
Editors' Introduction

First things first. Several significant changes in the leadership of *Landscape Journal* have occurred in the last few months. James F. Palmer, FASLA, recently named Fellow of the Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture and Emeritus Professor, has retired from SUNYESF. He is also stepping down as co-editor of *Landscape Journal* after four very full and productive years (2002–2006) in that position. With the preparation of volume 26 (2007), M. Elen Deming will become solo editor.

As other past editors have done, Jim will continue to advise *LJ* as a consulting editor—but from greener pastures in Burlington, Vermont, where he is working as a scientist, consultant, and entrepreneur. All of us at *Landscape Journal* and the University of Wisconsin Press wish Jim very well, and thank him for his tremendous service, judgment, mentoring, and friendship. We're not sure how we'll manage without him, but we have all learned a great deal from Jim, and will make every effort to maintain his high standards on behalf of our community of scholars and readers.

If all else fails, we've still got his phone number.

In addition, we are sobered to report that John Delaine, the very capable Director of the Journals Division at the University of Wisconsin Press has also retired. This is a different kind of loss for the *Journal*. Most *LJ* readers might never appreciate how much John has done for the quality and reliability of our publication, but he has been one of the most generous and loyal of friends since the very inception of the *Journal*. While we will miss him a great deal, we wish to thank him for his generosity to *Landscape Journal*, and also offer a warm welcome to his successor at the University of Wisconsin Press.

As if all that wasn't quite enough, this summer one of our key editorial staff members, Robin Per-

kins, accepted a well-deserved promotion to another office at SUNY ESF. Robin has been an important stabilizing force for the *Journal* and, often, the first member of our team that authors encounter. Her responsiveness, organization skills, and unfailingly kind (and patient) professionalism will be dearly missed.

Extreme Makeover: Landscape Journal Edition.

Over the past few issues, you may have noticed several subtle changes to the look and feel of *Landscape Journal*. In addition to establishing online subscriber service, added content, regular distribution, and financial stability, the editors are also working with the publisher toward a comprehensive graphic redesign. Cover varnish (Spring 2004) has already been followed with a higher quality paper (Spring 2006), and the project will culminate in a fresh new page template to be unveiled in Spring 2007. Coated paper allows us to improve the print quality of text as well as black and white images, and offers a simpler, less costly four-color option to authors. The updated page template will result in improved readability, visual appeal, and new layout options for images and tables. We are very pleased with the design process so far and eager to celebrate its premiere in a few months. Be assured, however, despite the planned new look of the *Journal*, its mission will remain steady: "the dissemination of the results of academic research and scholarly investigations of interest to practitioners, academicians, and students of landscape architecture."

An Upcoming Anniversary: Call for Proposals.

The timing of the makeover is also significant. Many of you are aware that volume 26 (2007) will mark the 25th anniversary year of *Landscape Journal*. A quarter-century ago a group of dedicated CELA members inaugurated this first peer-

reviewed journal of landscape architecture with high aspirations and a handful of papers from the CELA conference held at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. We are planning to recognize the 25th anniversary of *Landscape Journal* with a variety of small events at the next CELA annual meeting (Penn State University, August 2007). Among other things, we are also preparing a special section in the Fall issue (26:2) devoted to the early editorial pioneers, the long-term patterns and trajectory of the *Journal*, and its impact on the discipline of landscape architecture. To that end, we invite proposals for short statements—generally less than five hundred words (about two double-spaced pages)—from editors, readers, organizers, advocates, and contributors to *Landscape Journal* in its seminal year(s). To be included, we need to hear from you no later than January 20th, 2007. To launch ideas, and/or for further details, please contact Elen Deming at landscapejournal@esf.edu

About This Issue

Our Fall 2006 issue is just about as full as we can possibly manage (and about as heavy as the Press will tolerate). Although it is an omnibus issue that ranges far and wide, two surprisingly coherent mini-themes emerge from the alignment of certain articles. Perhaps describing currents of thought, rather than mere coincidences of content, the first theme augments the history of the linked discourses of professionalization and gender in landscape architecture, while the second group examines alternative methods for understanding and managing large landscape change in rural areas. Two additional articles round out this issue; in completely different ways, they both offer critical observations on how the canons of dominant culture (whether western Europe or midwestern America) continue to shape the way we represent, and thus

value, the heritage of local cultural landscapes.

Peer-Reviewed Articles. Our lead-off article, “Seven Ways of Looking at a Mountain: Tetzcotzingo and the Aztec Garden Tradition,” by Paul Avilés (English, Onondaga Community College), invigorates the study of gardens and pleasure grounds of pre-Columbian and Mesoamerican peoples. Using a post-colonial framework, Avilés adopts a *hermeneutics of multiplicity* to pry open the canon of major monuments in landscape design history. This article should motivate landscape historians to consider the extraordinary complexity of non-European botanical gardens that often get overlooked in typical survey courses.

The three articles in the mini-theme on professionalization are organized, according to their content, in roughly chronological order. Carla Corbin (Landscape Architecture, Ball State University) suggests that landscape architecture “is not well understood by today’s general public” partly because of the seminal debates on appropriate nomenclature, mission, scale, and project types for landscape professionals. Her article “No ‘Gross Offenses Against Good Taste in Landscape Art’: The Pre-Professional Era in *Garden and Forest*,” reports on analysis of primary content from that publication in the late nineteenth century. “Theodora Kimball Hubbard and the ‘Intellectualization’ of Landscape Architecture, 1911–1935,” by Heidi Hohmann (Landscape Architecture, Iowa State University), picks up where Corbin leaves off—with the establishment of the ASLA and the first professional course of study in landscape architecture at Harvard University at the turn of the century. A welcome addition to the growing literature on the role of women in landscape architecture, this article introduces us to one of the most important and yet understudied figures in the formation of the basic pedagogy of the field. These articles are followed up by “Early Social Agendas of Women in

Landscape Architecture,” by Thaisa Way (Landscape Architecture, SUNY ESF). Using primary historical records, Way explores the gendered social politics of domestic landscape design in the early modernist period in her study of three female landscape architects: Martha Brookes Hutcheson, Annette Hoyt Flanders, and Marjorie Sewell Cautley.

The article by Larissa Larsen (Landscape Architecture, University of Michigan) and Lily Swanbrow (BS Environmental Science), “Postcards of Phoenix: Images of Desert Ambivalence and Homogeneity,” presents contextual analysis of content in a postcard archive containing hundreds of commercially-produced images, of a single city, generated over nearly a century. In so doing, this article makes a tidy *segué* from the historical studies, as well as from mixed methods of content analysis applied to historical documents, as it introduces an even larger discussion about the impact of historical patterns of representation on the way we understand and value contemporary landscapes.

The next two articles use geographic information systems to simulate and critique policies aimed at managing rural landscape change. Both offer examples of what we have described elsewhere as *critical evaluations* with “clear objectives and focused analysis” (*LJ*23:1, Spring 2004, iv). “Can Broad Land Use Policies Maintain Connections Between Protected Green Spaces in an Urbanizing Landscape?” by Tenley Conway (Geography, University of Toronto) is an excellent technical contribution from a researcher working in a related discipline. Unfortunately, the answer to the title question appears to be “no”: based on Conway’s models, land use management policies alone appear to be generally ineffective in protecting connectivity between green patches in urbanizing areas. There is a considerable overlap in aims and techniques—even concepts—between this paper and the work by Patricia Machemer (Urban & Regional Planning/Landscape Ar-

chitecture, Michigan State University), “Policy Analysis of Transferable Development Rights Programming Using Geographic Information Systems Modeling.” Machemer’s detailed paper simulates a variety of scenarios for allocating transferable development rights as a program for redirecting urban growth away from agricultural resources.

Short Subjects. Finally, in response to a pattern of interest from contributors, we are pleased to present a new category of work—something not-yet-completely-defined—that we are calling Short Subjects. This category accommodates the type of sketch, poem, photo essay, etc. that may not be appropriate as a conventional peer-reviewed article, but is still too enticing, too evocative, to pass up. Readers will remember “GeoTropes” by Jolie Kaytes (*LJ* 24:1, Spring 2005, 69) as a recent example of this category.

Rounding out the mini-theme on rural landscape change, therefore, is a short parable from Craig Johnson (Landscape Architecture, Utah State University) called “Mid-Morning Fishing on the Henry’s Fork: A Short Allegory About Passion and Responsibility to Protect Place Through Planning and Design.” The author urges planners, developers, and consumers of landscape to embrace a more intimate, a more passionate empiricism in their work. The parallel, of course, is in the poetics of angling: the patient, deeply intuitive, closely studied, and repeatedly tested *knowing* about the nature of a river, and the fluid interdependence of its hidden forms and currents and populations. On the surface, Johnson seems to express a different sensibility than Machemer or Conway. Deeper, however, each is working out a strategy to gain mastery over the question.

History, landscape, method. What tools, techniques, coax these things up to the surface where we can see them? Where shall we position ourselves to comprehend a condition undergoing constant change?