

## Editors' Introduction

With this issue, we are pleased to report that *Landscape Journal* is getting back into the rhythm of the academic year. This was our first big test as editors and we are glad to have squeaked through. We thank our contributors for being responsive and patient in the hurry-up-and-wait world of academic publishing, and we recognize the staff at the University of Wisconsin Press for expediting the end game of the publication process. In the back pages of this issue we also acknowledge our excellent supporting cast of peer reviewers and the copy editors who assisted us in preparing volume 23.

Our second challenge—to increase the quality and quantity of manuscripts—is proving to be quite enjoyable. Many new contributors have made contact with us at conferences and colloquia; others were encouraged and mentored by our editorial board members. We are getting better at giving direction, and coaxing, wheedling, and prying manuscripts out of authors' reluctant fingers. These efforts are beginning to show a positive return. The number of new and revised manuscripts we received at *Landscape Journal* has more than doubled over the past year. A growing number of manuscripts arrive each month from European authors and scholars outside the discipline of landscape architecture. While this is very exciting we remain devoted to our CELA and professional contributors, and hope to see increasing depth and breadth, and new types of scholarly work from all our authors in the coming year.

We also want to encourage direct feedback on the content and quality of the articles we are publishing. To that end, in addition to email or letters to the editors ([landscapejournal@esf.edu](mailto:landscapejournal@esf.edu)), you should feel free to utilize the landscape architecture discussion list

[LArch-L@listserv.syr.edu](mailto:LArch-L@listserv.syr.edu) to initiate dialog and debate over current issues and events. To subscribe to LArch-L simply send a message to [listserv@listserv.syr.edu](mailto:listserv@listserv.syr.edu) that says "Subscribe LArch-L" followed by your name. The rest of the procedure is self-explanatory.

*Emerging Topics.* Sometimes we see a manuscript that suggests other research may, or should, follow. While we are not favoring or excluding any relevant subjects—not by any means—there are some emerging topics we are particularly interested in learning about. One is the subject of landscape and race: while racial identity and experience of place is an important topic in cultural studies and geography today, in design education there appears to be a dearth of scholarship on landscapes of enslaved, oppressed, or even assimilated people. We hope that some of our readers are working on these and interrelated topics, and may help shed some light on the racialized ways that we teach and practice in landscape architecture. Another emerging topic is the landscape of devastation—whether caused by war, resource extraction, climate change or other natural disaster. The condition of destruction evokes a broad set of responses in landscape architecture: it may be ignored, erased, reprogrammed, 'healed,' or monumentalized, among other things. We are interested in seeing papers that deal with a variety of aspects of destroyed places and cultural response to them.

*About This Issue.* This issue—focusing on cultural landscape design, history, theory, and criticism—presents one featured paper and four refereed articles. The featured paper is by Peter Jacobs (Université de Montréal), a distinguished scholar and teacher whose

work continues to elevate the standards for critical writing in landscape architecture. "Folklore and Forest Fragments: Reading Contemporary Landscape Design in Quebec" is based upon his 2003 lecture at Dumbarton Oaks. Jacobs understands that the Muse, the deep inspiration for contemporary designers whose work "resonates in the collective soul" of Quebec, is the vast boreal forest of northern Canada. On multiple levels, he argues, this body of art and design demonstrate why great care should be taken to protect the health and integrity of that dark and primal landscape.

The second article is a multidisciplinary collaboration between sociologist and architecture professor Galen Crazz (UC Berkeley) and practicing professional and doctoral candidate Michael Boland (UC Berkeley). Effectively functioning as a sequel to Crazz's seminal work *The Politics of Park Design* (1982), and working from similar parameters, this paper extends beyond the four well-known models first outlined there—the Pleasure Ground, the Reform Park, the Recreation Facility, and the Open Space System. Enter a new paradigm, "Defining the Sustainable Park: A Fifth Model for Urban Parks," one that offers an ecological perspective on park design. Here, sustainability may be understood as a cultural landscape response to changing urban conditions—of its time and place, just as the four earlier models were indices of their own context.

In light of our recent interest in context-sensitive design, and the role of landscape architects in the heritage of infrastructure, the paper by Mary Myers (Temple University Ambler) is timely. "The Line of Grace: Principles of Road Aesthetics in the Design of the Blue Ridge Parkway" speculates on the conceptual links between 18<sup>th</sup>-century formal design theory, the education of landscape architects between the

World Wars, and the kinaesthetic engineering of some of the most beautiful highways in the United States. It is not only a very interesting analysis, but should be assigned in all site engineering and road alignment classes.

Amita Sinha and D. Fairchild Ruggles (University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign) collaborate on "The Yamuna Riverfront: A Comparative Study of Islamic and Hindu Traditions in Cultural Landscapes." This is a carefully observed analysis of different traditions of visibility, enclosure, and access to natural features in two of the many cultures of South Asia. History, theory, and situated cultural practices are illuminated in this article. The final peer-reviewed article "Attributes of a Successful Ethnobotanical Garden," is co-authored by Susan B. Jones and Mark Hoversten (University of Nevada, Las Vegas). Based on survey and analysis of existing gardens, the



Figure 1. Garden gate at Castle Howard, England. (Photograph by Elen Deming)

authors have sketched a coherent curatorial framework for new ethnobotanical gardens. In so doing they try to move the possibilities of thinking about landscape interpretation beyond the conservation of genetic material, and toward more holistic frameworks of traditional botanical knowledge. The successfully designed ethnobotanical garden may thus balance both nature and culture in splendid complexity. This sensitive interweaving is suggested by all the landscapes considered in this issue.

MED & JFP

---

## Errata

---

The editors call attention to the fact that *Imprints/Footprints*: the annual meeting of the Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture (held September 24–27, 2003) was hosted by Daniel Nadenicek, Frances Chamberlain, and other members of the Department of Landscape Architecture at Clemson University, in Charleston, South Carolina. We

apologize for this inadvertent omission from the review (LJ 23:1, 78–80), and commend the organizers on a fine conference.

It is only fair of us to point out that *Landscape Journal* has committed the precise orthographic foul for which book reviewer Juan Antonio Bueno (Florida International University, Miami) lambasts the Princeton University Press (LJ 23:1,

71–72). In note #4 in his review of *Luis Barragán's Gardens of El Pedregal* (Eggner 2001), Bueno patiently explains the proper syllabification of Spanish words using the name Barragán. However, in two instances, the typography of the review itself repeats the more conventional but erroneous Bar-ra-gán (see if you can find them both). Our conclusion—the fault lies in the default.