



儒格·威恩

AIA, FIIDA, Hon. FASID

为什么设计是非常重要的 Why Design Really Matters

为了让中国设计师更多地了解国际设计师，北京科普兰德国际设计俱乐部在网站、邮件的基础上，特别开设了国际设计师特别推荐栏目。此栏目，每期会推荐一到两位国际设计师，内容涵盖他们的设计理念、设计作品、目前所做的工作等等。此次该栏目选择了英国设计师儒格·威恩写的一篇文章。该文章介绍了他对设计的一些思考以及他目前所做的工作。

了解更多设计师请登录：<http://idc.e-jiji.com>

设计必须融入到环境中。因为，你、我、她，所有人，总是处在某个特定的环境中的。有时候，这个环境是自然的，也就是说环境是自然提供的。有时候，环境是“我们”制造的，这种情况下，这个“我们”意味着这个环境是人为创造的。人类，一直在设计环境，所有人都无时无刻地在设计环境。

当然，环境的轮廓并不像白与黑的关系那么明了，因为有时候那些自然的环境已经是我们曾经设计、改造过的，现代的城市公园就是例子。不过，分清它们之间的区别可以帮助设计师以透视法的方法，从更广阔的角度发挥自己的杠杆作用。

我们以一个假想的案例为例。如果你是一个设计师，假想你现在正在做的一个项目。如果你不是设计师，那么就想象一下你现在的房间。你是否会给这个设计定义一个特点呢？它是否是基于某种特别的形状或者形式令人难忘的？它是否大胆地运用了颜色，还是采用现代超级市场的功能效率方式？这个设计最令人难忘的是它表达了对地球资源的敏感，而且设计最终是沿着这样的思路进行的？

设计行为本身是需要决策的。最简单的项目也是由很多璀璨的设计决策组成的，这些设计决策塑造了环境的形状及特点。当我们考虑环境的时候，更重要的是我们要记得环境并不仅仅是物理的或者现在就建在那的环境。事实上，它是物理的与社会环境的结合，它们结合在一起，共同打造了我们生活的环境。

在“设计环境”的框架下，我们需要思考一个问题：为什么不是所有的设计师的设计思想目的是打造一个地方，并使得该地方最大程度上促进人类的繁荣呢，不论是这个地方到底是做什么的——它可以是个人生活空间，可以是工作场所，可以是学习场所，医疗空间，零售空间，或者就是景观或者城市设计？如果我们设计所有的东西，那么我们为什么不将它们设计得使我们自己、我们的家人、我们的同事、我们的朋友生活的更好呢？

这个问题最简单的回答是：很多设计师并没有真正地想过这个问题。

儒格·威恩博士是一位在美国的建筑师，他思考这个问题已经四十多年了。八年前，他创立了一个以学习、研究为基础的机构，让设计师们在机构内思考该问题。在这八年中，他已经组成了由14个人组成的在五个国家设有分支机构的团队，通过这些机构将这种思想传播出去，并检测结果。

儒格·威恩博士的说明性是由合作者的两个不同范畴的成果决定。第一，合作者之间的进步必须是系统的、可持续的。系统的进步是指给予现状重要改变的进步，比如说一个全新的图案，而不是单纯的、简单的进步。持续的责任意味着实际的进步必须是持续的、不断增多的。也就是说，不仅是要进步一点点，而是要不停的进步。第二个范畴就是让所有的合作者学会怎样使得进步持续化、可靠化，并且是生

活中可以预见的。这个学习过程包含22个因素，或者说主题，这些都是通过在现实环境中实验总结出来的。学会如何设计环境，将物理及社会环境融为一体，这需要全新的思维，然后做复杂的决策。事实上，这种新的设计行为就被定义为“活跃的、实验性健康的设计领导层以促进更多有生产力的空间，并通过空间促进繁荣。”

这种方法主要强调的是空间的繁荣。要实现该目标必须依靠“活跃的、健康的设计领导。”很明显，这种行为要求每个从业者的积极领导行为。最后，这种领导行为的目的是打造一个更有生产力的空间。更具有生产能力的空间的酝酿可以设计出全新的、不同种类的环境，并使得该空间更繁荣。儒格·威恩博士的这种方法目前已经在实践中得到了证明。

这篇文章主要描述的是“什么”和“为什么”设计环境可以使得人类变得繁荣。如何做到这点将是一个更加广阔的范围，不是一篇小小的介绍性的文章就可以体现的。如果想了解更多，请登录www.thecaritasproject.info/leadingbydesign，和www.aplacetofourish.net。

备注：

- (1).IDEAS + BUILDINGS, 2010 / Volume .03, Perkins + Will, page 60.
- (2).IDEAS + BUILDINGS, 2010 / Volume .03, Perkins + Will, page 72.
- (3).Personal email from James Lesslie to Glenn O'Neal of USA Today and Dr. Ruga, dated 30 September 2010.

Put ‘design’ into its context: we - that is: you, me, and everyone else - are always situated in an environment, always. Sometimes this environment is natural, meaning it is the environment that ‘nature’ provides. Other times this environment is the environment that ‘we’ have made - in this case, the ‘we’ means that the environment is a human construction. As humans, we are always designing environments...all of us, and all of the time.

Of course this contextual framework is not quite as black and white as it appears - since sometimes the natural environment is one that ‘we’ have designed and constructed, as in the case of many of the modern urban parks. Nevertheless, by clarifying these distinctions we can begin to see how we can approach ‘design’ from a perspective that gives us much greater leverage as designers.

For example, imagine a ‘design project’. If you are a designer, think about one that you are currently working on. If you are not a designer, think about the room that you are now sitting in. What were the compelling thoughts that gave this design its signature? Was it based on a shape or form that made it memorable? Was it a bold use of color, or perhaps an approach to functional efficiency - like in the design of an ultra-modern supermarket? Does the design become memorable because of its sensitivity to our planetary resources, and the range of design decisions that follow this line of thought?

The activity of designing requires making decisions. The simplest of design projects is made up of an enormous constellation of decisions that give shape and character to the environment. And when we consider the environment, it is important to remember that the environment is so much more than the physical or built environment. In fact, it is both the physical and the social environments - together, as one - that make the places that we experience our lives in.

Given this framework for understanding ‘design of the environment’, a

question to consider is - why wouldn’t all designers have their most compelling thought be that of wanting to create a place that supports the highest degrees of human flourishing - irrespective of whether the place was for personal living, work, learning, healthcare, retail, or even as a landscape or urban design? If we could design anything, why wouldn’t we be designing places that enable ourselves, our families, our colleagues, and our extended relations to be living the best possible lives that they could possibly imagine?

The simple answer to this question, is: ‘because most designers never actually think about this’.

Dr. Wayne Ruga, a US-based architect working globally, has been thinking about this for more than 40 years. Eight years ago, he developed a research-based learning process that enables designers to accomplish this. During this eight-year period, he has engaged a group of 14 individuals and their respective organizations in five countries, to apply this new learning process to those environments that they are responsible for and to measure the results.

Dr. Ruga’s accountability is determined by two very different dimensions of outcomes by these collaborators. First, the improvements that the collaborators make must be both systemic and sustainable. The systemic improvements must be significant changes to the status quo, such as a completely new pattern - not just mere increments of improvement. The sustainable accountability means that the actual improvements must progressively improve over time. This means that - rather than just making an improvement - the actual improvement must improve, and improve, and continue to improve.

The second dimension of Dr. Ruga’s accountability is for the collaborators to learn how to make these improvements consistently, reliably, and predictably in their personal lives, organizational and professional work, and in their community engagements. The learning process has

22 elements, or ‘themes’, and these are learned through actual application in real-world situations as ‘practice’. Learning how to design the environment - the integrally unified physical and social environment - in this manner, requires a completely new mindset to making the multitude of decisions that such an activity entails. In fact, this new design activity is characterized as ‘actively exercising health design leadership to cultivate a more generative space to create a place to flourish’.

This approach puts the emphasis on creating ‘a place to flourish’. The activity to accomplish this is described as ‘actively exercising health design leadership’. Clearly, this activity requires active leadership by each of its practitioners. Finally, the goal of the leadership activity is to ‘cultivate a more generative space’. It is precisely the cultivation of this ‘more generative space’ that designs a very new and different kind of environment that actually becomes ‘a place to flourish’. The actual application of this approach, by Dr. Ruga’s collaborators, is providing documented evidence of the many benefits that this new approach offers. The following examples are actual projects that have been designed by several of Dr. Ruga’s collaborators.

This discussion has presented the ‘what’ and ‘why’ of designing environments that enable human flourishing. The actual ‘how’ of accomplishing this is a discussion that requires more extensive engagement than such an introductory article could allow. For additional information about this new approach to designing environments, visit www.thecaritasproject.info/leadingbydesign, and also visit www.aplacetofourish.net for information about an annual design award program called the ‘Generative Space Award’.

Notes:

- (1).IDEAS + BUILDINGS, 2010 / Volume .03, Perkins + Will, page 60.
- (2).IDEAS + BUILDINGS, 2010 / Volume .03, Perkins + Will, page 72.
- (3).Personal email from James Lesslie to Glenn O'Neal of USA Today and Dr. Ruga, dated 30 September 2010.