

Editor's Introduction

Thanks to all who applauded the changes to the typography and page design of *Landscape Journal* in the last issue. Having (just barely) reached an age when optical aids have become necessary, I hope the increased legibility of the text is also a boon to others. The content of the spring issue, however, eclipsed its elegant presentation. We are encouraged that many of you responded so thoughtfully to the race and landscape theme (vol. 26:1), and expect that Dianne Harris's guest edition will establish a high water mark for the *Journal*. The impact of this issue will be told in time—the genesis of heightened awareness, multiple new lines of design and social research and, hopefully, increased racial and cultural diversity in the coming generation of landscape architects. We welcome whatever additional thoughts and letters you may be motivated to share with us.

It was also rewarding to see colleagues and mentors gathered at the CELA annual meeting (Pennsylvania State University, August 2007), where a retrospective panel session was held in recognition of the quarter-century mark of *Landscape Journal*. Founding editors Arne Alanen (University of Wisconsin) and Darrel Morrison (emeritus, University of Georgia) offered their accounts along with those of long-term editorial board members Joan Nassauer (University of Michigan) and Fritz Steiner (University of Texas). Researchers Matthew Powers (Florida A&M University) and Jason Walker (Mississippi State University) also presented empirical evidence that both supports and refutes our editorial impressions. The lively and thoughtful debate that followed suggests that the future of academic discourse, especially in the pages of *Landscape Journal*, will remain as vital as ever.

TRANSITIONS

We offer our warm congratulations to Marcy Denker who graduated with her MLA degree (and an ASLA Merit Award) from SUNY ESF in May 2007. Marcy is now off to greener . . . uh, mountains . . . in Vermont.

As our trusted assistant editor (2005-2007), Marcy possessed an unerring sense of the-right-thing-to-say-at-precisely-the-right-moment. Happily, Marcy helped us in selecting and training her successor. We are fortunate to welcome Jessi Lyons (MLA '09) as the new assistant editor of *Landscape Journal*. Working closely with the editor-in-chief, with editorial assistant Brenda Bolliver (who handles our database and correspondence with aplomb and good humor), and Kate Auwaerter (our capable multi-tasking managing editor), Jessi has taken over the coordination of our peer review process and research tasks. If Jessi ever contacts you about providing a peer review for *Landscape Journal*, please welcome her (and then say yes).

Meanwhile, at the University of Wisconsin Press, other changes have been both exciting and sad. We are grieved to report that Ken Sullivan, who oversaw marketing and promotions for *Landscape Journal*, died much too young in an accident this Spring. Ken will be missed by many, for many reasons, and we offer our condolences to all Ken's family and colleagues at University of Wisconsin Press. On a brighter note, we were pleased to welcome Pamela Wilson, new director of the journals division at UW Press, in January 2007. One of Pam's first initiatives was to improve the way journal articles may be accessed. UW Press has recently partnered with their journal printer to offer an online ordering system for article reprints. These reprints are high quality photocopies and may include a title page and/or cover. Previously, authors could order copies of their article only with a minimum order of 100; this number has been reduced to 25. For further details, please see the UW website: www.wisc.edu/wisconsinpress/journals/ or consult the manuscript guidelines in the back of this issue.

ABOUT THIS ISSUE Manifesto Theme

We are very pleased to offer readers a special “mini-theme” group, four articles assembled and guest-edited by Dorothée Imbert (Harvard GSD). Three of

these papers were originally included in a session on the modern manifesto in landscape architecture that Imbert organized for the annual conference of the Society of Architectural Historians in Savannah, GA (April 2006). In one short year since the Savannah session, Imbert has further articulated the theme of the manifesto, authors refined their work, and an additional contributor joined the group. The theme authors include Imbert herself, along with Judith Major (University of Kansas), David Haney (Newcastle University, UK), and Annermarie Bucher (ETH, Zurich). Alone, each of the papers is fascinating and original; together, their alignments afford a remarkable perspective on the manifesto tradition. For a better understanding of the context and importance of manifestoes in landscape architecture, do not miss Imbert's very clear and interesting foreword to the mini-theme, following my introduction (vii-viii).

Omnibus Articles

The theme group is balanced by four independent articles. Topics range from an exploration of the sacred spaces of prehistory to the peripatetic pleasures of landscapes experienced in motion; from the ironies of a civil-war-themed subdivision in contemporary Ohio, to the latest contribution to the perennial debate on how gardens mean. By illuminating each of their subjects in a spotlight of specific theories of landscape, vision, and meaning, these four freestanding articles collectively demonstrate a range of provocative techniques for landscape interpretation and critique. They also serve as a satisfying foil to the mini-theme on manifestoes, suggesting how the most unprepossessing act of design may be uniquely positional as well as paradigmatic.

In his study "Sacred Groves: Sacrifice and the Order of Nature in Ancient Greek Landscapes," Rod Barnett (UNITEC, Auckland, New Zealand) choreographs the contemporary philosophical writings of Georges Bataille in a tango with nonlinear systems theory. Arguing that the Greek understanding of sacred and profane conditions existed in a continuum from disordered to disciplined, he shows that the sacred grove served as a

portal between states. Barnett illuminates the potential for sacrificial rituals to "permit the passage of the sacred into human systems," and draws a comparison with the role that disturbance plays in other transformative systems. Among its many merits, this article offers a fresh and original interpretation of the relationship between ecological design and deep cultural dynamics.

In "Walking and Reading in Landscape," Ben Jacks (Miami University of Ohio) extends some of the principles from his earlier article, "Four Ways of Walking in the Landscape" (*JAE* 2004), toward a closer reading of the experience of landscape. In this delightfully eclectic study, Jacks analyzes the experience of spiritual, aesthetic, and psychological walking in environments as disparate as the monastic cloister, the earthwork sculptures of Richard Long, and the lifestyle centers of contemporary consumer culture. The author pursues an established line of inquiry on motility in landscape perception—running from Donald Appleyard, Kevin Lynch, and Lawrence Halprin, and then skipping to Bernard Lassus and Michel Conan. Because interesting design opportunities may result from the various crises of sedentary living, this article will, no doubt, stimulate alert students and practitioners.

Continuing in the vein of "reading" the landscape, Andrew Shanken (University of California at Berkeley) presents an object lesson in landscape semiology. Constructed as an erstwhile memorial to the Blue and the Grey, the subdivision called Union Station is one developer's quirky paean to the Civil War of myth and legend. Challenging our notions of public spaces and monuments, Shanken's article demonstrates that theming is not limited to the suburbs, nor to commercial public spaces, but is always questionable compensation for the destruction of more authentic places. As amusing as it is ascerbic, this case study raises more questions that it answers, and leaves us to wonder about the private purposes of national narratives attached to monuments—both large and small, both official and commercial.

Susan Herrington (University of British Columbia) rounds out our Fall issue with a continuation of

the debates on garden meaning that have transpired in these pages since Anne Spirn guest edited the theme issue *Nature, Form, and Meaning*, *LJ* 7:2 (1988). “Gardens *Can* Mean” is Herrington’s putative rebuttal to Jane Gillette’s “Can Gardens Mean?” *LJ* 24:1 (Spring 2005), itself an extension of “Must Gardens Mean?” by Marc Treib, *LJ* 14:1 (Spring 1995). In attempting to systematically dismantle some of Gillette’s main arguments, however,

Herrington is unable to completely collapse Gillette’s main thesis: gardens *can* and *do* mean, chiefly as a vehicle for meaning constructed by others and experienced, changed, interpreted by visitors—meanings that are slightly, unavoidably, and differently re-constructed with each encounter. We venture to predict that Herrington’s will not be the last word on the subject. Enjoy.

MED