Public

To Rally Discussion

Dear Dorlyn Lyndon,

Thank you very much for the first issue of Volume 15 of Places which I read with great interest. Since I have repeatedly been asked to express my opinion on the jury’s choice not to give an award to our project for the Cardada mountain in Switzerland, I would like to use this opportunity to comment.

The jury discussion showed that the submitted documents presenting the Cardada project did not sufficiently stress the project’s research basis. However, the much-discussed “beauty” and “poetry” of the project are the results of thorough research into environmental processes and phenomena, human landscaping, and landscape perception. As a matter of fact, geologists, biologists and historians were involved in the project. Since I was presenting my project to a highly qualified jury I assumed the experts involved would notice and therefore take into consideration the considerable and important research work accompanying the design process.

Taking into account, if I may dare say, the project’s uniqueness, I was taken by surprise when I got to know of the jury’s choice. However, reading your last issue I did get the impression that the project started fruitful discussion amongst the jurors, and I hope that it might be helpful for future awards programs and decision-making. I think this is a challenging discussion worth carrying through.

Yours,

Paulo L. Birgi

A juror responds:

Creating great places goes beyond reliance on an isolated, singular vision. The EDRA/Places program assumes that systematic inquiry enhances planning and design processes and produces. That inquiry can span boundaries that often divide researchers from each other and the design professions. This is a difficult, messy, and relatively unheralded process. Therefore, the EDRA/Places award honors explicit attention to communicating across disciplines and across design/research boundaries.

But what I really meant was . . . .” So lamented students when I am unable to discern the research between the lines of their papers. Our 2002 jury faced a similar difficulty deciphering the research behind Paolo Birgi’s vision.

How did the research of geologists, biologists, and historians help inform particular aspects of this vision? How do visitors experience the site in ways that provide both confirmation and surprise for the researchers and designers? Explicit presentation of such questions and answers to them would have elevated the word “between the lines,” and provided a significant and lasting contribution not only on the mountain, but in our professional discourse.

Barbara Brown
President EDRA, juror, 2002