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查尔斯·瓦尔德海姆（Charles W. Waldheim 1930-1974）是20世纪美国最重要的景观设计师之一，他的许多作品至今依然影响着世界各地的景观设计。他的职业生涯大部分在美国度过，但他在德国的早期工作和对欧洲景观设计的影响也非常重要。

瓦尔德海姆在1956年完成了他在哈佛大学的研究生课程，随后他在美国景观设计界崭露头角。他的作品涵盖了从城市公园到大型公共空间的各种类型，包括纽约中央公园的改造工程。他的设计风格被认为是后现代主义的先驱，他对景观设计的贡献主要体现在他对空间的探索和对自然与人文环境的和谐融合。

瓦尔德海姆的许多作品至今仍然受到高度重视，他的设计理念和方法也在不断的实践中得到发展。他的一生虽然短暂，但却为景观设计领域留下了宝贵的遗产。

瓦尔德海姆的许多作品至今仍然受到高度重视，他的设计理念和方法也在不断的实践中得到发展。他的一生虽然短暂，但却为景观设计领域留下了宝贵的遗产。
Landscape urbanism has emerged over the last decade as a critique of the disciplinary and professional conceptions of traditional urban design and an alternative to "New Urbanism." The critique launched by landscape urbanism has much to do with urban design, which is perceived as a discipline steeped in the past, neglecting to come to terms with the rapid pace of urban change and the essentially historical character of contemporary automobile-based urbanization across North America and much of Western Europe. It equally has to do with the inability of traditional urban design strategies to cope with the environmental shift in the wake of deindustrialization, bureaucratization, and increased error for an ecologically robust, urban, and the ongoing pressures of the contemporary design culture as an aspect of urban development.

The dislocating discourse of landscape urbanism as chronicled in this book and other venues shines light on the ultimately abandoned proposal for the picturesque urban space that might then have been truly formed in landscape architecture at Harvard. One reading of Joel Lake's Stuart's original formulation for urban design as placed in Harvard is that he wanted to provide a transitional space within the academy. But urban design is still often a discipline that engages in the design of disciplines engaged with the built environment. In the wake of that, unfilled potential, landscape urbanism has proposed a critical and historically informed reassessment of the environmental and social aspiration of Modernist planning and its most successful models. This essay offers one potential counter-historical narrative as a way to illuminate the present predicament of urban design. In so doing, it proposes a potential recuperation of at least one strand of Modernist planning, the one in which landscape offered the medium of urban, economic, and social order.

Among the many noteworthy contributions on the origins of urban design, Eric Klopfer's Motherland's formulation of urban design in the wake of CAM is a particular mention, since it extends knowledge on that topic of international significance for architects, urbanists, and academics historically engaged. Klopfer's account provides useful background for several of the more contemporary accounts, including Alex Krieger's thorough overview of the field as a contemporary professional concern. Krieger's essay recounts the multiple motivations in framing the field and completes the readers of the inquisitive questions raised at the Harvard conferences on the potential relationships within and between ecological urbanism and the ongoing pressures of the contemporary design culture as an aspect of urban development. The dislocating discourse of landscape urbanism — as chronicled in this book and other venues — shines light on the ultimately abandoned proposal for the picturesque urban space that might then have been truly formed in landscape architecture at Harvard. One reading of Joel Lake's Stuart's original formulation for urban design as placed in Harvard is that he wanted to provide a transitional space within the academy. But urban design is still often a discipline that engages in the design of disciplines engaged with the built environment. In the wake of that, unfilled potential, landscape urbanism has proposed a critical and historically informed reassessment of the environmental and social aspiration of Modernist planning and its most successful models. This essay offers one potential counter-historical narrative as a way to illuminate the present predicament of urban design. In so doing, it proposes a potential recuperation of at least one strand of Modernist planning, the one in which landscape offered the medium of urban, economic, and social order.

The Other '56

Cheney WALKHAIMER (Professor and Chair, Department of Landscape Architecture, Harvard Graduate School of Design)

Abstract — The critique launched by landscape urbanism has much to do with urban design's perceived legacy, culturally-crafted urban design's projective nature, and, consequently, its role as a courtier to political forces. This essay offers one potential counter-historical narrative as a way to illuminate the present predicament of urban design. In so doing, it proposes a potential recuperation of at least one strand of Modernist planning, the one in which landscape offered the medium of urban, economic, and social order.
a policy speech to New York as "a high-end product, maybe even a luxury product." I would second Michael Sorkin's call for urban design to move beyond its implicit bias in favor of Manhattanism and its predisposition toward density and elitist enclaves explicitly understood as furnishings for luxury lifestyle. Finally, urban design's historic role of interlocutor between the design disciplines and planning has been too invested in public process and process as a surrogate for the social. While the recent recuperation of urban planning within schools of design has been an important and long overdue correction, it has the potential to overcompensate. The danger here is not that design will be swamped with literate and topical scholarship on cities, but that planning programs and their faculties run the risk of reconstructing themselves as insular enterprises concerned with public policy and urban jurisprudence to the exclusion of design and contemporary culture.

The most immediate and problematic dimension of this historical overcorrection has been an antagonism between design culture and public process as a surrogate for the construction of a more legitimately social position within urban planning or the design fields. In lieu of endless public consultation as a form of postmodern urban therapy, I would argue for a reconsideration of the broad middle-class mandate of mid-century Modernism. While a recuperation of Hilberseimer or other protagonists in Modernist urbanism is not without its challenges, the potential benefit is a precedent for an ecologically informed and socially activist practice reconcilable with high status design culture. The very fact that Hilberseimer built precisely one planning project in his career is testament to the difficulty of this model, but equally points to its viability and efficacy. As we have collectively abandoned Modernist urbanism, we have lost access to the only brief moment in American history in which socially progressive, ecologically informed planning practice was available.

This brings me back to Lafayette Park and that other '56, the year which evidenced the best laid plans of the New Deal and the American welfare state. Among the successes of Lafayette Park was that it could imagine a mixed-class, mixed-race future for American cities precisely at the moment that most Americans were beginning to leave the city in favor of the suburbs. Ultimately, this is the promise, as yet unfulfilled, of urban design as described in 1956. If it were to recommit its resources to the historically informed, empirical description of urban form and its epi-phenomena, urban design would find ample evidence in the way that most Americans live and work.

Much of what constitutes urban design culture is produced in a thin band of urban density between Philadelphia and Cambridge, while most Americans live in suburban settings of decreasing density across fly-over country. The centrality of this dilemma for contemporary reconsideration of urban design is attested to by the no less than three competing and occasionally contradictory book reviews of Robert Bruegmann's controversial Sprawl: A Compact History that appear in the same HDM issue (although online only) where these essays first appeared. The relative lack of consensus on the value of Bruegmann's empirical analysis for urban design and the implicit threat that it represents to the urban design discourse as presently constructed are evident in the reception of Bruegmann's work in HDM and available for all to interpret.

Among those threats is the increasingly clear sense that urban design has largely abandoned its original aspiration to articulate urban order for the places where most North Americans live and work. Given the fact that many European cities are increasingly emulating the economic and spatial characteristics of North American cities, this is an issue of no small relevance to discussions of urban design internationally, particularly since so much of the history of urban design has been focused on the importation of European models of urbanity into North American cities.

It is in the contexts of urban design's as yet unrealized promise and potential that landscape urbanism has emerged in the past decade. Landscape urbanism has come to stand for an alternative within the broad base of urban design historically defined. Incorporating continuity with the aspirations of an ecologically informed planning practice, landscape urbanism has been equally informed by high design culture, contemporary modes of urban development, and the complexity of public-private partnerships. Julia Czerniak's account of landscape architecture's recent shift of concerns "from appearance to performance" says much about this potential. Equally, her invocation in these pages of Sebastian Marot's work is equally deserving of mention. Marot has recently formulated a coherent theoretical framework to correlate landscape urbanism with contemporary architectural culture.

Marot's paired theories of "suburbanism" and "superurbanism" promise a potential reconciliation of urban design's historical estrangement from architectural culture. Marot formulated superurbanism to account for contemporary architectural culture's interest in hyper-programmed architectural interventions as a substitute or surrogate for the traditional mix and diversity of urban milieus. He articulated suburbanism to describe an essentially landscape urbanist practice of design in the context of decreasing density. In between the super- and the suburbanism persists as an irreducible (and ultimately undesirable) subtext of lived experience. Similarly, landscape urbanists have argued that the economic and ecological contexts in which most North Americans live ought to inform our models and methods of urban design and have developed a menu of modes suitable for working in suburban, exurban, and rapidly urbanizing contexts.

It would certainly be fair to say, as Rodolfo Machado does in these pages, that "the form produced by landscape urbanism has not yet fully arrived." It would be equally fair to say that landscape urbanism remains the most promising alternative available to urban design's formation for the coming decades. This is in no small part due to the fact that landscape urbanism offers a culturally layered, ecologically literate, and economically viable model for contemporary urbanism as an alternative to urban design's ongoing nostalgia for traditional urban forms. The clearest evidence of this is the fact the number of internationally prominent landscape architects are retained as lead designers of large scale urban development proposals in which landscape offers ecological function, cultural authority, and brand identity. Among these examples of landscape urbanists one could cite the practices of James Corner/Field Operations and Adrian Geuze/West 8 as exemplary. Field Operation's projects for the redevelopment of the Delaware River Waterfront in Philadelphia and Eastern Darling Harbor in Sydney are indicative of this line of work, as are West 8's projects for the Inner Harbor in Amsterdam and their recent projects for Toronto's Central Waterfront.

It is no coincidence that landscape urbanism has emerged as the most robust and fully formed critique of urban design precisely at the moment when European models of urban density, centrality, and legibility of urban form appear increasingly remote and when most of us live and work in environments more suburban than urban, more vegetal than architectural, more infrastructural than enclosed. In these contexts, landscape urbanism offers both model and medium for the renewal of urban design as a relevant concern over the coming half century and in advance of the next '56.