
Editor's Introduction

Landscape Journal was founded only twenty-two years ago. There was the recognition that landscape architecture's long tradition of professional accomplishment and education needed to be augmented by the establishment of a refereed academic journal. In the past two decades the Journal has been at the forefront of the dissemination of an explosion of research and scholarship in landscape architecture. As editor since 1994 it has been a privilege to contribute to that effort. This is the final edition of *Landscape Journal* to be edited at the University of Oregon. The editorial migration began with the founding editors Arnie Alanen and Darrel Morrison at the University of Wisconsin and then the journal editorship moved to Robert Riley at the University of Illinois in an approximately seven year cycle. Beginning with the next volume, *Landscape Journal* will be edited by Professors Elen Deming and Jim Palmer at the State University of New York School of Environmental Design and Forestry (SUNY ESF) in Syracuse, New York. Both Elen and Jim are distinguished scholars and authors and long term contributors and friends of the Journal. They will surely continue the journal's nascent traditions, enhance the quality of the publication, and give it their own stamp.

Landscape Journal has been a central component of a still emerging academic culture of landscape architecture, where the discipline as well as the profession is deemed essential to the development of the field and allied endeavors. For educators especially, part of our responsibility, or job, is not only research and scholarship, but also the dissemination of our work for scrutiny by our peers and a wider audience. *Landscape Journal* is only one forum for this endeavor. It is important to view it within the constellation of ways that work in landscape architecture is disseminated and brought to

the attention of a wide range of constituencies, including the academic community, allied professionals, as well as a broader public. The process of critique and review of refereed scholarship, however imperfect, offers one mechanism for the insurance of quality and accountability. But it is not the only, or always, the most important mode of communication. The professional literature is equally critical as is the popular press, magazines, newspapers, magazines, and even trade publications. All of these have a role to play. The readers of many of these venues will far exceed that of the more selective readership of a journal such as this. I would urge all those who contribute to scholarly journals to also communicate their work in as many other ways as possible, in print and in person. Of course in the recent past the world wide web has emerged as a prime mode of communication and surely *Landscape Journal* will have a presence in that arena in the near future. It is imperative that we put our work "out there" in as many ways as possible, to educate, to create a constituency, and for the sheer joy of communicating and sharing our own interests and enthusiasm.

We are often asked about who submits material to the journal and who are its readers. A few statistical notes are in order. *Landscape Journal* is an organ of CELA, but it is not exclusive to that membership, thus our contributors, readers, and reviewers are broader than that core group. Since our first issue (14:2, Fall 1995) 310 articles have been submitted and 120 published along with reviews of 23 conferences and 81 books. Our authors represent scores of schools and institutions including 41 American universities and universities in Canada, Switzerland, Great Britain, Scotland, Australia, New Zealand,

Japan, Germany and Israel. About 60 percent of our authors (aside from conference and book reviewers) are landscape architects and the remaining 40 percent represent 30 disciplines notably architecture, planning, and geography, but also artists, writers, ecologists and historians. Over three hundred scholars and practitioners have reviewed articles, representing individuals from the full range of environmental design and other professions as well as a litany of academic departments. A citation index survey shows that citations of *Landscape Journal* articles number in the hundreds and are found in scores of other academic publications. (Importantly this survey includes only refereed publications and does not include books.) What is most interesting is the scope and range of these publications. They include everything from anticipated references in *Environment and Behavior*, *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *Environmental Ethics*, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, and *Landscape Ecology* to the *British Journal of Aesthetics*, *Western American Literature*, *Religion*, *American Antiquity*, and the *American Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*. The list surely validates the proposition that "landscape" as a concept acts as a bridge between disciplines. As landscape architects we may have a fundamental connection to the idea, but it is not a proprietary relationship. Much as landscape provides a ground in actuality, it provides a common ground for intellectual discourse.

The job of editor is not only to facilitate a judicious review process. Research and scholarship in a field as multifaceted as landscape architecture takes many forms and draws from a variety of scholarly traditions. How could scholarship in "landscape" where the subjects and content of our work is so broad, not be so? Methodologies vary from scientific methods, to practices in the humanities, technology, arts, and

design. All need to be addressed with equal rigor in their demand for careful thought and intellectual honesty. With this diversity of content and methodology it is not surprising that we employ a range of communication techniques to disseminate our interrogations and investigations including text, statistics, diagrams, photographs, drawings, stories, poetry, and performance. In other words, the whole panoply of ways that we represent ideas and phenomena. All of these have validity, all need to be conducted with rigor, and all should be subject to scrutiny and critique. As editor I have tried to facilitate the process of *Landscape Journal's* role as a forum for this scope of investigation and communication. For example, as a modest but significant gesture we have introduced color illustration where possible. We were privileged to have contributions of poetry by Grant Jones, Joni Palmer and Ian McHarg, in one of his last published works. These all were subject to blind peer review. We published drawings by Carl Steinitz and J.B. Jackson. We began to publish modest portfolios of the landscape architecture winners of the Rome Prize, fine work that is only too rarely seen outside the American Academy in Rome community. We facilitated an award winning special issue on Eco-Revelatory design edited by Brenda Brown and her colleagues at the University of Illinois, which also functioned as an exhibit catalogue. We fittingly published a tribute to J.B. Jackson, for his work has been a model and inspiration to us all. These have all been satisfying accomplishments, but as an editor most gratifying has been the process of working with authors as they develop their ideas and articles.

The journal is the result of the work of many. I would like to thank all who contribute their time, energy, and intellect. A journal such as this is sustained by its contributors and reviewers. Donna Erikson has single handedly been responsible for Book Reviews. Susan Kau our primary liaison at the University of Wisconsin Press has been invaluable in keeping us well informed about the publish-

ing side of journal work. I began this term as editor with Robert Melnick as co-editor. However, soon after he was appointed Dean of our school and thus reluctantly gave up his co-editorship position. Regardless Robert continued to provide and facilitate essential support for the Journal from the University of Oregon. I also received continued assistance from my departmental colleagues as my teaching load was lessened (only slightly) and especially the support of David Hulse and Cynthia Girling who have been department chairs during this period. However the most significant individual has been Rene Kane, who has been the editorial assistant for the journal, initially while pursuing her Masters in Landscape Architecture and then continuing in the position after her graduation. She alone has been indispensable to the journal's everyday function and success. Her imprint is present on every page.

*Imagining Futures—
Education & Landscape Architecture*
I'll close with some comments that were offered at the "100 Years of Landscape Architecture at Harvard" conference in April 2000.

In thinking about the future it is always tempting to be futuristic, to imagine science fiction visions of possibilities that are products of new technologies, biologies, or economies. We know that imagined futures are important – after all that is what designers and planners do, in a sense all our work is futuristic. The visions do matter. They set an expectation even as targets to shoot for, they are aspirations. If we think of our modern history, Americans not only imagined the great Futurama exhibit of the General Motors pavilion at the 1939 World's Fair in New York, in many ways we now live within a world that is that actual version of that grand diorama. Visions, in design, in education, in any endeavor, are the groundwork for new realities.

I am reminded of Ridley Scott's

film *Blade Runner*, not because of any desirability of its dystopic vision of replicants and vacations "off-world," but because of its visualization of a Los Angeles of the year 2019 where old cars, clothes, buildings, artifacts and advertisements are an essential part of this vision of the future. (I think the date is meaningful—20–20 is perfect vision, 20–19 is a little sharper.) The images are an important reminder that in no endeavor, and certainly not in the landscape, do we wipe the slate clean and create something that is purely new. It is a reminder that the past is always present, it not only never goes away, it is part of the present in both senses of the term, it is *now* and it is *here*. For landscape architects this is an essential message. The film is also a reminder that any future speculation we engage in about any topic is really about the present, our current ideas and issues projected into an imagined time and place.

A new and transformed landscape is emerging that we will confront as professionals and educators. Portions of it are already here, but only the bow of an immense ship that is entering the horizon. It is what I call the emerging *E-scape*, what William Mitchell has called the City of Bits, it is the world of cyberspace. It is tempting to be caught up in the exciting possibilities and potentials of the new realities that this world has to offer, but we also know, from history, that all technologies, all media to use McLuhan's term, have both positive and negative impacts, effects that are foreseen and unforeseen. The profession of landscape architecture was in many ways born in the nineteenth century as a reaction to the excesses of the industrial revolution and its impacts. With a similar reformist sensibility, perhaps it needs to be re-born in terms of post-industrial society and the world of the *E-scape*.

This emerging virtual world of images and systems, of seeming realities and unrealities, calls into question what have been accepted as eternal truths. There is a questioning of the verities of time and space, an ambiguity and even confusion between

here and there, now and then, originals and copies. This may sound new, but it is not, the issues have been with us and addressed at least since the invention of photography, but they are surely being exacerbated in our time. They will be paramount in the future as the impacts of everything from computers, the World Wide Web, bioengineering, and globalization are realized in the landscape. These transformations are overwhelming but also have great meaning to people. I do not mean to denigrate this world—it is *not* unreal – it is a reality, it has meaning and significance and immense challenges, but it is different from the physical, corporeal, tangible landscape of direct experience. Future design education and scholarship needs to deal with these two worlds and importantly the relationship between them – the landscape and the E-scape.

Surely we need to be educating for this emerging world, but I would like to suggest that that in the process we also address a series of constants in landscape architecture—concerns that are fundamental to our history, expertise, skills, and philosophy. Our profession has a set of fundamental themes. These thread their way through the history of landscape design and continue to inform contemporary practice. These include the genius loci, garden and park, nature and time. The genius loci, the spirit of place, is an expression of the many attachments we form with places. A fundamental concern of design practice has been and will be to understand the qualities of places, recognize that spirit, evoke its message and make all of these elements tangible. It is how we create landscape meaning. Garden is the master metaphor of landscape architecture as site, symbol, and as an archetype of an idealized landscape. The park is the public variant of garden. Nature is our medium and we accept as axiomatic that contact with the natural world in some form is fundamental to human experience and well being. And time is landscape architecture's most characteristic variable, for we deal with materials and concerns that have their own



Being in the Landscape. Kenneth Helphand photographing the Millennium Clothesline, a project by Sandra McMorris Johnson, on the summit of Mt. Pisgah, Lane County, Oregon. June 2000. Photograph by Rene Kane.

lives and imperatives. Our artistry lies in the manipulation of both landscape space and landscape time. Each of these constants has a universal, perhaps even an archetypal component, but they also have great cultural variability.

The significance of these constants will be only grander in the future, for they can no longer be taken for granted. Future design education will need to continue to address them, but with a renewed attention. We can no longer take what we may have accepted as obvious for granted, for the meaning of each of these is in flux, even upheaval. In response we need to address and reassert the significance of what we do. This means renewed attention to our theory and philosophy, continuing in more profound ways to address questions of why, questions of meaning, and continuing to reassert landscape architecture as a humanistic as well as pragmatic pursuit.

In a world where the virtual will be on the ascendancy I think this

means a return to essentials: trees, water, soil, rocks, air, the shape of the ground. For our wellbeing and satisfaction actual direct, physical, human contact with natural forces may matter more in the future, not less. In this world a return to essentials or fundamentals may be a needed counterforce. The virtual *is* a reality, but our encounter with physical landscape is part of what makes us human. (This of course includes all the physical world of our creation.) We need to address how this new landscape can be composed, ordered, choreographed. We need to study the interactions between E-scapes and landscapes. We all need to explore this new world, perhaps guided by Marcel Proust's observation that "The true voyage of discovery consists not in seeking new landscapes but in having new eyes."

A return to essentials or our history is not in any way reactionary. By looking back I do not mean a nostalgic pastoralism either in style or ideology, or a replication of the old, but a revivification of landscape, as medium, message, structure, setting and system. Certainly as educators

and scholars we have a special role to play. Let me suggest just three areas for action. (There are of course many more.)

First. Revivified historical study is essential, especially as a groundwork to theoretical insight that can inform practice. This is an ongoing process, but there has been a welcome explosion of scholarship and practice in landscape history in the past generation.

Second. Landscape studies have been energized as “landscape” has been discovered or rediscovered by many disciplines. The material world, ignored or neglected by scholars has

become central to investigations in diverse disciplines from history to critical studies, literature, and the social sciences. We have much to learn and contribute to this work. However, we will need to be ever more discerning in what we glean from the investigations of others and not jump on every bandwagon that floats by.

Third. Design educators and scholars, and for many of us, our students, need to spend time in the

landscape, in field work of all kinds; site visits, travel, walks, doing everything from most the most refined scientific monitoring to careful observation to a ruminating ramble. Be in the landscape, it is our best teacher.

Kenneth I. Helphand