

LANDSCAPE OF RE-INVENTION

Andrea Oldani

Assistant Professor in Landscape Architecture

Politecnico di Milano. Department of Architecture and Urban Studies (DASTU)

The etymology of the word “invention” derives from the Latin *inventio-onis*, meaning “to come upon, find; invent, discover”.

The most resonant implications of this term for the spatial disciplines lie in the foundations of polytechnic culture, where it represents a fundamental act within the fields of architecture, landscape, and urban design. For centuries, “inventing” was oriented towards the discovery of the new, directed at improving the relationship between nature and culture, and at enhancing humanity’s ability to adapt and survive.

Today, in the midst of the Anthropocene, this ancient orientation towards invention can no longer be directed at transforming what is pristine. Instead, it must inevitably engage with a landscape of ruins and waste. These remnants testify to an era in which the demands of nature were largely eclipsed by the imperatives of consumption, an age when technology fostered the illusion of surpassing the boundaries imposed by the natural order. Consequently, we are faced with a complex legacy that demands re-invention. This process requires a profound undertaking: to observe what

already exists with attentiveness, to critique it rigorously, to reflect upon its obsolescence, and to propose a new framework of re-evaluation. What is called for is the recovery of the ontological meaning of nature as an ethical and moral resource, one capable of guiding future trajectories.

Therefore, it is unsurprising that the notion of “reverse engineering” has recently become relevant, reflecting the growing necessity to critically reassess the artificial construction of our environment, much of which has been shaped by the mere exploitation of resources and an overreliance on technology. This notion clarifies one possible interpretation of the concept of re-invention. At the same time, it encourages us to consider areas that are usually outside the scope of architectural discourse. It shifts our focus towards diverse materials that are waiting to be discovered and reconnected within a broader range of possibilities for spatial disciplines.

However, the process of re-invention cannot be equated with a codified practice. Rather, the emphasis is on exploring what it entails and how it

might be applied. Re-invention emerges as the necessary pathway through which new territories for the discipline can be extended and alternative roles for architecture can be defined for the decades ahead.

The papers presented at this conference session contribute to the identification and critical interrogation of possible "landscapes of re-invention". In doing so, they highlight the importance and necessity of engaging with the existing environment and its contradictions from a conceptual and theoretical perspective, while also emphasising the urgency of rethinking our living spaces. They demonstrate how architecture, with its millennia-old knowledge base, can contribute in original and innovative ways to the urgent contemporary debates.

This in turn necessitates a consideration of the form of space, its formal characteristics, and the way in which it interacts with itself, with its environment, and with the materials of which it is made. The process of re-invention encompasses various categories and modes of

spatial interaction, providing a useful framework for describing the contemporary landscape.

In the following papers, we can deepen the intersections generated by interdependence, the dynamics of superimposition produced by anthropocentrism and the interruptions caused by a lack of clarity in programme structures. At the same time, we can address the hybridisations and coexistences that are necessary for interpreting contemporary conditions. This requires us to pay attention to the nature of transitional spaces and the fragments produced by the mechanisms of accumulation and rupture that are now integral to every context.

All of this highlights the urgent need to revise design methods and tools to manage the intensification of complexity during a period of major reconsideration of development models. In this context, we must take responsibility for nurturing our landscapes, safeguarding their legibility and ensuring they have the capacity to sustain forms of attachment and recognition.

Ivers, B. Cannon (2021). *250 Things a Landscape Architect Should Know*. Basel: Birkhauser.

Oldani, A. (2023). *Verso una emblematica della manutenzione per le infrastrutture idrauliche / Towards an emblematic for the maintenance of hydraulic infrastructure* – Atlas+Primer. Melfi: Libria.

Tsing, A., Swanson, H., Gan, E. & Bubandt, N. (eds). (2017). *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet: Ghosts and Monsters of the Anthropocene*. Minneapolis, Mn: University of Minnesota Press.