
Editors' Comment

The strength and foundation of *Landscape Journal* has resided, since its inception, in the vision of its editors, the contributions of the authors and reviewers, and the support of the readership. As educators and new editors, we wish to express our appreciation to the founding editors, Arnold Alanen and Darrel Morrison, and the outgoing editor, Robert Riley. Each of these persons has shaped the *Journal*, but more importantly, they have advanced the profession and discipline of landscape architecture. We are all in their debt. Robert Riley now joins Alanen as a contributing editor. The *Journal* will continue to benefit from his intelligence and invaluable experience. As with many other aspects of landscape architecture, the development of the *Journal* has been a cumulative process. The tradition of broad-based scholarship which has defined the *Journal* has had expected and unexpected impacts in the field and on the discipline. It is now customary to expect that there will be the continued advancement of rigorous scholarship in landscape architecture. Thankfully, we no longer question whether there is a need for a journal such as this. We seek, instead, ways to expand its vision, depth, and readership.

As editors, we bring to this task more than forty years of teaching, practice, and research in landscape architecture. Our view of the field is broad and inclusive. In Albert Fein's terms, we see ourselves as boundary expanders with "landscape" as a bridge between disciplines. "Landscape" is a shared idea and common medium, which is not the property of a single discipline. While there is much for us to glean from other areas, landscape architecture also has much to offer to others, and here the *Journal* has a role to play. We share a commitment to intellectual rigor and to scholarship of the highest order, to clarity of communication, and to informed and impassioned debate. All

are necessary for landscape architecture to flourish. We believe that landscape architecture and landscape research hold the capacity to expand the ways in which we understand our world. Even a cursory review of the past twelve years' articles and commentary in *Landscape Journal* reveals a curious and probing discipline and a remarkable breadth of commentary and analysis of the world which we inhabit.

Landscape Journal is now an established scholarly journal within our discipline. Its fourteen volumes are a testament to the previous editors and to our collective need and desire for a vehicle to share research and scholarship within the academic and professional community. It is imperative that a balance be maintained between continuing the direction and precedent that have been set and offering a new and expanded vision. We must strike a balance between continuity and innovation, a basic dilemma shared by any design enterprise.

The *Journal* is a collaboration among the editors, editorial board, University of Wisconsin Press, CELA, authors, reviewers, and the multitude of readers. Each of these collaborators has responsibilities and expectations from the *Journal*. The editors will work in consultation with the editorial board and rely on their advice as well as the expert opinion of external reviewers. The important and careful process of blind review, essential to a scholarly journal, needs to continue. We intend to call upon a wide network of association to facilitate that task. The editors are clearly more than a conduit. We will solicit papers and encourage conference presentations, lectures, and the work of professional practice to be transformed into articles.

The editors will, as Robert Riley and Brenda Brown as associate edi-

tors have done, offer other features in *Landscape Journal*, such as the provocative questions posed to a variety of individuals. We also intend to expand reviews of books, conferences, exhibits, performances, and events. The special issues of the *Journal* have been superb and have become standard reference works. It is our intention to expand this process. We can imagine, for example, special issues on questions of landscape representation, accessibility, or equity. There are, no doubt, many other topics, and we encourage your suggestions and proposals. The voice of the *Journal* is the voice of its contributors.

From its scholarly core, *Landscape Journal* will be free to experiment, as it continues to evolve and explore its niche amongst the burgeoning number of design and planning publications. We live in a time when the modes of communication of ideas are in flux. We are linked via e-mail and a world-wide-web. The libraries of the world are becoming available in our offices, along with direct conversation around the globe. The computer has become what Gene Youngblood described many years ago as access to all media. Within that context, print journals have a tradition of centuries to foster, while seeking their place within this emerging situation.

The difficult question of what constitutes the parameters, methods, and standards of research and scholarship in landscape architecture is ongoing. We envision a circumstance in which results of scholarship which are not primarily written or numerical, but graphic, would be sent out for blind peer review. The *Journal* can play a more active role in this realm, for surely text or statistics are not the only way we present the methods and products of our research. In this issue we are pleased to include articles by our two contributing editors and leading educators. As Carl Steinitz notes in his article, "Design is a Verb,

Design is a Noun,” design is both a noun and a verb. There is a continuing need for research on places, but we also need more scholarship on the verb, the processes and action of landscape architectural design.

There are multiple forms of research, all of which need to be dealt with seriously and with rigor. Thus, we regularly look to libraries and archives, laboratories and experiments, questionnaires and observation. However, we should not forget the research of the informed eye and action in the field. We are the heirs to a rich and varied professional research tradition. Where would landscape architecture be without Olmsted’s travels in England and the American South, or Jensen’s philosophical musings, Manning’s mappings, J. B. Jackson’s essays, or Halprin’s Notebooks? As the founding editors noted in the first issue, “*Landscape Journal* represents an important

bridge between academia and the practicing profession.” We still need to develop this relationship and remember that bridges travel in both directions, that research has many forms, and that it is embedded within professional practice as well as the academic arena.

There are commonalities with other disciplines, but the medium and concept of landscape surely structure our concerns, actions, methods, sensibilities, limits, and ethics. Landscape is the interaction of people and place, and landscape architects reside at that intersection. Our profession has its constants, the questions of concern which cut across centuries. The vocabulary changes, but a sense of continuity is crucial. Here the landscape itself may be offering us some wisdom. Thus we continue to seek the genius loci, to create gardens and parks for private and public pleasure and purpose, to look to the natural world for inspiration, and to act as stewards of the environment.

All members of CELA now receive the journal. As they read, submit, and pass it along to their colleagues and students, the impact of *Landscape Journal* is surely expanding. *Landscape Journal* thrives only as we continue to receive scholarly submissions from colleagues throughout the world. We welcome articles and other submissions from academics and private and public practitioners, as well as those scholars outside the traditional realm of landscape architecture, whose vision and comments can provide insight into landscape issues. We encourage your comments on articles, issues, and reviews. *Landscape Journal* is not only for the dissemination of research findings, but a medium for critical discourse within the discipline of landscape architecture. It should serve as a record of scholarship, but also of our collective deliberations on our methods, questions, issues, and concerns.