Editor's Introduction

Landscape Journal sometimes seems a fragile thing, an exercise of merest faith. Yet the locus of its quality and resilience lies most securely within the CELA community. As Jim Palmer and I guided the *Journal* these past seven years (2002–2009), we gradually became aware of our position in the continuous transition that will be the history of *Landscape Journal*. We are the last editors of the first phase of *Landscape Journal,* and perhaps the first to confront the stark necessity for change. We began our tenure by addressing CELA's need to make the *Journal* more professional, timely, and profitable. We arranged for the *Journal* to receive a subtle facelift that allowed for integrated color. We recognized the opportunity to form new institutional and commercial partnerships. More important, we knew it was crucial for *Landscape Journal* to be digitally archived and fully searchable online. With support and advice from the University of Wisconsin Press, CELA leadership, and our editorial advisory board, these projects have all been secured. We are very pleased to announce that the digital archive project is now complete and full-text content of *Landscape Journal* can be retrieved all the way back to the inaugural issue of Spring 1982.

For the long term, perhaps the most significant achievement occurred on the eve of our retirement. Due to concerted efforts by the University of Wisconsin Press, *Landscape Journal* was accepted for indexing in the Scopus family. Scopus is a large, international abstract and citation database of research literature (print and web), boasting "more than 15,000 peer-reviewed journals from more than 4,000 publishers, and more than 1000 Open Access journals" among other resources.[1] Scopus is also recognized for its citation indexing features and its own variant of the "impact factor." The lack of a calculable impact factor has been a deal-breaker for many would-be contributors in the past, and a sticking point in many recent debates about the limitations of the *Journal*. We are all extremely pleased that work published in *Landscape Journal* will not be "counted out."

Even as Jim and I managed what we could understand, we have also warily watched the emergence of the unfamiliar. Boon or bane, the consolidation of several new trends in publishing portends a sea-change for small academic publications like ours. Many of these are technological responses to changes in readers' (and authors') expectations, in turn, linked to larger cultural paradigms—the pace of life, dominance of consumer culture, pressures peculiar to the industry of higher education, etc. Others have to do with new technologies of production and marketing.

Closely related to this, at no time have both the fragility of the *Journal* and the security of the CELA community been more evident than during the editorial recruiting period just concluded. Several excellent proposals were considered from teams whose qualifications and vision were, quite simply, outstanding. Debating the talents and commitment of these aspiring editors would have been pointless. Instead, the editorial transition committee deliberated on the strategic merits and risks of alternative publishing models and how well they might, or might not, serve the needs of the CELA membership.

As a result of this decision, in January 2009, we were thrilled to begin the transfer of editorial responsibilities to a new team led by Lance Neckar and David Pitt at the University of Minnesota. The current issue (vol. 28:2, Fall 2009) has been a collaboration staged so that we could "pass the baton" to the new editors, both technically and metaphorically. By the time this issue is distributed, we expect their learning curve will have leveled out and, we hope, any oversights on the part of the outgoing editors will go completely unnoticed.

In deciding on this new leadership, CELA also implicitly chose to continue the relationship developed over long, sometimes lean years with the University of Wisconsin Press, which has proven its commitment to *Landscape Journal* beyond reproach. However, as a small not-for-profit academic press, they are vulnerable to heavy weather in the larger publishing climate. And as reading, writing, and research practices evolve, and as publishing paradigms shift, CELA's decision on the editorial leadership will not forestall the need for further debate.

Landscape Journal 28:2–09 ISSN 0277-2426

Emerging trends in publishing, indexing, and information sciences are forcing radical reconsideration of *all* academic publishing sectors. Commercial media tell us we live in an on-demand, interactive world; the publishing industry is pressed to be more nimble and bring new ideas to readers more quickly than ever with online content, e-journals and books, and short print runs. Along with an emphasis on paperless, digital publishing, we also see the rise of previewing and "reselling" content—e.g. blogging, listserves, search engines, advance citation or abstracting services, pay-per-view articles, etc.

We know from the news (*New York Times* on-line, anyone?) that digital media are bringing some of the most venerable print establishments to the brink. It seems paradoxical therefore that, despite the rapid expansion of modes of access to knowledge, there is a general pushback, a resistance to the sheer mass of information available. Most people cite "lack of time" as the reason they read less than ever. We suspect the situation is probably more complicated than that.

At this transitional moment, the editorial team at SUNY-ESF is very glad to commit the *Journal* to Neckar's and Pitt's capable hands. It has been an extraordinary privilege to serve as your editors these past seven years but, it must be said, we look forward to Minnesota's tenure with a mixture of hope, gratitude, and relief. If we were the last editors of the first phase of *Landscape Journal*, it is clear and necessary that the *Journal* should now enter its next phase with new editors. With guidance from our esteemed colleagues, there is no doubt *Landscape Journal* will continue to present the finest available work in new formats, with even greater relevance and vitality for all students of the landscape. We therefore congratulate our colleagues Lance Neckar and David Pitt and pledge our full support for their success.

PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF KNOWLEDGE

"Knowledge is power," goes the old saying, "and the first rule of power is 'don't tell anyone else the rules'." Like the perfect distribution of wealth, the perfect communication of knowledge should level the playing field, in effect, aiming for a balance of power and access to opportunity. The worldwide web promised a utopia of perfect access to knowledge that has appeared, to some extent, in surprising and hopeful ways. But we are forced to admit that perfect equity typically does not happen without intervention—neither in market-driven economies nor in communication of professional knowledge.[2]

In a world where knowledge is king, citations of knowledge or its corollary, expertise, may become commodified, or proprietary. The policy and even the illusion of exclusivity makes commodities seem more valuable. This is how many top universities, consulting firms, academic journals, citation indexes, and real estate (among many other things) maintain their market appeal. In many ways the industry of higher education depends on proprietary models of knowledge production, especially the carefully cultivated perception of knowledge/expertise as limited, exclusive, and therefore privileged. Patents, grants, rankings, licensure, title and practice laws, accreditation, tuition, etc.—the official apparatus constructed to produce, support, and leverage the institutional value of proprietary knowledge depends on a myriad of sacrosanct academic traditions.

This principle extends to publishing as well. Landscape architects need the intellectual confidence to challenge both the quality and forms of new knowledge, most particularly to navigate the apparatus of its production, dissemination, and access. This challenge is increasingly important for students and practitioners. Indeed, the future of the profession seems to depend more than ever on the practices of critical reading and writing.

Critical Reading and Smart Research

During its first 100 days, the Obama administration was commended for its intelligence, effective organization and, above all, its competence. Much of the economic stimulus plan has been directed at forward-looking technological and environmental initiatives and a revived national technocracy is being welcomed by many.

Meanwhile, the current catchphrases are all about being "smart"—smart growth, smart energy, smart cars, smart cities. If we accept any part of the truism that "knowledge is power," then landscape architects might need to get smarter too.

Pursued as a trade for centuries, then regulated as a field of professional practice, landscape architecture has slowly matured into a comprehensive scholarly *discipline*. The term refers to an abstract body of knowledge—an evolving, semi-autonomous system of learning, knowing, and praxis that is methodically and consensually produced, legitimized, and consumed. Bodies of knowledge undergo constant renewal through the processes of interrogation and investigation. Similar to a system of civil laws, academic disciplines have rules of evidence, precedent cases, and stylized, structured forms of argument. Similar to our system of litigation, we maintain and advance disciplinary knowledge in a collective, participatory process of open challenge and debate. Instead of trial by jury, however, we call it peer review.

It should be emphasized that knowledge production and consumption are reciprocal processes. The production of new knowledge is never a one-way street, and expertise does not naturally flow from the academy to the profession. After all, practical application (design and planning) is what makes science (theory and method) meaningful. But the practice of better *questioning* helps produce better answers—and therefore new competencies. All this begins with the fundamentals of reading and writing.

Would greater participation in professional research narrow the perceived gulf between practice and the academy? Possibly. Important research does not begin only in university laboratories and institutes. Precisely because practitioners also produce valuable new knowledge, they need to work at disseminating, testing, and reinvesting in the results of practical research. This may be accomplished in several ways, including the appointment of research directors in firms, "seeding" a percentage of excess revenues back into R&D, forming academic-professional research partnerships or "practice lines," publication of case studies and research reports, and drawing up professional research agendas, among other strategies. In fact, all of us need to pay closer attention to specific research priorities, rather than feeding indiscriminately at the trough of research agendas that are publically funded and may be politically freighted.

Professional research intelligence starts with our students. Because students are a crucial part of our discursive community, they should be expected to know the literature and participate in the formation of research questions. If fully embraced, this attitude could have strong implications for what we consider core, or foundational, in professional education. The fundamentals of research demand a skill set that ought to be taught at the undergraduate level, emphasized and honed in graduate programs, and reinforced in professional practice. In other words, the production, legitimization, and consumption of *disciplinary* knowledge should not grind to a halt when students enter practice.

It happens that there is an entire industry of academic publishing devoted to this proposition. As the first peer-reviewed journal in landscape architecture, *Landscape Journal* was created to disseminate the results of emerging research and scholarship for academics and practitioners. We take this opportunity to challenge all professional students to take *Landscape Journal* into your field of practice, in any sector, ask your office libraries to subscribe, and actually *read* it. Even better, *write*—contribute your own research articles to a wide variety of academic journals, so you may influence practical research and give the profession a "smarter" edge. If knowledge is power, then competence, research intelligence, and expertise might well be the ultimate business plan.

ABOUT THIS ISSUE

We turn now to the content of this issue, a mixed bouquet of half a dozen provocative topics. The articles are ordered by scale: topics range in scope from vast conceptual explorations to very particular case stud-

ies. Four of these six articles are authored by colleagues from around the world—from countries in Europe, the Middle East, South Asia, and the Pacific Rim. We think the increasingly international range of topics and contributors in our pages is testament to the expansion of landscape architectural programs and practices around the world, and the subsequent need for scholarship that addresses a broader, global perspective on landscape issues.

We decided to lead off with the mediaeval garden of love, a topic we all can warm to. "Serpent of Pleasure: Emergence and Difference in the Mediaeval Garden of Love" offers another compelling chapter in Rod Barnett's (Unitec, New Zealand) growing *oeuvre* (see *LJ* vol. 26:2, Fall 2007). Focusing on alternative interpretations of major historical categories of garden types, in this article Barnett challenges the traditional interpretation of the mediaeval garden as a moral, usually Christianized parable of good and evil. Instead, Barnett posits the garden of love as a non-judgmental environment, a space open to ambiguity, complexity, and the nature of humanity. This reading allows for greater philosophical compatibility between landscape interpretation and current trends in eco-criticism.

Also relevant to contemporary philosophy and design theory, Martin Prominski (University of Hannover, Germany) and Spiridon Koutroufinis (Technical University of Berlin) explain theories of *enfolding* from Gottfried Leibniz and Gilles Deleuze *vis à vis* contemporary notions of complexity and flow in landscape design. In "Folded Landscapes: Between Baroque and Contemporary Notions of the Fold," the authors analyze, compare and contrast two large projects—Rebstockpark in Frankfurt-am-Main, and the Garden of Cosmic Speculation—with less well-known but perhaps more successful examples of enfolding. We think this intellectually challenging critique will be interesting to many students of the history and theory of design and may help inform contemporary approaches.

In her article "Landscape Architecture and Agriculture: Common Seeds and Diverging Sprigs in Israeli Practice," Tal Alon-Mozes (Technion, Haifa) surveys the agricultural roots of contemporary and modern landscape architecture in Israel. As agricultural areas become increasingly urbanized, she argues, the forms and patterns of the productive landscape become increasingly encoded in formal and stylistic motifs of landscape architecture. Because symbolic form arouses feelings of nostalgia, place-attachment, or desire for preservation, it is important to understand the dynamics of how these designs communicate to a population that may not "remember" an agrarian Israeli culture in a few more years.

With respect to farmland conservation, the state of California faces similar pressures to those of Israel. However, instead of synthetic vocabularies of design, policy strategies and regulatory tools have been crafted to mitigate the loss of California's agricultural landscapes. In a co-authored article, "Easement Exchanges for Agricultural Conservation: A Case Study Under the Williamson Act in California," Brendan Stewart and Timothy Duane (University of California, Berkeley) present their analysis and evaluation of the long-term efficacy of one such policy tool, and suggest modifications to improve upon it.

Amita Sinha and Terry Harkness (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign) share a case study of heritage planning practices for one of the world's most famous cultural monuments—the Taj Mahal. Since the mid-seventeenth century, curators of the monument have responded to changes in the environmental context of the Taj Mahal by limiting visitor movements and restricting their views of this icon of Mughal culture. "Views of Taj: Figure in the Landscape," presents the results of a design studio, funded in part by the Indian government, that proposes the development of an extensive greenbelt and viewshed to surround the Taj, protect it from pollutants, and extend its visual relationships to the larger cultural landscape of the Yamuna waterfront.

In contrast with the Taj Mahal in every possible way, the vernacular Kentucky landscape is the subject of the final article. Yet, as Ned Crankshaw (University of Kentucky) explains, this landscape has also been subjected to radical contextual changes over time, as well

as a "view from the road" that foreshortens an accurate geographic perspective. Similar to the Taj project, the article "Plowing or Mowing? Rural Sprawl in Nelson County, Kentucky" also happens to be the result of several years of study by Crankshaw and his students. County-wide in its extent, but national in its implications, this study of the patterns and characteristics of exurban domestic landscapes has relevance for the types of pressures being felt by communities in many developed nations around the world, from the US to Israel to New Zealand.

Enjoy. And please keep reading.

MED

Send correspondence to M. Elen Deming at ladept@illinois.edu

NOTES

1. Scopus is a product of Elsevier, and a rival to Thompson ISI's "Web of Science" that delisted *Landscape Journal* several years ago. While catering mainly to the scientific community worldwide, Scopus has plans to add significant new coverage of arts and humanities titles in June 2009. For more information see http://info.scopus.com/
2. These remarks have been adapted from a statement prepared for the Symposium on Leadership & Landscape Change, the final event of the LAF-sponsored Landscape Futures Initiative hosted by Clemson University, in Charleston, SC, 18–21 May, 2008.