

Guest Editor's Introduction

Half of the articles in this issue of *Landscape Journal* examine the manifesto as a record of change and a promulgator of ideas in landscape architecture. Generally, manifestoes advocate for and are symptoms of modernization. They have ranged from political tracts (Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels's 1848 *Communist Manifesto*) to fashion statements (Giacomo Balla's *Antineutral Suit Futurist Manifesto* of 1914). The question of what constitutes a landscape manifesto remains somewhat ambiguous. Although twentieth-century architecture left numerous ideological texts, the same cannot be said of modern landscape architecture. Notable exceptions include Leberecht Migge's 1919 "Green Manifesto," Christopher Tunnard's 1938 *Gardens in the Modern Landscape*, Garrett Eckbo's 1950 *Landscape for Living*, and Ian McHarg's 1969 *Design with Nature*. Of these, however, Migge's would be the only true manifesto—a politically charged exhortation with major social implications. A better understanding for the transformation of landscape architecture from the late-nineteenth-century to the mid-twentieth-century calls for a broader definition of manifesto, one that includes built works and other discourses, as well as lesser-known examples of landscape architecture propaganda. Because the landscape manifesto addresses both a specialized and a general audience, it also underscores the challenges facing a profession searching for a specific theoretical stance while raising its visibility in the design environment.

This collection on landscape manifestoes began with the eponymous session I chaired at the 2006 Society of Architectural Historians annual meeting in Savannah, Georgia, which convened Michael Lee, Judith Major, David Haney, Susan Solomon, and Udo Weilacher. Their respective papers spanned two centuries (1790s–1990s) and a wide range of topics that explored the relationship between garden design and philosophy, painting and botany, planning and land reform, public space and children, and ecology and land art. With the encouragement of *Landscape Journal* editor Elen Deming, I sought to build on several of the themes that emerged from the Savannah meeting. In order to focus on the definition and development of the modern landscape profes-

sion, I narrowed the chronological framework to the late nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century. Consequently, I invited Annemarie Bucher to contribute an essay on the G 59 Swiss garden exhibition to expand the inquiry on manifestoes to concrete examples.

The declarations, essays, and designs examined in the following texts probe the nature of the manifesto in landscape architecture, specifically its role, message, means, and audience. In discussing the articles published by Marianna Griswold Van Rensselaer in the American journal *Garden and Forest* in 1888, Judith Major explores a manifesto in installments. Van Rensselaer's writings underscored the need for the nascent American landscape profession to ground its qualifications. Her preference for the title "landscape gardener" rather than the "landscape architect" of Frederick Law Olmsted called attention to the hybrid lineage of the landscape discipline. Written for an audience of enlightened amateurs, her perspective onto the world of the gentleman-artist-scientist was as much a search for her own identity (as journalist-critic-woman) as it was an interpretation of the design specialist's intentions. Writing for both proprietor and gardener, she explicated the art practiced by Olmsted, Calvert Vaux, Charles Eliot, Jacob Weidenmann, and Horace Cleveland, thus creating an essential link between the making and reading of design.

David Haney examines the political roots and implications of Leberecht Migge's provocative tracts—"Every Man Self-Sufficient" and "The Green Manifesto"—advocating land reform in Germany after the First World War. Migge addressed his imperative manifestoes to political thinkers and the intellectual readership of *Die Tat*, and called for drastic measures during desperate economic times. He argued for the creation of peri-urban Siedlungen and a productive garden program to combat the ills of cities. Intended to function autonomously, such settlements offered an alternative to both communist and capitalist control. Migge's "return to nature" was technologically progressive. The "architect for horticulture" utilized the small (the garden) to bear an impact on the large (national planning). In its sustainable underpinnings and ambition, Migge's vision

was also prescient of today's green architecture and landscape urbanism.

My own essay examines how the manifesto of the International Association of Modernist Garden Architects (AIAJM), launched by Jean Canneel-Claes and Christopher Tunnard in 1937, mirrored the concerns of a profession in transition. Their declaration addressed democratization and modernization, the need to establish a dialogue with architects and to shape the urban environment. Modeled after the Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne (CIAM), the AIAJM focused on the city and was directed to an international and multidisciplinary audience. This effort to foster a broader intellectual discourse underscored the ambivalent stance of modern landscape architecture, caught between specialization and the promotion of an all-encompassing practice. Socially more modest than a program like Migge's, the AIAJM explicated instead the garden as a functionalist unit of larger spatial reform. The modernist association also sought to increase the visibility of the profession amidst future collaborators and clients—a recurring concern within the field.

In her essay, Annemarie Bucher assesses a concrete manifesto—the 1959 Swiss Horticulture Exhibition known as G 59—and the many messages it broadcast. Examining the exhibition as both a design event with many shades of modernism and as a cultural construct, Bucher reflects on the intentions and reception of this manifesto. Conceived by landscape architects, members of gardening associations, and politicians, G 59 equally publicized modern design and art, popular floral displays, and national pride. The avowed relation between garden design and movements such as Concrete Art and Tachism suggest a distancing from horticultural antecedents. Just as Canneel and Tunnard borrowed from architectural theory, Swiss modernist garden designers established their intellectual credentials with artistic references. At the same time, they were well aware of the exhibition's potential for marketing new garden aesthetics and the modern landscape profession to a wide audience. Thus G 59 left a physical legacy in Zurich, with several extant gardens and struc-

tures, and a theoretical legacy for landscape architecture: it was a manifesto produced by the profession for the general public.

These four essays present a set of core samples taken from landscape culture across seven decades. Widely ranging in scope, intention, means, and impact, the manifestoes discussed here nevertheless shared a desire to take landscape outside its medium. The need for landscape architects to address a broader audience than themselves points to the issue of professional visibility. However, it also expresses the flexible boundaries of the discipline and its privileged relation to urbanism, planning, architecture, and art. Thus the manifesto projected a vision for landscape architects (defining their own position and ambitions) and a view onto landscape architecture (advertising professional services to architects, politicians, and clients).

Just as the manifestoes mentioned here reacted to the uncertainty of modernization and economic depression or to the potential of new beginnings, it should come as no surprise that the second millennium has seen a resurgence of this type of declaration. La Villette was to become the first park manifesto for the twenty-first century; Kenneth Frampton's 1999 address to architects was entitled "Seven Points for the Millennium: an Untimely Manifesto"; Sheila Harvey and Ken Fieldhouse concluded *The Cultured Landscape: Designing the Environment in the 21st Century* (2005) with a manifesto; Charles Waldheim framed the *Landscape Urbanism Reader* (2006) as a manifesto "describing emergent conditions"; and polemical endeavors such as "Landscape Architecture: An Apocalyptic Manifesto" took advantage of the internet as a vehicle for promotion. Thus the manifesto remains an index of professional strength and connectivity with other disciplines, as landscape architecture continues to reconstruct, challenge, and question itself.

I would like to thank Elen Deming and Kate Auwaerter, the anonymous peer reviewers, the original conference participants and, of course, the authors themselves for making this thematic issue possible.

DOROTHÉE IMBERT