

Aesthetic Investigations

Published on behalf of the Dutch Association of Aesthetics

Special Issue – Architecture beyond the building



Urban Ruins and the Neo-Picturesque Landscape

Author

ELIZABETH SCARBROUGH

Affiliation

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY

Abstract: While classical ruins are seen as tourist destinations, contemporary or industrial ruins are dismissed as disused sites. In this paper I argue for the preservation of urban (or contemporary) ruins. I focus on one specific case, that of the Miami Marine Stadium in Miami, Florida USA. Since the 1990s the stadium has been derelict, a canvas for graffiti artists and a home to skateboarders. In 2018 the City of Miami decided to revamp the stadium and reopen it as a concert and sporting venue. The current design-development plan has sanitized this urban ruin, robbing it of its past. I will situate the debate about rehabilitating contemporary ruins within the growing literature of the neo-picturesque, specifically neo-picturesque landscape design. I believe that urban ruins such as these have a place in the modern city and will suggest some paths forward for these neo-picturesque ruin beauties.

I. INTRODUCTION

While classical ruins are seen as tourist destinations, contemporary ruins are often dismissed as disused sites. In this paper, I argue for the preservation of contemporary urban ruins. I focus on one specific case, that of the Miami Marine Stadium in Miami, Florida USA. Since the 1990s, the stadium has been derelict, a canvas for graffiti artists and a playground to skateboarders. In 2018, the City of Miami decided to revamp the Stadium to use it as a concert and sporting venue. The current design-development plan has sanitised this urban ruin, robbing it of its past. I believe that urban ruins such

as these have a place in the modern city and will suggest some paths forward for urban ruin rehabilitation and preservation.

I first give some history of the Miami Marine Stadium before turning to a discussion about the differences and similarities between contemporary ruins and ruins of antiquity. I then situate this debate within the framework of the British picturesque (and neo-picturesque) landscape design.¹

II. CASE STUDY: MIAMI MARINE STADIUM

Located off Key Biscayne in Miami, Florida, Miami Marine Stadium is considered a modernist concrete masterpiece. The architect, Hilario Candela (June 4, 1934-January 18, 2022) was the first Cuban-born American architect to receive a major public commission. Only 27 at the time, Candela built the stadium for \$1 million dollars in 1963. His Stadium has been called ‘[t]he most Cuban building in Miami’. It was also the first brutalist building to adorn the Miami skyline.² Miami Marine Stadium is a beautiful stadium, with seating for up to 6,500 people. Designed to host powerboat racing events, it has also been home to much more. Between 1964 and 1992, the Stadium hosted myriad events including religious services, campaign rallies, musical performances, water shows, boxing matches, and more. The Stadium hosted Jimmy Buffett’s 1985 ‘Concert of the Bay’, and served as the backdrop to the 1967 Elvis Presley movie, *Clambake*. It was also the location for a Richard Nixon campaign rally during which Sammy Davis, Jr. famously embraced Nixon on stage.

In 1992, the City of Miami alleged significant structural damage to the Stadium by Hurricane Andrew. The City argued that the damage was severe enough that the entire property needed to be demolished. Since the Stadium sits on an expensive piece of property, adjacent the Miami Seaquarium on Virginia Key in the Biscayne Bay, many locals suspect the Stadium was not so badly damaged, but that the city wants to demolish it so developers can build more profitable establishments in its place. The City received \$1 million from FEMA for demolition, even though an independent insurance company commissioned to study the Stadium concluded that the Stadium suffered little to no damage from the hurricane. Rather, \$2-3 million in repairs were needed to counteract neglect from 1964-1992. After this report was made public, Miami residents rallied behind the Stadium and prevented its demolition.

Since 1992 the Stadium has been shuttered. The Friends of Miami Marine Stadium (‘Friends’ hereafter) have complained that it ‘has been vandalised and covered with graffiti’.³ Not all see this graffiti as vandalism. Candela, the architect, has stated, ‘Graffiti artists have kept this building alive,’ turning the Marine Stadium from a powerboat racing venue to an ever-changing work of art. The Friends have hosted numerous events to raise the stadium’s profile. In October of 2008, the City of Miami Historic and Environmental Preservation Board approved the historic designation of the Marine Stadium.

In 2009, the Marine Stadium was named one of the ‘11 Most Endangered Historic Places’ on the National Trust for Historic Preservation’s list. This accolade pushed the stadium into the mainstream consciousness through *The New York Times*, NBC Nightly News with Brian Williams, and *USA Today*. In October 2009, the World Monuments Fund added the Marine Stadium to its 2010 Watch List, alongside higher-profile sites such as Machu Picchu, the City of Old Jerusalem, and Gaudi’s La Sagrada Familia in Barcelona.

In 2010, an engineering study completed by Simpson Gumpertz & Heger (SGH) showed that concrete restoration would cost between \$5-8 million (much less than the City’s estimate of \$15 million). In April of the same year, Miami-Dade County (the local jurisdiction where the Stadium resides) approved \$3 million for restorations through its Historic Preservation Program. These pledges were deferred, since the City failed to approve them during its May 2022 meeting.⁴

Since 2010, the site has received various grants and endorsements from celebrities such as Jimmy Buffett and Gloria Estefan. In 2014, the Florida State Legislature approved up to \$1 million for restoration and gave the Friends the goal of securing \$30 million for restoration – they were only able to raise \$15 million in contingent funds. Another failed attempt to raise support was buttressed by the Heineken corporation. During 2018’s Art Basel, the new group ‘Restore Marine Stadium’ held an art exhibit where they auctioned off 60 works of art to raise funds for restoration. The corresponding exhibition, ‘If Seats Could Talk’, contained artworks made from some of the Stadium’s seats.⁵ 3,200 Seats remain, and the organisation has left open the possibility to auction off more seats decorated by artists to raise additional restoration funds.

Under their ‘Keeping it Modern’ initiative, The Getty Foundation gave Miami a \$180,000 grant and conducted an on-site investigation. The investigation, which lasted from October 2014 to November 2015, provided concrete recommendations for restoring the Stadium. Unlike many local stakeholders, the Getty restoration practitioners acknowledged the importance of graffiti on the site. After all, the Stadium gained the art world’s attention only after graffiti had been illegally applied to the site.⁶

While the City argues that the Stadium was ‘abandoned’ in 1992, nothing could be further from the truth. Officials might consider the site ‘disused;’ but I argue its use has merely changed. It is used as a place for skateboarding, taggers and graffiti artists. It is home to the homeless. It is a place for teenagers to congregate. It is a place for artists to take photos and paint. While the original surface of the Stadium had a limited pallet – mostly poured in place reinforced concrete – the Stadium is now covered in colourful graffiti. The Getty estimates that there are up to 200 layers of graffiti paint in some places. By talking to locals and surveying YouTube graffiti videos of this site, the Getty was able to trace the types of paint used.⁷ The Getty also hosted a panel with local graffiti artists to canvas what they would like to

have done to the Stadium. The street artists community was unanimous in its opinion that it was ‘not in keeping with the historic character of the locale’ to either erase all the graffiti or to invite street artists to provide sanctioned murals on the walls. To them, an important feature of the art is that it is an ‘unauthorised and uncurated activity’.⁸ Moreover, the local artists believed that installing walls specifically for street artists to paint was in ‘violation of the spirit of its history from 1992 to the present’. However, there was support for recording the current images on the Stadium and projecting these images on large screens placed around the restored location.⁹

In the current design, two walls at the front of the Stadium are reserved for *curated* street artists’ work. This goes against the street art community’s wishes. The current plan also has the Stadium covered in ‘Graffiti Melt’ or ‘Defacer Eraser’, a transparent film that prevents spray paint from adhering to a structure’s surface.¹⁰ The vast majority of the Getty’s 83-page report details the field trial for removing the graffiti, while only a few pages detail their community engagement with local graffiti artists.

News and entertainment venues continue to publish articles about the beauty of the Stadium in its current form, including a *Sports Illustrated* story.¹¹ The story features graffiti written about the Stadium on the Stadium, ‘AND THEN ARTISTS KEPT IT ALIVE’. In April of 2021, the City announced it had won a \$1.2 million dollar FIND grant to update the repair plans. In June of 2021, Miami entered a three-year contract with Matthew L. Rossetti PC of Detroit to provide an expert consultant for \$125,000 per year.

As of today, very little has happened. The restoration plans by RJ Heisenbottle have been completed. There are some preliminary plans for the renovation. The new designs include a new floating stage and a state-of-the-art sound accompanied by an ‘Ocean Drive’ lighting system. City planners had hoped to have the stadium up and running by 2022. Ultra – a large electronic music festival – was hoping to use the venue for its 2023 edition, produced by EDM Events. Of course, COVID-19 has pushed back all plans further and all previous bond authorisations have expired. The city commissioners have now twice deferred the proposed resolution to authorise a \$61.2 million dollar bond.¹²

The current design plan is unsatisfactory because it ‘sanitises’ the structure and keeps none of its histories. The plan’s dominant purpose is economic, and it is willing to achieve that goal at the expense of sacrificing the Stadium’s history and diminishing its beauty both as a contemporary ruin and a prime example of modernist architecture. Before providing a list of suggestions for the site, I will first discuss the unique beauty of contemporary ruins.

III. CONTEMPORARY URBAN RUINS AND THE NEO-PICTURESQUE

III.I Urban Ruins

Given that the ruin is one of the most enduring representational icons, the Miami Marine Stadium's value lies within the context of contemporary 'modern American ruins'. What does 'ruin' mean in this context? Elsewhere I have argued that for something to be a ruin it has to be in the process of decay, and thus we cannot arrest the decay entirely and still conceptualise the site as a ruin.¹³ Yet here I would like to discuss the sorts of values ruins engender more generally, leaving open the question of whether this structure (the Miami Marine Stadium) currently counts as a ruin. Ruins contain multitudes. They are valued for their historical importance, beauty, economic potential, and meaning, which varies among cultures and communities. Ruins of antiquity are often deemed lucrative objects (i.e. tourist sites), while contemporary ruins are often dismissed as blights on the community.

In *The Aesthetics of Ruins*, Robert Ginsberg recognises two traditional theories of the aesthetic appreciation of ruins: the romantic and the classical (also known as the archaeological).¹⁴ While both theories emphasise the activation of the imagination, the classical conception focuses on how the viewer might imagine the original architectural structure, while the romantic conception considers ruins to serve as symbols that allow our minds to wander. Ginsberg's view is a bit enigmatic, as he combines bits from both the romantic and classical traditions. However, he seems more anti-classical than anti-romantic, as he devotes less time to understanding a structure's original architecture and history.

The growing aesthetic literature in the field of ruin appreciation acknowledges and maps onto the distinctions between classical and romantic ruin lovers. The chapters in *Philosophical Perspectives on Ruins, Monuments, and Memorials* feature remnants of the classical and romantic views on full display.¹⁵ While discussing ruin appreciation, several contributors (e.g., Korsmeyer, Scarbrough, Lamarque) invoke romantic notions of the sublime. However, those theorists who invoke the sublime tend to also mention the necessity of focusing on the incompleteness of the ruin, a feature typical of the classical conception. Jennifer Judkins' essay 'On Things That Are Not There Anymore' offers an example of the classical approach. She states,

Even sites where the structures are considerably damaged or ruined, like the Parthenon or Pompeii, are understandably attractive, as we fill in the blanks and imagine them as they were, based on what is left, thus emphasizing the importance of 'imaginative reconstruction', or imagining what was once there.¹⁶

In the past ten years or so, there has been considerable attention to modern American ruins. John Patrick Leary's article 'Detroitism' discussed the

way the derelict buildings of Detroit are conceptualised as ruins.¹⁷ And more recently Renee Conroy's treatment of 'Rust Belt Ruins' provides yet another reference for contemporary modern American ruins.¹⁸ Both the ruined buildings in Detroit and other 'Rust Belt Ruins' of the American Midwest have spurred the tourist industry. In this sense, modern American ruins share features with their European classical kin, but there are important differences.

The key difference is the modern American ruins' relative newness. Rarely items of archaeological importance, they need not be preserved in the same way. Additionally, their relative newness puts the classical model's 'imaginative reconstruction aspect of ruins' on the back burner. Ruins of antiquity are remnants of the distant past and as such invite us to reimagine past peoples and also ask us to reimagine what the ruin must have looked like at the height of its architectural form. New ruins ask less of us in terms of imaginative reconstruction. I need not imagine past people when engaging with the Michigan Central Train station. I need only ask my mother or my grandmother what it was once like. When more of the ruin remains, less imaginative reconstruction work is required to reimagine the structure as the architect intended.

Also, the sorts of symbolic meanings new ruins carry differ slightly in content. Ruins are easy targets for symbolic loading. No doubt, new ruins evoke some of the old ruin-gazing themes such as 'hubris undone' or the 'fall of empires'. Today's modern American ruins can be seen as the decline of the empire, the fall of capitalism or the downturn of domestic industrialisation, even though they are not yet remnants of a long past empire.

III.II Similarities between contemporary ruins and ruins of antiquity

Here I want to say a few things about what new ruins share with ruins of antiquity. In 'Nature and Art: Some Dialectical Relationships', Donald Crawford provides some ruin features relevant to this discussion:

1. Ruins are (for the most part) aesthetically unintended,
2. Ruins have a history, 'usually rich in meaning and associations',¹⁹
3. Ruins are incompletely ruined,
4. They have aesthetic foci often not found in the original aesthetic unity,
5. Ruins reference both the future and the past.

To this list I would add:

6. In a ruin, age-value is esteemed. Even in the case of new ruins, the ruin expresses this age-value through their perseverance.
7. Ruins show a change in use-value. A building that can no longer serve its primary function is often seen as a blight to communities. I will argue later

that its use-value does not diminish, even if its economic-value falls, but it has changed.

8. Ruins are not structures waiting for reassembly or repair. A ruinate factory is not waiting to return to its use as a factory – rather it has become something in its own right.

9. And finally, I would like to amend Crawford’s fifth feature: ruins possess an inherent reference to both the future and the past. I think it is more accurate to say that ruins possess a tripartite focus – allowing us to re-imagine the past, engage with what is in the present, and project what the future might hold. Too often theorists wax poetic about the transient nature of ruins, focusing our attention on either imaginative reconstruction or imaginative projection. However, ruins force us to engage with the present as well: they are often unsafe for us to walk around forcing us to pay attention to our body in space. They might feel dangerous or unsafe for other reasons (perhaps they are currently being used as a place to do drugs or a home to urban animals such as racoons). Ruins also allow us to have interesting tactile sensations. In the Miami Marine Stadium, you can drag your hands across the 200 layers of spray paint, chipping pieces off in various places on the structure. The ruin may be home to new creatures such as birds and (in Miami) lizards. We may hear them scampering around. What we find in the present is often unexpected and opens up interesting opportunities for aesthetic play.

Although we see some differences between contemporary ruins and those of antiquity, there are many similarities. Now that we have some ruin features under our belt, I’d like to situate new ruins within the neo-picturesque.

III.III Relationship to the picturesque and neo-picturesque

In thinking about contemporary North American ruins, I’d like to look at the 18th-century notion of the British Picturesque before I turn to contemporary North American discussions of the neo-picturesque. In Reverend William Gilpin’s ‘An Essay on Prints’ from 1768, he defined the picturesque as ‘a term expressive of that peculiar kind of beauty which is agreeable in a picture’.²⁰ One notion of the picturesque is the prospect of converting beautiful vistas into two-dimensional pictures. Gilpin argued that ruins were more able than other features of a landscape to offer variegated patterns of light and colour to the artist. The picturesque was a moment in history where artists and landscape designers revelled in the relationship between art and nature. Gardens became canvases for people to work on in concert or contrast with nature. During this period, ‘sham ruins’ or follies were in vogue. Follies held a variety of aesthetic purposes. Often, the aim was to artistically mold the landscape. The most popular of these follies on the English landscape was fake ruinate towers. In James Howley’s book *The Follies and Garden Buildings of Ireland*, he states,

The attraction of towers to landowners is... an obvious one, as there is no better way to survey one's estate or display it to others than from a high vantage point of one's own creation.²¹

It's no wonder so many gardens have been designed with 'station points', where one can pause and reflect on the views. This picturesque ideal no doubt inspired natural places for ruin lovers to stop and look. These sham ruins may be the true heritage one gleans from the picturesque. The importance of follies speaks to the beauty of ruins. During their 'grand tours', men marvelled at ruins and wanted to replicate their experiences abroad at home. One lesson learned from the British picturesque movement is its tie with tourism – ruin exploration and appreciation is also an important component of contemporary tourism.

Contemporary ruin tourism is bent on producing picturesque photos; posted on social media for all to see, again taking 3-dimensional spaces and reducing them to 2-dimensionality. Instead of walking around, climbing or otherwise exploring the ruin, tourists wait their turn to take perfect Instagrammable shots.

In 'Neo-picturesque', Susan Herrington and Dom Lopes point out another tradition of the picturesque: the picturesque as an artistic practice...

that uses the medium of landscape to produce certain effects. These effects include a characteristic cluster of feeling and memories centered on the idea of a way of life that has vanished.²²

They claim that an archaeological perspective on ruins engenders three constitutive characteristics. First, the built structures have been taken over by natural forces such that they no longer function as they were designed. Second, they involve absence (parts are missing in their form), and third, they have a special relationship to time.

They believe that there is a three-way distinction between a ruin in an archaeological sense, a restored structure and as a picturesque medium. With picturesque and neo-picturesque ruins, natural forces of decay are stopped or controlled, while novel programs and events enlist new uses. Crucially, though, the new uses are ones that change people's attitudes toward time and the past.²³ The authors situate the neo-picturesque as one of the arts of memory. According to Herrington and Lopes, while the picturesque typically included ruins, the neo-picturesque *requires* ruins. The ruins of the neo-picturesque, they believe, should be (a) maintained in their current condition and (b) foreground what is present, rather than what is absent.²⁴

In sum, according to Herrington and Lopes, the use of ruins in the neo-picturesque is an artistic practice via the medium of landscape whose purpose is to 'preserve, enhance and shape environmental memory'.²⁵ They claim,

[n]eo-picturesque landscapes demonstrate that we must take care not to over-intellectualize. Little of their power derives from the memory that this was an industrial complex. . . What they preserve, enhance, and shape is the memory of the materiality, mechanics, and scale of the spaces of the industrial past.²⁶

I find their account of the neo-picturesque extremely useful in discussing contemporary urban ruins. Unlike the ‘archaeological’ or ‘classical’ conception of ruins, the focus with urban ruins, such as the Marine Stadium, isn’t on what is absent but on what is present. Here I agree with Herrington and Lopes. I further agree with their three-way distinction between a ruin in the archaeological sense, a restored structure and a neo-picturesque ruin.

There are a few places, however, I would like to push back. First, the focus of their account of the neo-picturesque (and most accounts of contemporary ruins) is exclusive to landscapes that honour our industrial past (e.g., gasworks, steelworks, railways, etc.). I do not think this needs to be the case. While it might be typical, urban ruins need not be industrial or factory sites, as highlighted by the Miami Marine Stadium.

Further, as I mentioned when discussing Crawford’s account of ruins, we need not exclusively think about ruins, or the neo-picturesque, solely in terms of memory. Again one of the most powerful parts of ruins is their ability to keep one foot in the present with the other in the past and future. Ruins reimagine our relationship with time – the neo-picturesque does this as well.

Besides being sites of memory, ruins are sites of resistance. That is to say: they have resisted the ravages of time, resisted the forces of nature and in the context of contemporary American ruin appreciation, they have resisted the ever-shifting political, economic and cultural orders. Miami Marine Stadium, this cathedral of concrete, resisted Andrew, a Category 5 hurricane, with little damage. It is a site of resistance in a city that is always changing, always new. While the Miami Marine Stadium is only 60 years old, it is ancient, given the timescale of the city of Miami. Ruins with their changing and unexpected features provide counter sites to orderly cities, where every spot is planned.

Ruins are sites of resistance in another way – they resist easy narratives. Being a hybrid of the artefactual and the natural, they do not have one clear aesthetic foci, nor do they have one clear use. As Tim Edensor, geographer and author of *Industrial Ruins* argues:

Ruins foreground the value of inarticulacy, for disparate fragments, juxtapositions, traces, involuntary memories, uncanny impressions, and peculiar atmospheres cannot be woven into an eloquent narrative. Stories can only be contingently assembled out of a jumble of disconnected things, occurrences, and sensations.²⁷

This seems truer of contemporary ruins than ruins of antiquity. Ruins of antiquity have fallen under the control of cultural heritage agencies who

manage their narratives in straightforward and coherent ways. By contrast, Miami Marine Stadium evokes many disparate narratives: city corruption, Modernist architecture, Miami's Cuban population, Miami's love affair with street art (and subsequent attempts to institutionalise street art), Miami's desire to erase the past and constantly look shiny and new, etc. Some of these narratives conflict, yet they all make up the patchwork truth of the site. Ruins insist on composing alternative accounts with the past. They are counter sites to the orderly city. This narrative instability makes them unsuitable for the commerce of the stable city but very suitable for aesthetic play.

IV. APPLYING WHAT WE'VE LEARNED TO MIAMI MARINE STADIUM: SITES OF MEMORY, RESISTANCE AND RESONANCE

What should be done for the Marine Stadium in light of our discussion of ruins and the neo-picturesque? The most successful cases of the neo-picturesque as the art of memory of a place have involved turning industrial ruins into public parks. Gas Works Park (Seattle, WA) is an example where the aesthetic potential of a modern ruin has been actualised. Right before the 1962 World's Fair, a Seattle Times' correspondent remarked. . .

With all the rush to beautify our city before the Century 21 Exposition. . . a large black eyesore has been overlooked: The abandoned gas works. . . stands out – a huge blot on an otherwise interesting and beautiful waterway.²⁸

While many in Seattle desired to wipe the slate clean, removing the gas works structures, Richard Haag used the industrial ruin as the starting point for a public park. Haag valued postindustrial landscapes and did not want to erase their history. In her book *The Landscape Architecture of Richard Haag: From Modern Space to Urban Ecological Design*, Thaïsa Way describes how Haag's park got built:

Architects, artists, planners, and activists united to oppose what they saw as unnecessary destruction along with poor stewardship of public finances and resources . . . This urban-oriented movement grew out of discourses on social, political and economic equity in conjunction with environmental and ecological arguments.²⁹

In Haag's depiction of the gasworks we can see his respect for the site; the gasworks, in his own words, gave him new eyes for the old. While Haag doesn't say what the towers are symbols of, I believe the gas plants evoke something powerful that is hard to analyse, the feeling of the sublime. Edmund Burke argues that obscurity, power, privation, vastness, infinity, success and uniformity may elicit the sublime. Haag called the gasworks 'ferro-forests'

with a brooding presence. Similarly, Burke said the sublime comes to us ‘in the gloomy forest, and in the howling wilderness’.³⁰ These ferro-forests are indeed gloomy and brooding. The industrial landscape is thus reborn through ruination. Incorporating it into a park setting breathes in new life.

As seen through the example of the gasworks, ruins reimagine our relationship with time. Although many, including myself, have mentioned the ability of ruins to evoke Kant’s notion of the dynamical sublime, I want to stick with Burke’s sublime. Burke’s sublime manifests in degrees, the strongest of which invokes astonishment from the viewer, mingled with a degree of horror.³¹ What would be the horror with Marine Stadium? One such horror is the fact that while the Stadium is still standing, it might still be standing underwater long after human beings have abandoned this site. The Stadium has stood for 50 years and most likely will stand - albeit submerged - for 1000s more. A three-foot sea-level rise is predicted for this part of the Biscayne Bay, making it a complementary artefact to Half Moon, a nearby underwater archaeological site. The terror of projecting ourselves into the future is real. Florida is drowning, yet condos are springing up in record numbers. Projecting ourselves into the future is terrifying, but we must do so to counteract the unfettered optimism of the present developers’ boom.

So while I think the Marine Stadium would make an excellent park à la Gas Works Park, I recognise that it is highly unlikely in a city governed by developers’ dreams.

In lieu of a conclusion, and in light of Miami Marine Stadium’s ‘neo-picturesque’ potential, I offer several realistic suggestions for its overhaul:

1. Projected images. Ruins of all sorts have important rich histories – Miami Marine Stadium’s redesign should recognise its own. This not only includes highlighting its thirty-year history as a concert and sporting venue but its twenty-year history as an urban ruin, a reusable canvas that has facilitated the creation of murals and street art. Projected images on walls should feature historic events such as visits by Nixon, Elvis and Jimmy Buffet, as well as various cases of street art erected in situ. This seems especially appropriate since the street art community has given its blessing for such a project.
2. Non-curated spaces. One of the beauties of ruins is that they are always changing – always in the process of becoming something else. The Getty proposal recommended that two walls at the venue’s entrance be reserved for curated shows of street artists, an idea roundly rejected by the artists themselves. What I’d like to see are spaces on the stadium that are not treated with ‘graffiti away’ and are left for this community to decide how to adorn. These non-curated spaces would be regulated by Miami’s street art and mural community, thus keeping the site in flux and pushing back a little on the institutionalisation of street art.
3. Playful park. In addition to a non-curated space for artists’ interventions, there should be spaces for general play as well. While I recognise that Miami will not give up such prime real estate for a park, a park featuring Mangrove

Hammocks to ward off future hurricanes should be incorporated into the design. As ruins notably have multiple uses, I hope these aspects get invoked in the redesign.

4. Sites of memory. It's imperative that the tripartite nature of urban runs be addressed: projecting us into the past, providing us unplanned aesthetic encounters in the present and inspiring us to imagine our future. We've talked about the past – projecting images on concrete walls – and we've discussed the present – allowing for a non-curated public space and park – but what of the future? How would we project ourselves into the future? One possibility is Augmented Reality. The Miami Murals project has already devised some augmented reality software for use on one's smartphone, so when one views a mural through the lens of one's smartphone, one sees the mural come alive with animation. I imagine something similar with Stadium, such that one views the stadium 10, 20, and 50 years into the future – watching the sea level rise and the stadium become increasingly under water. This might seem bleak to some, and it invokes Burke's sense of the sublime for others, but it does seem to keep the spirit of the rich associations that urban ruins provide.

5. Sites of resistance. Urban ruins offer narrative resistance, another feature that should be highlighted in the redesign. If we think about projecting the space in the future, there is no reason we shouldn't also highlight its distant past as the ancestral home of the Tequesta peoples. Highlighting the transient nature of a place allows for such counter-narratives. Well before the Cuban immigration to Miami, well before Mary Brickell and Julia Tuttle convinced Henry Flagler to build his railroad down to the keys, the Tequesta had made this part of Florida their home. In the 16th century, European explorers brought diseases that nearly wiped out indigenous populations by the mid-1700s, which led to the arrival of new populations from neighbouring Seminole and Miccosukee tribes. By focusing on the timescale of a place, we can foreground some of these narratives that have been silenced or lost. Projected images of future sea-level rises, accompanied by, projections of what the site looked like in its distant past evokes transience and the particular power of ruins.³²

escarbro@fiu.edu

NOTES

¹Although I focus this discussion on the British picturesque, I acknowledge that the concept of the picturesque had purchase before being introduced in the 18th century. We find picturesque traditions in Italy and the Netherlands. Going as far back as the 16th century, we see the Dutch

term '*schilderachtig*' which is often (mis-)translated as 'charming' yet has a use akin to the French term *pittoresque* and British picturesque (Bakker 1995, 147). My focus on the British picturesque here is not intended and in fact should not discourage others from applying other conceptions of the picturesque to ruins and

the ethical preservation of cultural property. Finally, I apply what we have learned to the Miami Marine Stadium, providing the reader with concrete suggestions for the preservation and use of this contemporary urban ruin.

²Armario 2022

³<https://www.marinestadium.org/SeeMarineStadium.org>

⁴Robbins 2022

⁵See marinestadium.org

⁶RLA Conservation, 1 (see URLs).

⁷RLA Conservation, 15 (see URLs).

⁸RLA Conservation, 26 (see URLs).

⁹RLA Conservation, 26 (see URLs).

¹⁰RLA Conservation, 28 (see URLs).

¹¹Smetana 2021.

¹²Robbins 2022.

¹³See Scarbrough 2014; 2018, and 2020.

¹⁴Ginsberg 2004.

¹⁵Bicknell, Judkins, and Korsmeyer 2020.

¹⁶Judkins 2014, 441.

¹⁷Leary 2011.

¹⁸Conroy 2020.

¹⁹Crawford, 52

²⁰Gilpin 1802.

²¹Howley 2004.

²²Herrington and Lopes 2020, 134.

²³Herrington and Lopes 2020, 141.

²⁴Herrington and Lopes 2020, 142.

²⁵Herrington and Lopes 2020, 145.

²⁶Herrington and Lopes 2020, 144.

²⁷Edensor 2005, 846.

²⁸Reported by Way 2019, 150.

²⁹Way 2019, 107-108.

³⁰Burke 2008, 61.

³¹Burke 2008, 61.

³²The author would like to acknowledge and thank two inspirations for this article, philosopher Donald Crawford and architect Hilario Candela, both of whom passed away while the article was in press.

REFERENCES

- Armario, Christine. 2022. "As Miami's skyline booms, the future of a long-neglected tropical brutalist gem hangs in the balance." vol. 27 February.
- Bakker, Boudewijn. 1995. "Schilderachtig: Discussions of a Seventeenth-Century Term and Concept." *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 23 (2/3): 147–162.
- Bicknell, Jeanette, Jennifer Judkins, and Carolyn Korsmeyer, eds. 2020. *Philosophical Perspectives on Ruins, Monuments, and Memorials*. New York: Routledge.
- Burke, Edmund. 2008. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Conroy, Renee. 2020. "Rust Belt Ruins." In Bicknell, Judkins, and Korsmeyer 2020, 121–132.
- Edensor, Tim. 2005. *Industrial Ruins: Space, Aesthetics and Materiality*. New York: Berg.
- Gilpin, William. 1802. *An essay upon prints*. Fifth edition. London: A. Strahan.
- Ginsberg, Robert. 2004. *The Aesthetics of Ruins*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Herrington, Susan, and Dominic McIver Lopes. 2020. In Bicknell, Judkins, and Korsmeyer 2020, 133–146.

- Howley, James. 2004. *The Follies and Garden Buildings of Ireland*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Judkins, Jennifer. 2014. “On Things That Are Not There Anymore.” *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 72 (4): 441–445.
- Leary, John Patrick. 2011. “Detroitism.” *Guernica: A Magazine of Arts and Politics*.
- Robbins, John Charles. 2022. “Miami’s indefinite deferral stalls Marine Stadium restoration.” vol. 7 June.
- Scarborough, Elizabeth. 2014. “Unimagined Beauty.” *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 72 (4): 445–449.
- . 2018. “Ruminations on Ruins.” *The Philosophers’ Magazine* 81 (2): 62–67.
- . 2020. In Bicknell, Judkins, and Korsmeyer 2020, 228–240.
- Smetana, Jessica. 2021. “Power Boats and Paint Cans: In Miami, a Relic of a Marina Finds New Life, Again.”
- Way, Thaisa. 2019. *From Modern Space to Urban Ecological Design: The Landscape Architecture of Richard Haag*. University of Washington Press.

URLS

Armario 2022:

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/2022/02/24/miami-marine-stadium/>
RLA Conservation Inc et al.:

https://www.getty.edu/foundation/pdfs/kim/miami_marine_stadium_final_report.pdf

Robbins 2022:

<https://www.miamitodaynews.com/2022/06/07/miamis-indefinite-deferral-stalls-marine-stadium-restoration/>

Smetana 2021:

<https://www.si.com/more-sports/2021/02/19/miami-marine-stadium-revival>

COPYRIGHT:

© 2023 Elizabeth Scarborough

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC-BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

See <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Aesthetic Investigations is a peer-reviewed open access journal published by the Dutch Association of Aesthetics.