*Sebastian Feldhusen, Ute Poerschke and Jürgen Weidinger*

# Mixings in Architecture and Landscape Architecture. Editorial

An underlying question of the last issue of Cloud-Cuckoo-Land (Issue 34) was how the experience of an architectural space can be verbalized.[1] Many of the spaces discussed in the last issue lie between the categories of "architecture" and "landscape architecture" and cannot be characterized with these terms. Because of that, many authors explored the spaces in the following way: they first described the organization, direction, and succession of particular spaces from the perspective of their own experience. After that, they proposed for these descriptions an approximating, often metaphorical term to express the spatial character, such as "sequence," "threshold," "joint," "hybrid," "island," or "mimesis." The authors pointed out that the same space could be discussed, depending on the experiential context, in one instance for example as a "threshold" and in another as a "joint." Overall, this heuristic method turned out to be a practicable path of verbalizing the character of an individual space, comparing it with other spaces, and eventually exchanging spatial experiences.

Following Issue 34, a conference in Berlin on January 28th and 29th, 2016, organized by the Technische Universität Berlin, the Pennsylvania State University, and *Cloud-Cuckoo-Land*, further investigated the relationship between architecture and landscape architecture.[2] In the conference, a new focus crystalized, away from the question of verbalizing spatial situations, toward identifying potential *mixings* in architecture and landscape architecture. Of central importance were questions such as what is and can be mixed in our environment at all and in which ways does this happen? The presentations and discussions at the conference resulted in the present Issue 35.

## Questions
Since the 1960s, one of the discourses in architecture, landscape architecture, and urbanism has been about "mixed neighborhoods" and the "right urban mix"—in most cases with reference to mixing "uses," first and foremost of "working" and "dwelling." Aside from that, however, additional discourses in

architecture, landscape architecture, and urbanism can be identified, in which mixings have played an important role. The 1980s discussed mixings of everyday and high culture, borrowing from and contributing to postmodern theories. The 1990s and 2000s engaged in a discourse on the mixing of city and countryside in response to the ongoing urbanization of rural regions. And since the 2010s the mixing of nature and culture has become a central topic, manifest in the concept of the "Anthropocene." Approximately since the same time, discussions have addressed the mixings of things or spaces, in particular with regard to the discourse on atmospheres, but also in the context of urban densification processes of spatial situations resulting from increasing migration movements, city populations, and costs for city center properties.

In view of these developments, the conference speakers and authors of the present issue asked the following questions: What is meant at all when speaking of mixings in architecture, landscape architecture, and urbanism? What is mixed in our environment and how? Who is responsible for mixings–politicians, administrators, designers, or users of architecture and landscape architecture? What do architects and landscape architects try to achieve when they mix something? And what problems arise with mixings? Do things mix at all? Or, are mixings a question of scale, saying that something looks mixed from a distance while consisting of isolated components when looking closer? Is separation the precondition of mixing? Can we generalize that architecture, landscape architecture, and urbanism of the last sixty years removed separations and supported new mixings? These and other questions will be discussed in the current Issue 35 "Mixings in Architecture and Landscape Architecture." First, theories of mixing will be introduced (chapter 1), followed by three different forms of mixings: mixings of nature and culture (chapter 2), mixings of things or spaces (chapter 3), and mixings of uses (chapter 4).

## Chapter 1: Theories of Mixing

Eduard Führ, in his article, discusses mixing as a process of perception. He proposes to further specify the concept of mixing by considering the term "indifference": One and the same thing or space can be perceived both as something united and separated. Through works by Sou Fujimoto and theories by Colin Rowe and Fred Koetter, Führ shows how the design of things and spaces can provoke the perception of indifferences.

Alban Janson, similar to Führ, is interested in spatial perception, but looks at other terms. He reminds us of the fundamental relationship of mass and void within architectural design. Mixing mass and void can create, as a qualitative surplus, a "new spatial substance," which Janson calls "porosity." Janson adds that the components of mass and void, although mixed in space, must be clearly distinguished and recognizable, otherwise unwanted blurring would occur.

Sonja Hnilica addresses another kind of mixing mentioned but not elaborated on by Führ in his article: physical mixing. After distinguishing different kinds of mixings based on the properties of their ingredients, Hnilica re-

fers to examples of twentieth century architectural history and studies if and how the metaphor of mixing—for example in form of fog or foam—inspired designers and influenced their work. Mixings appear in these cases as conceptual models in the architectural design process.

Mixing as a process of perception (Führ and Janson) and mixing as a physical process (Hnilica) can be understood as the theoretical underpinnings of most articles in the current issue. Because of that, these articles introduce the current issue.

## Chapter 2: Mixings of Nature and Culture

Looking into the relationship of nature and culture has been an ongoing endeavor in the discourses of architecture and landscape architecture since Socrates or Vitruvius. While modernism since the eighteenth century had separated nature and culture, cultural theories since the beginning of the twenty-first century have considered nature not an antipode, but rather a component of culture. With man having exerted influence on all beings and processes in a comprehensive manner, the position evolved that there is no difference between culture and nature in today's world. We can therefore speak of today's nature and culture as being mixed.[3] Since they cannot be distinguished any longer, the discussion about their relationship is obsolete: The "Holocene" has ended, the "Anthropocene" has begun. What does this mean for projects of architecture and landscape architecture? How can we determine "culture" when "culture" absorbs "nature"? And how do we address man's need of "nature"—as indifferent as the term may be in today's understanding—in increasingly dense metropolises?

Jörg H. Gleiter asks, in his article, when exactly nature and culture mixed in such a way that we can speak of the Anthropocene. He believes that the beginning of the Anthropocene pre-dates the early twenty-first century with the acknowledgement of climate change, the twentieth century with the development of genetic engineering, the nineteenth century with nuclear technology, and even the eighteenth century with the steam engine. Instead he determines that the beginning of the Anthropocene occurred with a fundamentally changed attitude toward the world, which fell in the fourteenth century: the discovery of nature as landscape.

Stefan Robel concludes from the idea of the Anthropocene that there is no difference between the city ("culture") and countryside ("nature") any longer. He proposes to consider the countryside a "functional component" of the city. By thinking in this way, the opportunity arises to rethink parks: as *Smart Parks*, which not only serve for recreational purposes but also for functions such as climate protection or food production.

Andreas Quednau goes even further. He concludes that the entire environment, culture and nature, needs to be understood as a "systemic whole," which allows a constant exchange between the "human system" and the "ecosystem," both creating a "second nature." In this regard Quednau refers to the term "metabolism," not in a metaphorical sense as it was approached in

**3** See Crutzen, Davis, Mastrandrea 2001 and Crutzen 2002.

the discourses of the 1960s, but in the true sense of the word as an exchange of materials, such as water and energy.

For Till Rehwaldt, geometrical and landscape gardens of earlier centuries as well as landscape concepts of the 1970s ecological movements are already mixings of culture and nature. He asks which landscape architectural forms are adequate for today's democratic and individualistic "Both-And" societies and concludes that today's landscape architecture needs to explore the right "extent of dissolution." Using his design for the *ULAP* area in Berlin he exemplifies this exploration process.

Margitta Buchert looks at mixings from the perspective of "landscape-ness as architectural idea." She investigates design concepts for buildings and open areas that refer explicitly to landscape forms. The goal of such concepts is, according to Buchert, to dissolve the categories of architecture and landscape architecture and to transform them into a mixed spatial experience.

## Chapter 3: Mixings of Things or Spaces

While the Spatial Turn has provided new perspectives for the humanities since the end of the 1980s, it did less so in architecture and landscape architecture. This does not come as a surprise: In eighteenth-century landscape architectural theory, corporal sensitivity of space had already been a discussed topic, particularly by Christian Cay Lorenz Hirschfeld in *Theory of Garden Art* (1779). And nineteenth century architectural theory had already elaborated on the human experience of space, first explicitly by August Schmarsow in *The Essence of Architectural Creation* (1894). Also the Material Turn, referring to the increased attentiveness to things by many disciplines since the 1980s, is not new, as we speak about thingness of architecture and landscape architecture no later than Martin Heidegger's 1951 lecture, *Building Dwelling Thinking*. In the last five years, however, theories of things and spaces in architecture and landscape architecture have received new impulses, for example in the discussion of atmospheres, significantly influenced by Gernot Böhme's essays since the early 1990s. Also, the debate on creating knowledge in the design process has contributed to an increased awareness of thingness of architecture and landscape architecture, penetrated by ubiquitous digital technologies.[4]

Daniel Purdy links his article to the discourse on atmospheres, tracing the phenomenon back to eighteenth-century philosophy and its concept of "character." For Purdy, atmosphere and character refer to the mixings of sensuous impressions, which happen particularly when a space is contemplated aesthetically.

Jürgen Weidinger focuses on the design process as he points out that atmospherical effects of spaces originate in the designer's controlled mixing or composing of things. He calls the result of a composition the "emergence effect." In addition, he proposes to define the process of composing things as a "narrow design concept" from which the process of designing systems and structures as a "broader design concept" can be distinguished that includes

[4] See for example: Doll, Bredekamp and Schäffner 2016.

activities such as consulting, organizing, managing and communicating. Keiko Tsuruta Cramer and Jared Edgar McKnight exemplify with the Hoover-Mason-Trestle project (opened 2015) in Bethlehem, PA, how the juxtaposition of historically significant abandoned structures and new architectural elements (things) can propose new occupations of space in the twenty-first century. With that, the authors refer to the thirty-year long history of architectural and landscape architectural reinterpretations of former industrial complexes of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Transforming the Bethlehem Steel Mill, once one of the largest steelworks worldwide, into a recreation area has its German equivalents in the Ruhr district and large parts of the former mining regions in Eastern Germany.

Yvonne Spielmann discusses mixings of things and spaces in the context of digital media theories and with examples of the Japanese-European group *doubleNegatives Architecture*. With her contribution, Spielmann refers to the discussion of the "hybrid" in numerous disciplines particularly in the 1990s.

## Chapter 4: Mixing of Uses

Urban concepts for mixing areas of working and dwelling have been developed for decades. Goals are, among others, to vitalize business neighborhoods outside of shopping hours; minimize walking distances between one's apartment and workplace and thus reconcile work and family life or support flexible work schedules; and address new forms of working, such as home office or co-work spaces. Today's discussions about such mixings continue the debates of the 1960s and 1970s, in which authors such as Kevin Lynch, Jane Jacobs, Hans Paul Bahrdt, and Alexander Mitcherlich reclaimed the mixing of uses, such as working and dwelling or car and pedestrian traffic, in reaction to the paradigm of the "functional city" that they considered a failure. The "functional city" paradigm, first framed in 1928 at the *Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne (CIAM)* and widely spread by Le Corbusier's *Athens Charter* of 1943, was quickly interpreted as a proposal to separate the functions within cities. The supporters of this idea justified the need of separating functions with the horrifying changes of the cities that came with industrialization, having turned them into "the very image of chaos." Referring to the Athens Charter, they demanded a restructuring of the "four key functions" in the city—"inhabiting, working, recreation (in leisure time), and circulation"—with each function having "its own autonomy."[5]

5 Le Corbusier 1973 [1943]: 155–158.

These disputes on distributing functional areas in the city exemplify that the idea of mixing functions can only be evaluated appropriately when the idea of separating functions is studied as well. Ute Poerschke is addressing this in the current issue. She shows how CIAM, during its existence between 1928 and 1959, became more and more trapped in its "functional city" paradigm. Not only CIAM representatives but large parts of the postwar generation of urbanists interpreted the separating process of analyzing functions in cities—used so ambitiously in the famous CIAM congress of 1933—more and more toward a dogmatic design process foredoomed to fail.

Cyrus Zahiri asks how mixed uses can be facilitated in urban design at all. Since urban designs are realized over long durations, Zahiri states, urban designers must work in their designs with the element of vagueness. Dealing with vagueness means that urban designs can only be frameworks, which create sufficient conditions for spatial characterization, while simultaneously allow for economic, social, and judicial developments. Zahiri supports his position with investigations of several completed projects, particularly in the Netherlands.

## Uncovered Topics and Open Questions

The two *Cloud-Cuckoo-Land* issues 34 and 35 and the Berlin conference have covered only small areas of the topics of "between" or "mixing" architecture and landscape architecture. Unaddressed aspects are, for example, the upcoming reevaluation of postmodern architecture and landscape architecture (mixing of everyday and high culture) or the ongoing debate about the definition of architectural professions (mixing of disciplines). The discussion forum of this issue invites all readers to contribute their views of mixings in architecture and landscape architecture. Three contributions have already been submitted and widen the range of investigations.

Architectural design means always to relate different things—urban structures, buildings, open spaces, building elements, or plants; considering the general theme of mixing might help during the design process. Depending on the design task at hand, its context, and the individual design attitude, the following questions might help approach, investigate and control the type and degree of mixing:

– Why do we need to mix something?
– What is mixed?
– How is it mixed?
– What for: What is the result of mixing?
– Who mixes: the provider of a design task, the designer, craftsmen, or the user of architecture and landscape architecture?

Among these, the "how" question embraces the core activity of design: Do the parts remain separate after the act of mixing? And do other terms exist that describe the examined phenomenon more precisely?

## Curators

Sebastian Feldhusen is a research assistant and doctoral student at the Technische Universität Berlin; managing editor of *Wolkenkuckucksheim | Cloud-Cuckoo-Land | Воздушныи замок*; and designer and critic of architecture and landscape architecture. Recent research projects include the relationship of the phenomena of "model," "quality," and specific "works" in architecture and landscape architecture. www.entwerfen. tu-berlin.de

Ute Poerschke is a professor of architecture at the Pennsylvania State University, USA. She is a co-principal of *Friedrich Poerschke Zwink Architects | Urban Planners* and co-editor of *Wolkenkuckucksheim | Cloud-Cuckoo-Land | Воздушныи замок*. Her research focuses on functionalism in architecture and the relationship of technology and architecture. Her book *Architectural Theory of Modernism. Relating Functions and Forms* was published by Routledge in 2016. www.fpz-architekten.de and http://stuckeman.psu.edu/arch/ute-poerschke

Jürgen Weidinger is head of the Chair for Landscape Architecture at the Technische Universität Berlin. He founded the office *Weidinger Landschaftsarchitekten* in Berlin in 1995. Weidinger taught in England, France, Italy, Ireland, and China. His research interest focuses on designing atmospheres (see the publication *Atmosphären entwerfen*, 2014) and the development of knowledge through design (see the publications *Entwurfsbasiert forschen*, 2013, and Designing Knowledge, 2015). Selected projects are: Park above the *Federal Foundation of Baukultur* in Potsdam (2012), and the *Kätcheslachpark* in Frankfurt am Main (since 2009). www.entwerfen.tu-berlin.de and www.weidingerlandschaftsarchitekten.de

## Literature

*Feldhusen, Sebastian; Ute Poerschke (2015)*: "Between Architecture and Landscape Architecture. Editorial." In: Feldhusen, Sebastian; Poerschke, Ute (eds.): "Between Architecture and Landscape Architecture." Cloud-Cuckoo-Land, International Journal of Architectural Theory, vol. 21, no. 34, www.cloud-cuckoo.net/fileadmin/issues_en/issue_34/editorial_en.pdf (enquiry date): 17–26.

*Crutzen, Paul Josef; Mike Davis; Michael Mastrandrea (2001)*: "Das Raumschiff Erde hat keinen Notausgang." Berlin: Suhrkamp.

*Crutzen, Paul Josef (2002)*: "Geology of Mankind." In: Nature, vol. 148, no. 415 (3 January): 23.

*Doll, Nikola; Horst Bredekamp; Wolfgang Schäffner (eds.) (2016)*: "+ultra. Gestaltung schafft Wissen." Ausstellungskatalog Martin-Gropius-Bau, Berlin. Leipzig: E. A. Seemann.

*Le Corbusier (1973)*: "The Athens Charter [1943]," translated by Anthony Eardley. New York: Grossman.

## Recommended Citation