

Editor's Introduction

Change is in the air. From the rhetoric of the 2008 presidential campaign to occasionally violent seasonal transitions, from the profound tremors of the credit markets to the gradual retirement of a formative generation of educators in landscape architecture, everywhere there seem to be new alignments, revised priorities, emerging orders. Most of you are aware that the leadership of *Landscape Journal* is also in transition. As I write this, my penultimate editor's introduction, I also prepare to relinquish the editorial reins in order to take on other projects. In the meantime, CELA's editorial search committee eagerly anticipates several excellent proposals in order to select and implement a new vision for the future of the *Journal*. Although CELA's editorial selection has yet to be made (it will be formally announced before this issue is distributed), we have been deeply impressed with the caliber of all candidate teams and the care and vision they have brought to this important process. Their distinguished records of achievement, breadth of ideas, energy for positive change, and commitment to the field of inquiry is more than just reassuring, it is inspiring. This is already cause for great optimism for the vitality and future trajectory of *Landscape Journal*, and more exciting news will come in time.

ABOUT THIS ISSUE

All editors have the special opportunity, and responsibility, to note change—whether that includes cyclical trends and topical currents in the field, or changing profiles of authors and institutions. In September 2008, Drew Gilpin Faust, president of Harvard University, disseminated a public letter about recent changes in that institution that, among other things, recalled another Harvard president from a century earlier—Charles William Eliot. His words, even out of the depths of the past, may be interpreted as an adaptive response to change. “To observe keenly, to reason soundly, and to imagine vividly,” still serves quite as well for journal editors and authors, as it does for voters, meteorologists, economists, or a campus community. If interpreted as a pro-

cedure for relevant research, we also think Eliot's advice is beautifully demonstrated by this issue of *Landscape Journal*. From start to finish, the articles we present to you now are all about change—changes in the scholarly paradigms of both design and planning, as well as changes in *Landscape Journal* itself.

Paradigms Change

Ancient sites, for which textual and/or contextual data are not typically available, present especially difficult interpretive problems for contemporary researchers. In “Rethinking the Sacred Landscape: Minoan Palaces in a Georitual Framework of Natural Features on Crete,” Dennis Doxtater (University of Arizona–Tucson) tackles these problems and posits an alternative understanding of ancient Minoan georitual frameworks. By recording, analyzing, and considering the probabilities of geometrical patterns occurring between specific sites (temples, palaces, caves, mountains) on the island of Crete, Doxtater inverts Vincent Scully's received ideas (*The Earth, the Temple, and the Gods*, 1962) about conceptual relationships between religious architecture and sacred landscape. Critiquing Scully's notion that architectural forms initiated a geometric *extension* that pointed or projected outward to the landscape, Doxtater argues instead for the notion of *intension*. In brief, *intension* is how a site gathers or calls the landscape toward itself, grounding both site selection and orientation in the power of the larger landscape. Obviously hypothetical, Doxtater's argument is carefully demonstrated using contemporary computer software developed for pattern analysis. By inviting new interpretations and research questions pertaining to sacred sites, this article offers a model for others to “observe keenly, reason soundly, and imagine vividly” within the Minoan culture, and perhaps for other ancient sites in the Mediterranean region, and beyond.

Selecting a more modern site system, analyzed at a smaller scale, Ann Komara (University of Colorado–Denver) also studies innovative techniques of topographic representation. Reconsidering the story of urban renewal in Second Empire Paris (1852–1870), in

“Measure and Map: Alphan’s Contours of Construction at the Parc des Buttes Chaumont, Paris 1867,” Komara highlights the technical skill of the designers and craftsmen working under Georges Eugène Haussmann (1809–91). In particular, she considers Jean-Charles Adolphe Alphan’s (1817–91) technical transformation of the Parc des Buttes Chaumont (ca. 1867), through his unprecedented synthesis of a precise topographic survey (measure) and a contour rendering of the proposed landform (map). This feat of site engineering was presented to the Parisian public in sumptuously rendered “vues pittoresques” in Alphan’s catalogue raisonné *Les Promenades de Paris* (1867–73). Arguing that “maps carry the power of ‘agency’—that is, they communicate an agenda, imply and construct ideological positions, and generate receptions of the [place] itself and what it represents,” Komara observes the cultural and political contexts of both producer and map. By studying the alignment between the practices of creating maps and shaping landscapes, this article extends our perspectives on landscape architecture and cultural politics in 19th-century Paris.

Our third article makes a chronological jump from Haussmann’s Paris to mid-20th-century America, as well as a methodological jump from interpretation of representational practices to primary research in the social psychology of a small domestic community. “Building Privacy and Community: Surveillance in a Postwar American Suburban Development in Madison, Wisconsin,” is a case study of Crawford Heights, a small enclave built during the late 1940s and early ’50s. Anna Vemer Andrzejewski (University of Wisconsin–Madison) explores “the critical role of domestic architecture and landscape design in everyday suburban life . . . helping [residents] balance desires for privacy and community.” Conducting depth interviews with residents, Andrzejewski explores and cherished aspects of community, especially where togetherness is balanced with privacy. Part of her objective is to temper contemporary “renunciations” of the postwar suburban landscape and offer a reasoned middle ground. This stance may prove valuable in those planning and design debates

that problematize mid-century American subdivisions even though close observation of the resale market suggests the postwar model retains much of its popularity among a new generation of American homeowners.

Continuing the theme of modern housing types in the postwar era, Ann Forsyth (Cornell University) and Katherine Crewe (Arizona State University) offer “A Typology of Comprehensive Designed Communities Since the Second World War.” The authors address the problem of confused or ambiguous terminology used to describe and discuss comprehensive designed communities realized between the end of World War II and the early 21st century. For instance, a New Urbanist enclave may be designed to resemble a small town, a Garden City, or an ‘eco-community’ despite the fact that its underlying politics, economic structures, and even social ideals may be wholly different. Arguing that this ambiguity undermines the important intellectual history of urban design and development, Crewe and Forsyth present a more reliable framework “based on the developments’ key assumptions and intellectual histories, and particularly their social, ecological, economic, political, and aesthetic character.” Crewe and Forsyth eschew a formal typology that may obscure underlying ideologies, and rather than merely describe spatial scale, formal *parti*, or housing types and styles that such settlements may adopt, they clarify the intentions of designers, planners, and their clients instead. The editors believe this article offers valuable potential for practice as well as teaching.

“Landscape as Infrastructure,” by Pierre Bélanger (University of Toronto) provides part of the environmental backstory for Charles Waldheim and Alan Berger’s “Logistics Landscape,” as well as for Lynda Schneekloth and Robert Shibley’s “The Public Realm: Weaving a Regional Civic Life” (previously published in *LJ* Vol. 27:2, Fall 2008). Confronting the massive legacy of brownfields, deteriorated industrial infrastructure, and devalued lands in the so-called “rust belt” of North America, Bélanger reviews an environmental history that, he argues, resulted from patterns of accident, “crisis and failure.” Contrasting two specific site studies—the Leslie

Street Spit on Toronto's downtown waterfront, and the infamous Love Canal in Niagara Falls, NY, Bélanger illustrates the historical processes of degradation, remediation, and reclamation of land in the Great Lakes Region, where the residues of 19th- and 20th-century industrialization continue to shape the regional landscape. Bélanger's essay is both critical and paradigmatic (landscape urbanism) as it aims to "redefine the conventional meaning of modern infrastructure," and thus recover the intricate functions, services, and structures of the biophysical landscape that support urban and regional economies. "Landscape as Infrastructure," is a challenging article with serious, hopeful, and far-reaching implications for the practice of landscape architecture.

Publications Change

The last two articles in this issue shift our focus to the changing landscape of academic publishing. Matthew Powers (Florida A&M University) and Jason Walker (Mississippi State University) have developed a baseline study of articles published in *Landscape Journal* since its debut in 1982. "Twenty-Five Years of Landscape Journal: An Analysis of Authorship and Article Content" examines changes in publication patterns over time, in order to inform a broader, perhaps more critical "discussion of *Landscape Journal's* role in advancing the scholarship of landscape architecture." Data on more than 300 articles and 500 authors were analyzed, correlated to four main editorial periods. Although many patterns were indistinct, there was some clear evidence of change, most notably in shifting topical emphases, gender rebalancing among authors, a broader range of acceptable research methods, and slight increases in collaborative work. Even with this baseline established, we recognize that much more work remains to analyze these data, to understand *Landscape Journal* as a reflec-

tion of, and its impact on, broader concerns and practices in landscape architecture.

While their baseline study was taking shape, Powers and Walker were invited to present their preliminary findings during a panel discussion held at the annual meeting of the Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture (Pennsylvania State University, August 2007). The panel, "Retrospect and Forecast: Remarks On the Occasion of the 25th Anniversary of *Landscape Journal*," was moderated by Elen Deming, editor of *Landscape Journal*, and featured founding editors Darrel Morrison (Dean *emeritus*, University of Georgia) and Arnold Alanen (University of Wisconsin–Madison). Two longstanding editorial advisors and contributors, Joan Nassauer (University of Michigan) and Frederick Steiner (University of Texas–Austin), were followed by respondent Patrick Miller (Virginia Polytechnic University). A second respondent, Anne Spirn (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), former guest editor and early advocate for the *Journal*, was invited to add her reflections on the panel *post hoc*.

The participants' prepared remarks, transcribed here in full, respond in part to Matthew Powers and Jason Walker's preliminary research findings (shared in advance). The vibrancy of the event itself—the sense of humility, pride, humor, and community shared by those in the room—does not transmit perfectly through these texts. However, the panelists' observations certainly indicate profound changes being faced by *Landscape Journal* in particular, academic publishing in general, and the larger fields of practice, as they (and we) mature. We hope you will find this extended editorial discussion at least provocative, possibly prescient, as CELA prepares to select our next editorial leaders.

MED

Send correspondence to M. Elen Deming at landscapejournal@esf.edu