

Mojca Golobič

LE V USTVARJALNOSTI JE PRIHODNOST VARSTVA KRAJINE

THE ONLY FUTURE OF LANDSCAPE PROTECTION LIES IN CREATIVITY

UVODNIK EDITORIAL

ČLANEK
ARTICLE
RAZPRAVA
DISCUSSION
RECENZIJA
REVIEW
PROJEKT
PROJECT
DELAVNICA
WORKSHOP
NATEČAJ

COMPETITION
PREDSTAVITEV
PRESENTATION

Za Francesca Petrarko, ki velja za »ustvarjalca« pojma krajina, je ta pomenila predvsem duhovno izkušnjo. Skoraj pol tisočletja pozneje je Alexander von Humboldt na krajino gledal predvsem kot na objekt znanstvenega raziskovanja. Danes je krajina predmet zanimanja številnih različnih strok ter meddisciplinarnih pristopov. Evropska konvencija o krajini v njej vidi pomembno sestavino kulturnih, ekoloških in družbenih procesov ter vir gospodarskih dejavnosti (Council of Europe, 2000). S pospešenim tempom spreminjanja krajine, za katerega je zaslužen predvsem človek, pa smo v njej začeli videti predvsem nekaj ogroženega, vrednoto, ki jo je treba zavarovati. Izguba krajinske in biotske raznovrstnosti, zaraščanje kmetijskih zemljišč, fragmentacija krajine, razpršena poselitve ... so pojavi, ki po prevladujoči strokovni in politični oceni ogrožajo krajino (Dejeant-Pons, 2005; Palang et al., 2006; Council of Europe, 2000; Antrop, 2005). Tako je krajina, ki je bila v preteklosti predvsem vir in inspiracija za človekov razvoj, postala razlog za omejevanje svobode pri uresničevanju razvojnih zamisli.

Sodobni procesi spreminjanja krajin so posledica naravnih in družbenih dejavnikov, ki so med seboj v zapletenih odnosih in se odvijajo v dokaj nepredvidljivi dinamiki. Odziv družbe na kompleksnost in negotovost v krajini

For Francesco Petrarca, who was allegedly the »creator« of the term landscape, landscape meant a spiritual experience. Almost 500 years later, Alexander von Humboldt regarded landscape mostly as a subject matter of scientific research. Today, landscape has been the topic of many different disciplines and interdisciplinary approaches. The European Landscape Convention notes that the landscape has an important role in cultural, ecological and social processes, and constitutes a resource favourable to economic activity (Council of Europe, 2000). With the increasing rate of landscape change, which is mostly due to human activities, the landscape has recently been considered under threat, i.e. a value that needs to be protected. The loss of landscape diversity and biotic diversity, overgrowing agricultural land, landscape fragmentation, dispersed settlement patterns are the phenomena that, according to the prevailing professional and political assessments, pose a threat to the landscape (Dejeant-Pons, 2005; Palang et al., 2006; Council of Europe, 2000; Antrop, 2005). The landscape that in the past provided the source of, and inspiration for, human development, became the reason for limiting the freedom in realising the ideas for development.

pa je prevladujoče standardizacijski. Tako si ljudje pač olajšamo delovanje v svetu, ki je prezapleten, da bi ga lahko obvladovali na holističen način: ustvarjamo tipologije, klasificiramo, postavljamo standarde in normative. Vse to so dobrodošla orodja in učinkovito delujejo zlasti v primerih, ko imamo opraviti s problemi, ki so si med seboj zelo podobni. Prostor pa ni tak. Vsak njegov delček ima svojo zgradbo, svoje posebne značilnosti in zgodovino. To drži že v pogledu naravnogeografskih lastnosti, če pa dodamo še načine, kako ga je (pre)oblikoval človek in kako ga ta uporablja, čuti, razume, koliko in katere skupine ga uporabljajo, pa je prav zares nemogoče primerjati en prostorski problem z drugim. Za neenostavne probleme torej uporabljamo poenostavljene rešitve. Krajina postane vodozbirno porečje, kmetijsko zemljišče, gozd ali habitat. Prostor upravljamo tako, kot da ga je mogoče glede na neko prevladujočo značilnost v krajini (voda, gozd, narava) razdeliti med posamezne »lastnike«, ki imajo nato skoraj neomejeno pravico z njim gospodariti in ostalim uporabnikom postavljati pravila »od zgoraj navzdol« in s svojega ozkega sektorskega gledišča. Povprečna slovenska občina ima danes v svojem prostoru opraviti z vsaj pol ducata takimi upravljavci, katerih zahteve so bolj ali manj stroge, predvsem pa z malo občutka za značilnosti konkretnega prostora, še toliko manj pa za potrebe ljudi, ki v njem živijo ali ustvarjajo. Takšni pristopi črpajo svojo legitimnost tudi iz vsesplošnega prepričanja, da je treba v odločanje pripeljati »več stroke (znanja) in manj politike«, saj naj bi bila prva – v nasprotju s slednjo – objektivna, nepristranska in neomadeževana s korupcijskimi in podobnimi grehi. Tehnokratizacija odločanja o ravnanju s krajino vodi v »logično napako«, ko iz ugotovitev o stanju v prostoru skušamo neposredno izpeljati, kaj je v njem tudi najboljše početi, iz dejstev torej izpeljemo »najstva«. Rezultati pa niso prav prepričljivi, kar nam kaže tudi stanje v prostoru. V praksi je namreč zelo malo napak storjenih zaradi pomanjkanja znanja, več pa zaradi zlorabe ravnotežja moči med stroko, politiko in javnostjo v procesih odločanja. Diagnoza za stanje v urejanju prostora bi lahko bila, da varujemo celo preveč zavzeto, a ne tistega, kar je v krajini vredno in ogroženo, temveč predvsem vpliv in družbeno moč institucije oziroma stroke, ki ji pripadamo. Na ta način zaradi varstva krajine ne omejujemo le človekovega razvoja, temveč tudi njegovo ustvarjalnost.

Kako torej preseči ta togi, statični in vase zaprti krog neuspešnih varstvenih prizadevanj, ki ne samo, da ovirajo razvoj (kar morda niti ni vedno slabo), ampak so tudi neučinkovita v svojem osnovnem, varstvenem poslanstvu? Odgovor je prav v ustvarjalnosti, ki ji v sedanji ureditvi ostaja zelo malo prostora. Ustvarjalnost v varstvu namreč ni preveč dobrodošla, saj njeno (preveč) dobresedno razumevanje namiguje, da je treba ustvariti nekaj novega, otipljivega, gradnja pa je varstvu po definiciji nasprotna. Vendar pa krajine, ki je po svoji naravi dinamična, sploh ni mogoče varovati drugače kot ustvarjalno; z iskanjem takšnih rešitev, ki bodo za zeleni cilj kar najbolj ustrezne, obenem pa čim manj obremenjujoče za druge uporabnike prostora in predvsem za naravo. Zlasti v primeru narave, ki svojih interesov ne more izraziti in braniti, smo, kakor pravi etik Taylor, zavezani iskati čim manj škodljive načine svojega bivanja v krajini (Taylor, 1986). Sylvia Crowe je dejavnost krajinskih arhitektov že leta 1969 opisala kot ustvarjalno varstvo (Crowe, 1969), kar je eno od osnovnih vodil stroke tudi danes. Ustvarjalnost seveda potrebuje nekaj svobode, prostora in zavzetosti, ki se običajno ne

Contemporary processes of landscape change are a consequence of natural and social factors that are in complex mutual relations and whose dynamics is relatively unpredictable. The response of the society to the complexity and uncertainty in the landscape is prevalently one of standardisation. This is how we ease our activities in a world that is too complicated to be controlled in a holistic way: we create typologies, classifications, and set standards and norms. Generally, these tools are welcome and efficient in cases when we deal with problems that are very much alike. In space, however, the problems are far from being alike. Each small part has its own structure, special features and history. This is true for natural geographical features, but even more so if we consider the ways that space has been (trans)formed by man; the ways in which man has used, felt, understood it; the nature of the groups who use it and the rate of use – then it is downright impossible to compare one spatial problem to another. In other words, we use simplified solutions to problems that are not simple. The landscape becomes a catchment area, an agricultural land, a forest or a habitat. Space is managed in a way that makes us think that it is possible to take a prevailing feature in the landscape (water, forest, nature) and divide the area among »landowners«, who then have an almost unlimited right to manage the space and to dictate the rules in a »top-down« manner, from their narrow sectoral viewpoint. Today, the average Slovenian municipality has in its territory at least half a dozen of such managers whose demands are more or less strict, and, particularly, who have little feeling for the characteristics of the area, and even less for the needs of the people who live and work there. Such approaches draw their legitimacy from a general belief that decision-making should include more »expertise (knowledge) and less policy«, as the former – in contrast to the latter – is supposedly more objective, unbiased and free of corruption and similar transgressions. The technocratisation of decision-making related to the landscape leads to a fallacy, when we want to derive what is best for a certain area directly from the observations about the current state of the landscape; from facts we derive 'oughts'. As can be seen, the results are not convincing. In practice, errors are mostly not the result of the lack of knowledge, but the result of taking advantage of the power balance in the decision-making among the profession, policy and the public. A diagnosis of the conditions in spatial management could be that, indeed, we protect even too enthusiastically, but not what is really of value in the landscape or under threat, but the influence and social power of the institution or profession that we belong to. In this way both human development and man's creativity are restricted.

How are we to surpass this rigid, static and self-absorbed circle of unsuccessful protection endeavours that not only hinder the development (which is not always a bad thing), but are also inefficient in its basic protective mission? The answer is, indeed, in creativity which has very little room in today's spatial management. In protection, creativity is not too welcome since, if taken (too) literally, it implies that something new, tangible is to be created; while construction is, by its definition, in conflict with protection. However, the landscape which is dynamic by nature can only be protected creatively; by pursuing solutions that will come close(est) to meeting the desired goal and will be the least burdensome to other users of an area, particularly nature. In the case of nature, which cannot express

porodi v birokratsko-tehnokratskih glavah, temveč v ljudeh, ki s prostorom živijo, ga razumejo v vsej njegovi zapletenosti in vidijo čez meje svoje stroke in lastnega interesa. Participativni pristopi danes v urejanju prostora niso več izjema. Tudi v slovenski praksi ne manjka (dobrih in manj dobrih) primerov iskanja rešitev, ki temeljijo na vključevanju različnih skupin uporabnikov v procese odločanja. Pravih učinkov pa ni videti. Razlogov je veliko. Primerov zgledne participacije je v resnici precej manj, kot jih nosi tako »nalepko«. Večina se jih namreč zatakne nekje med obveščanjem in posvetovanjem in ne dosežejo partnerske ali celo odločevalske vloge javnosti (merjeno po lestvici participacije Sue Arnstein, 1969). Po drugi strani tudi »javnosti« ne bi smeli videti preveč idealizirano, njeni predlogi pogosto temeljijo na pomanjkljivem strokovnem znanju in nepreverjenih predpostavkah, iskanje soglasja je zapleteno, postopki so dolgi. Še največja težava pa je v legitimnosti interesov, ki jim v participativnih postopkih uspe uveljaviti svoje predloge: koga zares predstavljajo, kdo preverja, kaj njihovi predlogi pomenijo v razmerju do javnega interesa? Kdo se pod sprejete odločitve podpisuje, kdo zanje odgovarja in kako? Zaradi vsega naštetega participacija največkrat ostaja v okvirih formalno urejenih razgrnitev prostorskih načrtov in razprav. Vključevanje predlogov javnosti v rešitve pa je opazno kvečjemu pri pobudah za spremembo prostorskih planov, kar v praksi pomeni, da se Franckin travnik spremeni v parcelo s hišo za sina. Tudi tukaj torej prostora za ustvarjalnost ne ostane veliko.

Primer, ki ga na kratko predstavim v nadaljevanju, kaže, da je za vključevanje krajine v kulturne, ekološke in družbenoekonomske procese, kar je cilj Evropske konvencije o krajini, treba preseči sektorsko varstvene mehanizme. Varstvo najboljših kmetijskih zemljišč ali Natura 2000 ne more obuditi opustelih Kočevarskih vasi, ki jih je nekoč v 177 vaseh naseljevalo 28.000 pripadnikov nemške narodne skupnosti Kočevarjev, danes pa tam ne živi nihče več. Zidovi stavb so skorajda izginili, ostale so le ruševine vodnjakov, sledi teras v pobočjih in kot najbolj trdoživi pomniki v prostoru: sadna drevesa in toponimi. Naloge so se lotili študenti krajinske arhitekture, njihove rešitve pa vključujejo lokacije in predloge za razvoj kmetijstva, načrte za dve ekovasi, turistično in lokalno oskrbno središče, ter načrt prenove območja nekdanje žage Rog. Predlagali so tudi, kako vse te lokacije med seboj povezati s pohodnimi in kolesarskimi potmi ter kako celotno tematiko ustrezno predstaviti. Na zapleteni problem so gledali zunaj meja posameznih strok, se učili od prostora in ljudi, ki v njem živijo, bili ustvarjalni in razvili predloge, ki omogočajo prostoru vdahniti novo življenje v skladu z naravo, z duhom zgodovine in obenem s potrebami sodobnega človeka. Takšni, študentski projekti seveda ne morejo biti alternativa dogajanju v »resničnem svetu«. Vendar pa (tudi) na tak način vzgajamo generacije, ki bodo morda bolje razumele kompleksnost prostora, ne le v njegovi fizični, temveč predvsem družbeni razsežnosti, ter znale uporabiti ustvarjalnost pri njegovem urejanju. S tem ko se študenti lotevajo resničnih primerov, se ne učijo le oni, ampak tudi vsi drugi, ki smo v proces vpleteni: župani, občinski svetniki in uradniki, sodelavci strokovnih institucij, prebivalci in učitelji. To je morda sicer dolgotrajna, a vendarle zanesljiva in dolgoročno uspešna pot naprej.

or defend its interests, we are, as suggested by ethics philosopher Taylor, under a responsibility to search for the least harmful ways of our living in the landscape (Taylor, 1986). As early as in 1969, Sylvia Crowe described the activity of landscape architects as creative protection (Crowe, 1969), which has remained one of the basic professional guidelines to this date. Undoubtedly, creativity requires a certain amount of freedom, room and enthusiasm, which is usually not cultivated in bureaucratic and technocratic minds, but comes from the people who live and breathe the area, who understand all its complexity and think beyond the limits of profession and own interests. In spatial management, the participative approach is no longer an exception today. In the Slovenian practice there is no shortage of (good and less so) cases where solutions were sought based on the inclusion of different groups of users in the decision-making. However, no real effect has been seen. There are many reasons for this. In fact, there are far less cases of exemplary participation than the number of cases labelled as such. Most of these cases get stuck somewhere between communication and consultation, failing to achieve the partner role or, indeed, the decision-making role of the public (measured using the Ladder of Participation by Sue Arnstein, 1969). On the other hand, »the public« is typically too idealised, while its suggestions are often based on poor professional knowledge and unverified assumptions; the search for a consensus is complex and the procedures are long. The biggest concern seems to be the legitimacy of the interests coming through in participative procedures: Who do they really represent? Who verifies the significance of their proposals in relation to the public interest? Who will sign on the dotted line, who is liable and in what way? Because of all these concerns, participation usually remains within the formally organised public unveilings of spatial plans and discussions. At best, the inclusion of public proposals into solutions is seen in initiatives to change spatial plans, which in practice means that Jane's meadow is turned into a parcel occupied by a house for her son. There is not much room for creativity left there.

A case in point, as summarised below, proves that for the landscape to be included into cultural, ecological and socio-economic processes – which is the goal of the European Landscape Convention – we need to go beyond the sectoral protection mechanisms. The protection of the best agricultural land or Natura 2000 cannot revive the abandoned 177 Gottschee villages that were once inhabited by 28,000 members of the German national community of Gottscheers (in Slovene Kočevarji), while today there is no one left. The walls of the buildings have all but completely disappeared, there are only the remains of wells, traces of terraces on the slopes and, the most persistent reminders of the past: fruit trees and place names. The task was addressed by the students of landscape architecture; their solutions include locations and proposals for development of agriculture, plans for two eco villages, a tourist and local supply centre and a reconstruction plan for the former Rog sawmill. The students also proposed the way to connect the sites with footpaths and bicycle trails and the way to properly represent the topic. They addressed the complex problem by looking outside the limitations of disciplines, and instead learnt from the area and its people; they were creative in developing the proposals that gave new life to the area, in line with the nature, historical setting and needs of modern man. Of course,

UVODNIK
EDITORIAL

CLANEK
ARTICLE
RAZPRAVA
DISCUSSION
RECENZIJA
REVIEW
PROJEKT
PROJECT
DELAVNICA
WORKSHOP
NATEČAJ
COMPETITION
PREDSTAVITEV
PRESENTATION

VIRI IN LITERATURA:

Antrop, M. (2005). Why landscapes of the past are important for the future. *Landscape and urban planning* 70 (1–2), str. 21–34.

Arnstein, S. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35, 4, str. 216–224.

Council of Europe, European Landscape Convention (2000).

Crowe, S., (1969). *Landscape Planning, a Policy for an Overcrowded World*. Volume 21 of IUCN Publications: Supplementary papers, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.

Déjeant-Pons, M. (2005). The implementation of the European Landscape. Pridobljeno na spletni strani: <http://www.visualdiversity.net>.

Palang, H., Printsman, A., Konkoly Gyuro, E., Urbanc, M., Skowronek, E., Woloszyn, W. (2006). The forgotten rural landscapes of Central and Eastern Europe. *Landscape Ecology* 21 (3), str. 347–357.

Taylor, P.W. (1986). *Respect for nature. A theory of environmental ethics*. Princeton University Press.

such student projects cannot be a real alternative to the events in »real life«. However, this (too) is the way to raise the next generations who may have a better understanding of the complexity of space, not only in its physical, but in its social dimension, and who will learn how to use creativity in their work. Students' work on real cases is an opportunity to learn – not only for them, but for everyone involved: mayors, municipal councillors and administrators, colleagues in professional institutions, inhabitants and teachers. It may be a long way forward, but it is a reliable and, in the long-term, a successful one.

REFERENCES:

Antrop, M. (2005). Why landscapes of the past are important for the future. *Landscape and urban planning* 70 (1–2), str. 21–34.

Arnstein, S. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35, 4, str. 216–224.

Council of Europe, European Landscape Convention (2000).

Crowe, S., (1969). *Landscape Planning, a Policy for an Overcrowded World*. Volume 21 of IUCN Publications: Supplementary papers, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources.

Déjeant-Pons, M. (2005). The implementation of the European Landscape. Accessed on: <http://www.visualdiversity.net>.

Palang, H., Printsman, A., Konkoly Gyuro, E., Urbanc, M., Skowronek, E., Woloszyn, W. (2006). The forgotten rural landscapes of Central and Eastern Europe. *Landscape Ecology* 21 (3), pp. 347–357.

Taylor, P.W. (1986). *Respect for nature. A theory of environmental ethics*. Princeton University Press.