

Editor's Introduction

SUSTAINING THE *LANDSCAPE JOURNAL*

Since 1982, *Landscape Journal* has presented an organization of knowledge within and at the boundaries of landscape architecture. This organization is broadly represented by its three general formats: in *open*, *special*, and *focused* editions, it has preserved continuity with past and existing strands of scholarly development, and it has recontoured discourse on new issues with experimental epistemologies and approaches. We appreciate previous editorial teams for establishing the breadth and quality of discourse that has become the mainstay of the *Journal*. Continuity of these purposes and standards as well as of this organization, of the *Journal*, and of peer review by members of the editorial board, subject-area experts, and rank-and-file CELA members lies at the foundation of our design for the future.

Nevertheless, the imperatives of this moment in the landscape, and in landscape architecture, clearly point to change. Sustainability, the elusive and broad-spectrum imperative of this century, requires general and unique approaches to the integration of knowledge about the design of and on the land. Among the most important disciplines of the new century, landscape architecture is uniquely positioned to offer a promise of reconciling science, technology, and aesthetics in the design, planning, and management of land in the diverse programs and settings that characterize the 21st-century landscape.

At the scale of cities and regions, the definition and manifestation of the concept of multifunctional landscapes, for example, require the integration of problem- and site-specific work by diverse academics and professionals. Landscape architects, architects, and planners must learn to work (better) together, and they must learn the research and practice languages of ecologists, epidemiologists, agriculture specialists, economists, sociologists, and engineers. At the site scale, a clientele in new landscapes of accelerated and massive change positions designers to integrate performance across a range of landscape criteria and programs.

Regardless of scale, we must remind ourselves that the imperative of aesthetics is our constant and unique responsibility. Beauty, too, is part of sustainability.

Discourse relating to sustainability in landscape design and planning is both local and global, and the international challenge creates an opportunity to open this conversation to the world. If we can meet this challenge well, our readership will expand.

Sensing the impact on landscape architecture of these broader ecological and cultural urgencies, we recommit to the stewardship of the discursive openness toward and timely management of critical academic inquiry that is singularly the charge with *Landscape Journal*. At the same time, we sense the several significant aspects of this particular moment in landscape architecture and the life of the *Journal* that give operational direction to this commitment.

The first, and perhaps most obvious, aspect is the traditional but now pointed challenge of reconciliation across academic and professional discourse. One approach to coming together is to focus on emerging issues that can forge new syntheses across academia and the profession. In the promotion of discussion and criticism of the explosion of inter- and transdisciplinary work, for example, we must forge connections across the boundaries of the multiple disciplines that produce research and scholarship pertinent to built work, planning, and management. While language, epistemology, and standards of research and scholarship create (wonderful) tensions across disciplines and cultures, the *Journal* must continue its focus on issues germane to the design, planning, and management of land.

Challenges swarm around the relative infrequency of *Landscape Journal's* publication. Semiannual publication threatens lively and engaged discourse as emerging issues in the freshest of articles are sometimes sidetracked or even lost. Special numbers of the *Journal* have brought critical mass to significant issues such as the role of ecology in making a revelatory landscape and metropolitan regions. Balancing the frequency of their appearance with the *Journal's* critical role as a

publication of the Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture of providing venues for academics in need of peer review for promotion is often challenging. While peer review may circumscribe readership to academe as the only true double-blind, peer-reviewed journal for a North American, Australian, and New Zealand professorate, the *Journal* must maintain its role as a showcase of peer-reviewed scholarship and research by members of the landscape architectural community.

Until now, another major challenge of infrequent publication has been indexing. Recently, the *Journal* has been indexed by Elsevier Scopus. The breadth of the discipline served by Scopus suggests that this index is fitted exactly to *Landscape Journal*, and we wish to commend Prof. Elen Deming, our immediate predecessor, and Pamela Wilson, University of Wisconsin Press Journals Division, for making this possible.

Still, as the discipline and profession enlarge in size and scope, it seems possible, even desirable, to consider moving *Landscape Journal* to three, perhaps four, numbers a year. Cost challenges exist on all sides of this proposition. Declining library subscription budgets provide a limit to all journals, print and digital. On the production side, university press-based print journals such as ours are especially challenged by printing and distribution costs. We remain committed to the rigor, scholarly infrastructure, and operational flexibility of the University of Wisconsin Press. This said, we are preparing for the possible reality that virtual publishing is the only future for academic journals.

GENIUS LOCI: THE LANDSCAPE JOURNAL/CELA CONNECTION

In part to address challenges to international breadth, timeliness, and readership, we aim to moderate current discourse on emerging issues via discussion sessions at CELA Annual Meetings and an edited blog, the working title of which is *genius loci*. We propose the blog be an edited, expert-editorial-panel-informed, but non-peer-reviewed, portion of the *Journal* operation that

also brings to print the best-of-the-best of these emerging issues as items/projects/discussions. We propose to connect the edited blog via annual, focused, expert-editorial-panel-hosted discussion sessions around emerging issues. These two principal capture points will feed the development of articles—both in the blog and in a new emergent landscape section of the *Journal*.

A side benefit of this more interactive approach will be the development not only of articles but also of the discipline, of its connections to the profession and clients/patrons, and perhaps most importantly of the mentoring of new authors. Furthermore, the *Journal* will gain exposure with its on-line counterpart, and the blog will be fueled by its connection to the print version, growing both readership and paths to authorship.

THE LANDSCAPE JOURNAL AND THE NEXT GENERATION OF FACULTY

Finally, we are mindful of the timing of our editorship. When we stood before the assembled CELA membership in January 2009, the sight of so many senior faculty members in that session was sobering. During our seven-year term, many of the professors who have guided the growth and development of our field will be eligible for retirement. We will be counting on the senior professorate, through continued article reviews for the *Journal*, participation on CELA discussion panels, and service on *genius loci* expert-editorial-advisory panels, to be closely involved in the mentorship and advancement of the next generation of faculty for which the stewardship of *Landscape Journal* plays a unique and central role. We know that the processes of new author engagement—for the blog, the expert editorial panels, and CELA sessions around each of the emerging issues—must be integrated into the core goal of bringing peer-reviewed work to press. *Landscape Journal* must maintain its central role in mentoring and developing a core of 21st century authors in landscape architecture. The best of peer-reviewed work across the

widening spectrum of this field is our core commitment, and we will give it our best effort.

ABOUT THIS ISSUE

We are pleased to present in this first issue produced solely under our direction a collection of articles reflecting the diversity of inquiry we hope to sustain. In a sense, we bracket two artistic/humanist interpretations of landscape design with a paper that examines the application of scientific concepts to landscape architecture and another that offers a critical appraisal of the ability of the *Journal* to meet its strategic goals as formulated by the Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture (CELA). We conclude with an outline for assessing community gardens in the urban landscape.

In the first entry, Susan Herrington, University of British Columbia, examines the contributions of one of landscape architecture's 20th-century North American icons, Ian McHarg, toward integrating scientific thinking into the design and planning of land. Through a critical analysis of McHarg's many publications, professional documents and public addresses, Herrington examines his unwavering beliefs that science links design to nature and that use of an overlay mapping system accurately reveals this connection. She calls McHarg's "scientific reasoning" into question in his unabashed admiration of the English landscape garden as a model of designing with nature, his failure to address limitations inherent in the act of mapping, and his dated interpretations of evolutionary and ecological theory.

Catherine Dee, University of Sheffield, offers a manifesto on principles and practices used in the education of landscape designers. Her essay draws from the thinking and design approaches of past and present in a framework arguing for reform of current educational approaches. Among the foci of Dee's approach to the making of form is a plea for the close observation of sites, a practice seemingly jeopardized by the explosion of visual data sources. In her argument for precision and direct experience with plants, soil and materiality,

Dee raises alternatives to a too-virtual educational experience and to teaching that encourages text to supplant form.

Amanda Shoaf Vincent, Pennsylvania State University, interprets the intentions of the designers of Parc de Bercy against the backdrop of the Paris in the 1980s and 1990s. Her nuanced interpretation of ruin and allegory in garden design theory and in the design and reception of the park illuminates both the parti of the park and cultural history of the city. Vincent's description of the spatial and figural arrangement of historic elements and references in the park enlists the 18th-century English theoreticians of emblem and expression and of the Picturesque. She structures her linkage of these ideas of the presence of the past, and differentiation from them, by reference to the writings of Walter Benjamin. In all she offers a revealing narrative on the contemporary values of memory, present in an expressive formal allegory that is, in her treatment, a central armature of the Parc de Bercy.

Paul Gobster, U.S. Forest Service Northern Research Station, Joan Iverson Nassauer, University of Michigan, and Daniel Nadenicek, University of Georgia, examine the content of the *Journal* over the last 25 years using a variety of citation analysis tools, manual searches of the journal, and interviews. They critique the performance of the *Journal* relative to the accomplishment of five strategic goals established by the Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture (CELA). The authors offer suggestions for moving the journal beyond the creation of knowledge by landscape architects for landscape architects and toward greater participation in the broader community of scholars and practitioners concerned with the design, planning, and management of land.

The declining economic environment, concerns about food security, and an increased interest in locally and homegrown food has prompted a resurgence of interest in community gardens as part of the urban landscape. Through literature review and a series of in-depth interviews, Lee-Anne S. Milburn, University of Nevada-Las Vegas, and Brooke Adams Vail, Integrated

Site Design in Seattle, Washington, examine factors affecting the development and administration of successful community garden programs in small- to medium-sized cities in the United States. They articulate the “seeds of success” as securing long-term land tenure; sustaining interest and support of gardeners

and their surrounding communities; organizing and operating the garden in a manner that responds to a community’s social, economic and physical needs; and attending to appropriate design considerations.

LN DP

