFERENCES

- [1] Nassauer, J. I. (1995). Messy ecosystems, orderly frames. *Landscape Journal*, 14(2), 161-170.
- [2] Gobster, P. H., Nassauer, J. I., Daniel, T. C., & Fry, G. (2007). The shared landscape: what does aesthetics have to do with ecology? *Landscape Ecology*, 22(7), 959-972.
- [3] Nassauer, J. I., & Opdam, P. (2008). Design in science: Extending the landscape ecology paradigm. *Landscape Ecology*, 23(6), 633-644.
- [4] Nassauer, J. I. (2017). Messiness: community, care, and complexity in sustainable landscapes. *Landscapes Paysages*, 19(2), 20-22.