Remixing the Landscape Architecture History Class

Daniel C. Jost

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Landscape Architecture

University of Washington
2015

Committee:
Thaïsa Way
Robert Mugerauer

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:
Landscape Architecture

University of Washington

Abstract

Remixing the Landscape Architecture History Class

Daniel C. Jost

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:
Associate Professor Thaïsa Way
Landscape Architecture

The pedagogical goals for landscape architecture history courses required as part of the curriculum in professional degree programs in landscape architecture vary from school to school. One goal of some of these courses has been to provide a broad survey of the field of landscape architecture. But analysis shows some of the major design challenges and project types designers face today have minimal representation in the imagery in Elizabeth Barlow Rogers's *Landscape Design: A Cultural and Architectural History*, which many landscape architecture history classes in the U.S. use as a primary text. This project explored how a one-quarter survey of historical landscapes that is offered as part of a landscape architect's professional education might be taught in a way that more closely correlates with some of the work designers are involved with today, as described by the American Society of Landscape Architects and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. I remixed Rogers's textbook together with other sources to provide a topically, stylistically, culturally, and chronologically broad introduction to the landscape architecture field that provides professional students a variety of examples of how they might learn from historical works of landscape architecture. Prior to creating this class, interviews were conducted to understand how current surveys of landscape architecture history that are required within the professional landscape architecture curriculum were being taught, in an attempt to build on this understanding. The class resulting from these explorations was taught in the spring of 2015 at the University of Washington. Reflections are provided on the experience.

Dedication

I would like to thank my advisors, Thaisa Way and Bob Mugerauer for their support and understanding. This exploration would not have been possible without their encouragement. I'd like to thank the landscape architecture professors who agreed to let me interview them so I could learn more about the way they teach history. All were doing wonderful innovative things. I'd like to thank Elizabeth Barlow Rogers for putting together a textbook that is rigorous and comprehensive enough to be worthy of critique. While this thesis is critical of what this textbook leaves out, what it manages to include is quite astonishing. Without the strong foundation Rogers created, none of the work I've done would have been possible. I'd like to thank my colleague Chris McGee for providing me copies of *Landscape Architecture's* 100th anniversary issue that I could reference, since my own were boxed in Buffalo. I'd like to thank Brice Maryman for showing me and my students around Mill Creek Canyon Earthworks on a beautiful Saturday in May. Finally, I'd like to thank my family for their support and my students for taking a chance on a class that had never been taught before. I hope they enjoyed the class as much as I enjoyed teaching it. I'd particularly like to thank Ivan Heitmann for driving the van for our field trip and for his expert u-turning skills.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The required landscape architecture history class varies in surprising ways from school to school. Some students on the quarter system are only required to take one 10-week survey of historical landscapes as part of their professional education, some students in the semester system are required to take just one 15 week survey of historical landscapes, while others are required to take two classes totaling 30 weeks. Between schools and even within one department, the subjects students learn about in these classes vary significantly. Some students may learn nothing about 20th century landscapes or traditional Chinese and Japanese gardens in their survey of historical landscapes; others learn aspects of a historical view in other classes from studios to seminars.

The primary text used in most of landscape architecture history classes in the United States is Elizabeth Barlow Rogers *Landscape Design: A Cultural and Architectural History*. It is one of the most comprehensive introductions to landscape design over time and across the globe. However, when I analyzed its imagery with an eye toward professional practice today, I found few images that would provide historical grounding for certain project types and design challenges landscape architects are working on now. Rogers includes few images of landscapes on structure, places designed for children to play, academic and corporate campuses, or small urban spaces. There are few examples of designing landscapes in response to the historic fabric existing on a site or designing urban wetland or stormwater systems in a way that seeks to meet social, aesthetic, and ecological goals.

Whether this is seen as a shortcoming of the textbook will likely vary based on what setting it is being used in and what a professor's pedagogical goals are. If one's goal is to teach about the spirit of certain ages and how cultural factors informed some well-known works of landscape design, the textbook arguably satisfies that goal. But if one seeks to learn from the past directly as one contemplates designing in the present, or if one seeks to explore the historical foundations of a

celebrated recent work in direct relationship to visually and functionally similar precedents, the minimal focus on these landscape types and themes seems problematic.

This academic project explored how a one-quarter survey of historical landscapes that is required as part of a landscape architecture student's professional education might be taught in a way that more closely correlates to some of the work designers are involved with today. I explored how I might remix Rogers's textbook together with other sources to provide a topically, stylistically, culturally, and chronologically broad introduction to the landscape architecture field that provides students a variety of examples of how they might learn from historical landscapes.

In creating an alternative approach to survey of historical landscapes, I tried to understand the "genius loci" of the existing history class and build from these ideas. I interviewed a small but diverse sample of landscape architecture professors about how they teach history and reviewed syllabi available online. At the time of the interviews, I had enrolled in four landscape architecture history classes from three different professors. I had also read through more than half of the volumes of *Landscape Architecture* in preparation for its 100th anniversary issue, which I curated with Linda McIntyre. However, at that time I had only begun to dig into the literature on how historical landscapes were being taught. The class I created continues to introduce students to much of the "canon" of landscapes taught in the classes I am familiar with and Rogers's textbook. Throughout this project, I have also sought to engage some of the broader educational goals found in existing surveys of historical landscapes, as I understood them. The class seeks to show how certain ideas developed over time and in response to particular contexts. It seeks to develop students' critical reading, thinking, and writing skills. And, as with many required history classes, this class was meant to provide an introduction to the field to both designers and a more general audience. Because having some introduction to the field is required before one can truly begin to study its history, the class teaches a variety of non-historical lessons alongside some history lessons, just as the landscape history class traditionally has. I have also

sought to create a survey of historical landscape architecture that fits within the amount of class time that is reserved for it in a number of programs—a single course that involves approximately 35-40 hours of class time.

However, the primarily chronological, regional, and (especially) designer-based organization found in many history courses and many textbooks is replaced with an original thematic organization based on different themes and frameworks for understanding historic landscapes. Descriptions of what landscape architects do by the American Society of Landscape Architects' and the Bureau of Labor Statistics informed this work. Recent interest in creating non-linear histories that compare landscapes across cultures and periods also informed some lessons. By using themes, I've sought to highlight certain similarities between times and cultures, and begin to peel apart some subtle differences and contexts that seem to have affected the design and/or performance of landscapes. However, I have tried to be careful to avoid suggesting these themes are always lineages.

The course models various approaches to learning from landscape architecture history, which are presented in the first week of class. Some early classes show how designers have drawn from both the form and experience of past landscapes to create new landscapes that draw on their meaning or solve similar problems. Over time, as students are introduced to more and more contexts that seem to play a role in the design, performance, and perception of landscapes, they are encouraged to explore more complicated questions. For example, what differences in context and design might we discern between the short-lived piazzas in American downtowns and their ancestors in Italy, which have persisted for hundreds of years? What are some of the similarities and differences in physical, social, and historical context that one can notice between American experiments with downtown pedestrian malls (which have often been ripped out) and similar looking "lifestyle centers" in the suburbs? Students are not provided simple answers to these questions, but encouraged to explore the complexity of variables that affect different types of performance in different places and times. Through this

approach, students might learn to think about landscapes in more complex ways as not just physical places but socially constructed and maintained places where the degree of publicness, the maintenance regime, the surrounding context, the historical atmosphere, and hydrological flows, among many other things, can affect the landscape and its performance over time.

The exploration of the contexts that led to the removal of certain landscape designs is not consistently included in landscape architecture history classes that I am familiar with, and it is not a theme in Rogers' textbook, which tends to be focused on design intent. Yet, it seems to be among the highest values history can provide if it intends to inform design practice as I understand the goal. So, in a few cases, landscapes that have been controversial are emphasized. Too often, the explanation of failed landscapes has been left to ideologues when it might be the subject of careful observation and contextual consideration. The survey of historical landscapes class is one place a productive discussion might occur and within the class I've created it is a major focus.

I taught the course I proposed at the University of Washington in Seattle during the spring quarter in 2015 to a class of 3 upper level undergraduates, 4 graduate students, and one international student from Japan who was not registered but audited the class and completed most assignments. The focus of the landscape architecture program at the University of Washington is "urban ecological design," and, in response, urban spaces and issues were generally prioritized over suburban spaces and issues. The focus on teaching writing found in some survey of historical landscapes classes was downplayed in this phase of development, since the class was not being offered for writing credit as some history classes are. Teaching was ongoing at the time this thesis was written, but early feedback from students suggests the class has been engaging for both landscape architecture students and those not currently studying the field. One of the undergraduates who was majoring in another field has even requested a letter of recommendation to pursue graduate study in landscape architecture. Most students seemed to appreciate the thematic nature of the class. However, there are many areas where

the class would benefit from further improvements, which I reflect on at the end of this paper. Among the most prominent critiques I have both heard and experienced is the need to adjust the readings or at least prioritize them for some weeks, so that the amount of work students put into the course is similar to the amount of credit hours offered. There are also some adjustments I would make if I taught this class in a way that was meant to provide writing credit, as the landscape history classes at UW currently do. This thesis does not pretend to offer the final answer on how to organize a history course. It is being published with the hope that others might critique it and build on it based on their own departments' foci and curriculums.

Precedent and Literature Review

Just as landscapes are typically tied into larger ecosystems, the required historical survey in landscape architecture is also part of a larger educational ecosystem. It has come to serve particular purposes within the curriculum. So before I proposed new ways of teaching about historical landscapes, I sought to understand how people were already teaching the subject. In the pages that follow, I explore how landscape architecture history is currently being taught within a small sample of educators, what landscape history is currently being taught, and what concerns appear to be driving the professors' approaches, based on what they expressed in the interviews. As part of the classwork for my research methods course, I conducted a qualitative interview study of landscape architecture professors. I publish a modification of this study in the chapter that follows.

This study is followed by a section that examines what types of work landscape architects do today. It provides answers to that question from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and the American Society of Landscape Architects and considers how some of the themes discussed are exemplified in recent ASLA Award-winning projects. I then analyze how these same themes are reflected the imagery in Elizabeth Barlow Rogers's ubiquitous textbook *Landscape Design* to see whether it is showing historical examples of project types and design challenges that landscape architects are involved with today.

The remaining sections look at selected recent literature on creating historical surveys of landscape architecture and architecture, and examine how some historians have experimented with non-linear and non-period based methods to develop historical narratives across time.

What Some Professors Are Teaching

In the spring of 2014, to get a general understanding of how landscape architecture history classes were being taught in professional programs, I conducted interviews of four landscape architecture history professors, each one to two hours in length. I did not speak with professors teaching in non-professional programs, as that was not my interest. The interviewing method used was drawn from Robert S. Weiss's *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies.* This method was appropriate for this study because my intention was to develop a detailed description of their history classes and the thinking behind them. I was also hoping to understand how the history class fits into a larger curriculum and the complexity of how that might vary from place to place. Weiss argues that qualitative interviews are often appropriate for "detailed descriptions" and "holistic descriptions" (Weiss 9, 10). Quantitative studies are not good for obtaining detailed explanations, especially when the interview subjects have unique perspectives, because you must ask the same question of every respondent (Weiss 2-3). Using a qualitative interview method allowed me to ask my interview subjects questions aimed at the unique features of their classes. And it allowed me to follow up when I felt the answers I'd received were not clear or I wanted more specific examples (Weiss 13).

Drawing on Weiss's advice for conducting interviews, I sought to put together a "sample of representatives," that could speak to the different ways people were teaching landscape architecture history (Weiss 18). I sought to "maximize range" to the greatest extent possible since I would be working with a sample smaller than 60 individuals (Weiss 23). My panel was also based on "convenience sampling" (Weiss 24). I chose Professor W because my classmate had her as a teacher and I knew she organized her graduate class chronologically, in a manner similar to some of the classes I had taken. I chose Professor X because one of her colleagues had mentioned she organized her history class thematically. I chose to talk to Professor Y because a colleague at *Landscape Architecture Magazine* had

a long discussion with him a couple of years ago about his desire to rethink the way he was teaching landscape architecture history, and had told me he was experimenting with this. And, finally, I chose Ethan Carr because I knew of his work in cultural landscape management. I was curious how that work might (or might not) be affecting the way he teaches landscape history. The professors I spoke with also had somewhat different backgrounds, some having Ph. D.'s in history or art history and others having master's degrees and experience practicing as a design professional. It is worth noting that I sought out additional interviews but was unable to establish contact in the period I had set aside for this part of my exploration.

Following Weiss's example, I sought to create an environment where I was "working together" with my interview subjects "to produce information" (Weiss 65). As Weiss advises, I did not question any of their choices or motives (Weiss 66). I did not initially offer anonymity to people. I later agreed to restrictions to the extent that people felt they were necessary to speak freely. When one professor became concerned about sharing a syllabus, I offered not to include his name. When another professor asked that I not mention the name of the author whose textbook she was using or the names of other individuals she had mentioned in the course of our discussion, I agreed. Based on the advice of my advisors, I later decided not to reveal anyone's identity in this document unless they had asked me to, instead referring to three of the professors by the letters W, X, and Y.

The questions I developed included some fixed response questions (number of credits of history required) and many open ended questions. The questions were varied based on who I was interviewing in order to focus on the particularly unusual traits of certain professors and the classes of which I was already aware. Some sample questions:

1. Could you briefly describe the landscape architecture history classes you put together
2. Are they required classes for landscape architecture students?

3. Are other history classes taught by others? How many history classes do students in your program take?
4. You are on the semester system—15 weeks—right?
5. What drives the way you teach landscape history?
6. What do you hope students will take away from your history class?
7. To what extent to you think there is a recognized canon of historic landscapes you must adhere to? (Follow up) Where does it come from?
8. What sorts of history tends to be included in your comprehensive landscape history classes?
9. What sorts of history tends to be excluded, and why?
10. At what point in history do your history classes start and stop?
11. What sort of subjects would you consider to be outside of the scope of a comprehensive "landscape architecture history" class? (Follow up) Materials? Social functioning of spaces? Ecology? Certain types of landscapes that are more functional than artful? Historical examples of grading? Undesigned landscapes?
12. Do you work with your colleagues to determine what falls in "history" vs. some other class? (If they do, ask for specific examples)
13. How do you organize your content? (Is it chronological, by person/firm, by landscape type, by region, by lessons that could be learned, some hybrid, some other way?)
14. Why?
15. Has your interest in [SOME OUTSIDE SPECIALTY] had any effect on your history classes?
16. To what extent are you focused on teaching vocabulary?
17. Does your class emphasize research and writing skills?
18. Do you use a textbook in your class?
19. If so, which one and why?

20. Do you teach landscapes you consider to be failures? Which ones?
21. Have you experimented with different ways of teaching landscape history? Tell me about that.
22. What did you learn from those experiments?
23. Anything you wouldn't do again?
24. Is it possible to look at any class materials like a syllabus?

As I have talked to only a few professors, it is not prudent to draw conclusions about the way landscape architecture is taught in *most* places or generate statistics; however, there is some reason to believe the sample is generalizable. A number of the landscape history professors with whom I spoke were aware of how other people were teaching landscape history classes differently than themselves or similar to themselves. They could assess to some extent whether their experiences were generalizable (Weiss 27). It can also be assumed that in other universities, there might be a similarity of dynamics and constraints, so while I may not be able to determine how common a certain issue is (for example, the perception that most students did not have any research or writing experience prior to taking their history class), I might conclude that it would be an issue in some other universities where students take the history class at the same point in their college career. The "Theory of Independent Qualifiers" would suggest that other landscape history professors might be facing some of the same challenges as the ones I spoke with were (Weiss 28).

In the pages that follow, I have briefly described five different approaches by the four different professors, based on the interviews and reviewing their syllabi. I have sorted information into a few categories: the beliefs and learning objectives that drive how they teach their history classes, the organization of the classes, and the landscapes taught. Then, I provide some analysis. Some of the

quotes included in the analysis are not included in the case descriptions in an effort to avoid duplicating information.

Case Study #1a: Professor W- Chronological, One Class per Week

Professor W has been teaching landscape architecture history since 1989. She has dual master's degrees in art history and landscape architecture and a bachelor of arts in classical studies. She shared two very different ways she has taught landscape architecture history. This first case study looks at the class she teaches regularly to graduate students.

Class(es): History of Landscape Architecture

Level: Graduate level

Time in the classroom: 38.5 hours total (once per week for 2 hours and 45 minutes, 14 class periods); each class includes discussion section.

Credits: 3 Credits

Credits of History Required: 3 Credits; This class is the only required history course

Class's Place in Curriculum: Fall of the first year

Text: *Landscape Design* by Elizabeth Barlow Rogers

What drives the way she teaches history? What does she hope students will take away from her classes? One goal of Professor W's graduate level landscape class has been to teach students about the way that a landscape's context—both in time and its surroundings—affects its design. "It's not about studying precedent in terms of form. It's about cultural expression—how a particular idea arose in a particular time and place and how they might apply that to the processes at hand." Understanding how historical designers have been affected by their historical and physical context can serve as a lesson to modern designers, she says.

Another goal is for students to learn design vocabulary they can use for talking about and critiquing landscapes. “They learn a complete formal language, from allée to rill and ecosystem,” Professor W says. “I hand out a vocab list every day.”

Additionally, she teaches graduate level scholarship and research practices. “Not everybody is on equal footing when they get here,” Professor W says. “I’m a bit of a stickler for footnotes, citations, styles of writing, [and using] primary and secondary sources.” She seeks to teach the difference between an argument grounded in research and scholarship and one grounded in opinion. She models critical methodologies—she does one class that focuses on archaeology, one on interpreting paintings, one on interpretation of an original text. With New York’s Central Park, she does five different takes on the same information—from formalist to post-structuralist—so they can see how interpretation can change based on the methodology one is using.

Teaching students to recognize “the canon” is also a major goal for her graduate history classes. “There is sort of a canon of recognized designs from particular eras and they have to have a grasp of the canon.” She says her understanding of what constitutes the canon comes from her own training and her travels. Getting students to think about these places experientially is also a goal. **“**Because they are design students and not just history students, there is an expectation that they start to imagine what these spaces look like, feel like, and operate like,” Professor W says.

Organization: Professor W has experimented with various ways of organizing her lessons, including chronologically, thematically, and a hybrid of chronological and thematic. Her first experiments with thematic organization were a complete failure, she says. It felt too personal. This class is organized mostly chronologically. “Chronology makes the most sense for people who don’t have any background in landscape architecture history,” Professor W says. “I think students have trouble making sense of the lineage when it’s thematic.” The chronology of Western design influences how she teaches Chinese

landscapes. They are not introduced chronologically but rather brought in during the 18th century to show how they influenced English landscapes of that period.

Landscapes Taught: The class primarily focuses on designed Western landscapes that predate Olmsted. The 19th and 20th centuries are covered in just 4 of the 14 classes. The titles of the 14 classes are Antiquity; Research Methods; Roman Civic Spaces and the Concept of the Armature/The Ideals of the Villa; Medieval and Islamic Garden Traditions; Italian Renaissance Gardens; Work Session on Analyses; East-West Interchange: China and the Anglo-Chinois Gardens; England: Scenography, the Circuit, and the Eye; American Settlement and Gardens from the Colonial Era to Manifest Destiny; 19th Century Urban Parks: Assessing a New Typology; U.S. National Parks/Parkways; The Later 19th Century: Locus of Domesticity / Arts and Crafts and Beaux Arts Gardens; and Trends of the Twentieth Century / Anglo-American Suburb.

Professor W gives only one lecture on Chinese landscapes and does not appear to cover Japanese landscapes. There is little or no coverage of Sub-Saharan Africa or Latin America. The whole class typically stops "around 1930," Professor W says. "My students don't really get 20th century history but they get some of it when they do theory. I think there are flaws in that, but that is kind of what it has evolved to be."

Vernacular landscapes tend to be excluded from the curriculum as well, Professor W says. Slave landscapes of the south may be mentioned briefly when she talks about Monticello but vernacular landscapes are never the focus. She says she also doesn't "overly emphasize plants."

Professor W will speak critically of certain landscapes but she does not teach landscape failures, like Harlequin Plaza (an example she brings up when asked about the issue). "Would I show a landscape I thought was a bomb? Probably not," Professor W says. "I don't have enough time."

Text(s): Professor W uses Elizabeth Barlow Rogers's textbook, *Landscape Design*. "[Roger's textbook] probably has the best pictures, and if I'm expecting you to have a visual understanding of the canon, it's probably the best. It is not a perfect text but it is more global than Newton… [And] I believe as she does that landscapes are cultural expressions." She supplements the textbook with primary sources and essays that provide scholarly interpretations. She says the textbook "probably doesn't" have an effect on what she teaches or how it is organized.

Unique things: Professor W will take students on a Saturday morning field trip where they visit sites nearby and try to read the site. "This course would be fabulous if you did it all as field trips," Professor W says. "How do you explain scale or the sound of the water at Villa d'Este? That whole phenomenological thing is really hard to convey. Movies help but they aren't as immersive as a site visit. You wait for the post card from the student six years later that I just went to Villa d'Este and it was amazing."

Case Study #1b: Professor W- Half Chronological, Half Thematic

In the Spring of 2012, Professor W experimented with a very different way of organizing a history class, and felt this method worked well, though she said she's not sure it would be appropriate for graduate students. It was offered in an environmental design program and not an accredited landscape architecture department.

Class(es): History of Landscape Architecture

Level: Undergraduate

Time in the classroom: 21 hours total (two lectures per week for 45 minutes, 28 class periods);

Credits: 3 Credits

Credits of History Required: N/A (Not a landscape architecture program).

Class's Place in Curriculum: N/A (Not a landscape architecture program).

What does she hope students will take away from her classes? Many of the same goals as the class above. In her syllabus, she stated the following objectives: "To facilitate visual recognition of significant designed landscapes; to become conversant with the application of a formal language of design; To explore conceptual and formal predicates attached to "garden" and other designed landscapes; To make thematic and conceptual links between designed landscapes throughout history; To explicate the relevance of landscape history to design studio; To develop and practice research and writing skills; To hone analytical thinking skills."

Organization: The class met for two lectures each week. "The first [lecture] was a thematic idea and the second was a case study that went chronologically," Professor W says. She had one lecture that was a thematic discussion of park design through the ages and one that focuses on Central Park at the point in

the chronology where Central Park would typically be discussed. The thematic sections were titled Eden and the idea of Paradise; Courtyard Gardens; Gardens of Sustenance; Mathematics and Divinity: Ordering Systems in Gardens of Islam; Scholar Gardens in China; Iconography: Narrative, Meaning, and the Golden Section; Gardens of Cultural Agency; Scenography, the Circuit, and the Eye: Picturesque Conceptions; Traditions Transformed: Colonial North America; Public Gardens to Urban Parks; East-West Interchange and the Challenge of Authenticity; Modernism: Architectonic Space and the Garden Room; Inspiration and Artistry; The Botanical Garden: Collection, Education, and Display.

Landscapes Taught: The class went deeper into 20th Century design than the class Professor W typically teaches. By organizing thematically, she was able to hit on things like victory gardens (in the landscapes of sustenance section), and 20th century parks (in a week long theme that looked at the park from Pompey's Forum through works by Turenscape in China). There was still a fairly deep focus on estate design, though perhaps less so than her typical class. Some South American landscapes were included.

Japanese landscapes were not represented. Additionally, many categories of landscapes commonly discussed in *Landscape Architecture Magazine* are not represented, since most of the themes are developed to closely mirror the typical canon. There is no discussion of play areas, street design, flood control, etc.

Text(s): Professor W used Elizabeth Barlow Rogers's textbook as she did in her other class, as well as supplemental readings posted online.

Case Study #2- Professor X—Themed Units

Professor X has taught landscape architecture history since 1996. She has a bachelor's degree in landscape architecture, a master's degree in architecture, and a PhD in architectural history. The themed units she divides her course into are unique.

Class(es): History of World Landscapes—required (she taught this class 15 times, through 2011 when she passed it off to someone else to focus more on an administrative position); History and Theories of Modern Landscape Architecture, 1850-Present—elective

Level: Both courses serve graduate and undergraduate students

Credits of History Required: 4 Credits. "I think I insisted at one point that the world history class be a four credit course because it was a ton of work," Professor X says. "That class satisfies two different general education requirements and an undergraduate requirement for writing and composition."

Time in the classroom: 60 hours (40 hours/30 classes dedicated to lectures, 20 hours/15 classes of section, focused mainly on writing instruction that are led by teaching assistants. Each lecture is 80 minutes long.)

Class's Place in Curriculum: 300-level course

What drives the way she teaches? What does she hope students will take away from her classes?

Professor X says a big part of what drives the way she teaches is her understanding of the student's backgrounds. **"**I've tailored my lessons to the kinds of students we have," Professor X says. She says most undergrads are from in state "largely from homogenous middle and upper middle class suburbs around [her state's largest city] or rural farm communities. In both cases they are not particularly worldly. They have not traveled much. We also have a growing number of international students from China and India and our master's program is dominated by that."

Like others, a perception that there is a canon of landscapes she must teach drives much of her content. “Some things I think an accreditation committee would be horrified if I didn’t teach, [like] Versailles [and] 18th century England country estates,” Professor X says. “But I might teach those differently than some others do.”

She seems to be less focused on design than most others interviewed. “I don’t teach a design history of landscape architecture,” she says. “I teach a cultural, social and intellectual history. My goal is to help provide them with frameworks for thinking about the landscape and understanding the past—intellectual and theoretical frameworks are more important than anything else,” Professor X says. “I use the themes to organize the history to help them understand how landscapes everywhere throughout time are about power and resources. The ideas about domesticity change but the issue of access to water is a constant. There are big picture topics that emerge that I do think they take away with them. I don’t think they remember the dates of Versailles construction but I do think they realize how territorial ambition shaped landscapes over time and Versailles is one of those places.”

Though she does not mention it in the interview, the class also seems to place an emphasis on recognizing images of landscapes. Image identification is part of the exam, according to the syllabus provided. The syllabus tells students: “The more ways you can find to ‘interact’ with the images the better,” and encourages sketching or diagramming of images in the students’ free time as a study strategy.

Learning from Mistakes: Professor X believes history is a very separate field than design criticism. She seems less focused on learning lessons from the past and more focused on why the past was as it was. “The critic in the design studio is asking: ‘Is it beautiful? Is it successful?’ That’s not the agenda of the historian,” Professor X says. “The historian wants to understand why something is as it is and how it fits into other parts of the past. We’re not interested in good or bad we’re interested in why and how. I

think in Landscape architecture departments where we seldom see Ph. D. historians, there is often a real lack of understanding between design analysis/criticism and history. Just because you are talking about the landscapes of the past doesn't mean you are doing historical analysis. This is not about gate keeping but these are two really different endeavors."

Organization: The classes have a thematic overarching structure, and individual classes tend to focus on a specific period and region. She does not have many classes organized by type like the class Professor W taught at UC Boulder. The major units are Religious and Ritual Landscapes (7 lectures), Landscapes and Political Ideology (8 lectures); Emperors, Popes, and Kings: Landscapes of Imperial Power (4 lectures); Domestic Landscapes: Dwelling and Gardening

Landscapes taught: Unlike many classes that focus on estates for the rich, Professor X says she tends to exclude "the landscapes of the 1%." She says: "I want to expose them to landscapes that were consequential for large numbers of people. I think high style stuff can be significant if many people have access to it. I am really interested in the consequential history of landscape architecture. I am interested in plantation landscapes not because of their beauty—I'm not going to teach Middleton Place because it was so beautiful—but rather how it was part of how we understand race in the U.S. It's about making those kinds of choices. What is consequential to human history? It's sort of a "people's history" of landscape." She had some content that seemed unique to her class, including a class on the colonial city in India. Also, it's worth noting nine of the 28 classes in the world history class focus on the United States including classes on the New Deal, the National Land Ordinance, and public Parks of the Progressive Era.

"In the World class, I do definitely include prehistoric and ancient stuff because there is great scholarship that keeps coming out on the pre-historic world. It helps students see these deep, deep

connections through time—people have always had to seek shelter, figure out what to do with the dead. People have also always minoritized, colonized, had slaves, and taken gold." But detailed discussion of landscapes built in the last 25 years rarely takes place in her classes. "It's really challenging to bring things up to the present," Professor X says. "I commonly bring things up to the 1980s. Sometimes I will talk about something that is happening now and then weave that in. The hard thing about talking about our moment is we are in it. Sometimes it is better to back off of the present a little bit, even as you can use the present to stimulate discussion about the past. In the modern course, the final project for undergrads is to have students present about a firm right now and how they are engaging with different ideas about modernity now, but in my own lectures I don't get that far."

Text(s): She uses a comprehensive text in the world history class and supplements it with readings handed out in lecture or posted online. She notes in her syllabus that the textbook often presents a different view than the one she does in class, and that the students will need to be on the lookout for that.

Unique things: During our interview, she made a strong point of her dislike of exams. "I am increasingly uncertain that students retain anything from the exams," Professor X says. "I think the whole exam thing is an ongoing question for me and I moved away a long time ago from having a mid-term and a final—way too much material for students to deal with. I moved toward quizzes. Some do well with that and some still do poorly and I'm still not sure how much students are retaining. In my modern class, I decided not to have any exams and to have assignments instead, but I'm not sure how much they'll retain of that either. I was surprised how much they did retain from lectures this year and incorporate into their presentations. Maybe not having exams took the pressure off [in a good way]."

She notes that budget constraints may force the school to pull back from its focus on writing in the history class. “The writing component of the course is really time consuming for the teaching assistants,” she says, “and I’m not sure with budget cuts that it is sustainable to teach writing as we have in the past. I’m not sure we could actually teach at that level without the right level of grad assistant support. We typically have four sections for writing—they typically have 20-25 students per section. I usually have 2 TAs to cover the 4 sections. It’s a big workload and I’m not sure it is tenable in our new budgetary structure to stay within union guidelines.”

Case Study #3- Professor Y—Two Class Survey, One Chronological and One Themed

Professor Y works at a state university in the United States, and has five years of experience teaching landscape architecture history. He has a bachelor's degree in landscape architecture, a master's degree in landscape architecture, and ten years of professional experience. For his master's thesis, he sought to understand how the historic canon of landscapes typically taught today was developed. He was very upfront about the fact that he could be taking a more innovative approach to the way he is teaching. He has been tweaking the classes he inherited over time to make them better, and plans to continue to do that for the next few years, so any syllabi he shared would only provide a snapshot in time and not necessarily speak to his perception of what is ideal.

Classes: History of Landscape Architecture 1 (Pre-History to 1800); History of Landscape Architecture 2 (1800 to Present Day)

Level: Undergraduate only

Time in the classroom: Unverified

Credits: 3 credits each

Credits of History Required: 6 credits. Both of the classes that Professor Y teaches are required. "We also have a mandatory study abroad that is two 3 credit classes," he says. "We go to Italy, France, England, Scotland, all those. That is a reiteration of history. The focus is not predominantly history but as you can imagine with that itinerary it reinforces it."

Class's Place in Curriculum: Fall and spring of sophomore year (300 and 400 level courses). A theory course is also required for the undergraduate students once these classes are completed.

What drives the way he teaches? What does she hope students will take away from his classes?

Professor Y says he is driven to make his classes "approachable and understandable." He says "the goal

of the class is [giving students an] understanding [of] the breadth of the discipline and giving them a foundation upon which it builds."

He emphasizes the cyclical nature of design and the common themes that appear regardless of the culture or the time period. "There seem to be some common principles that are inherent in human nature in the way people interface with the land," Professor Y says. "The idea of the garden being a place that is protected and used as a retreat from the world, for instance—this idea of retreat… Whenever we see that, I will reiterate that basic human need again and reiterate how it keeps popping up in the course of history."

Organization: "The fall semester is organized chronologically and broken into periods," Professor Y says. "When we get into a certain period like the renaissance, we are not only looking at European history in that period but what is happening in Asia at that same time. We are using a calendar to organize the fall class rather than cultures. I've seen some classes organized by culture—one unit on China and one on Japan. They try to cover a lot of history in just a lecture or two. Instead of doing it that way, we are breaking it down and allowing comparison to occur between places."

"Each of units have about 4 weeks or so. Unit one covers prehistory up the 15th century. Ancient Rome, Europe, Gardens of Islamic Spain, China to the Yuan dynasty and Japan through the Kamakura era. Unit 2 covers the 15th and 16th centuries, the Italian Renaissance, how it influences France and England. We also jump back to Japan and China again. Unit 3 is focused on the 17th century—in Europe primarily on the French Baroque. Also, [we look at the] U.S., India (Mughal gardens in Persia), and once again we return to Japan. Finally we look to the 18th century. We focus primarily on England but also touch on China, France, and the Americas as well."

"The spring semester class is a little different. The spring class again is 4 units. I just made some adjustments. Unit 1 begins with the parks movement—Urban and municipal parks and also public

lands—the forest service, the park service. That covers 1800 to the 1930s or 1940s. Unit 2 focuses on garden design. The second class is somewhat chronological but more thematic. We begin with gardens of Victorian area, go to arts and crafts, country place era, modernist and post-modernist gardens. Unit 3 is called urban space and form part 1- we look at urban design and community design from 1800 up to the beginning of the modern period. Things like industrial towns, the city beautiful movement and the garden city movement, and early modernism in planning. Unit 4 is urban space and form part 2. It continues with modernism- ties back into urban parks and plazas once again. Urban renewal, the emergence of post modernism, the emergence of environmentally sensitive and sustainable design in the 20th century."

"[The Students] start in 1800 and go up the 21st century a few times. By repeating that sequence over several times through several units, they understand how they tie things into each other. This seems to add some clarity. Students seem to like the thematic approach there."

"I've considered a thematic approach for the fall but ruled it out so far… We cover too many cultures in too broad a time period and it would be too confusing. In spring class, it becomes easily handled and by repetition, they learn that sequence and can talk quite knowledgeably about that sequence."

Landscapes taught/not taught: "I think there is a recognized canon," Professor Y says. "I don't think it is mandatory to adhere to, but I see little reason to depart from it. Because it is the canon, in some ways, I think it is my duty to teach it. We are learning history to learn what has influenced the design of landscapes through history—particularly in the American context. I am teaching mostly American students. If I had a lot of Asian landscape students, I would teach things differently. "

Where does this canon come from? "That's where you could get into the history of landscape history and it is worth studying. That's something I kind of looked at [for my thesis]. I looked at different

texts that had come out over the years. When someone teaches landscape architecture history, what do they teach and why? Part of that is traced to who wrote the first histories and what they were teaching. Certainly Horace Walpole wrote the *History of Modern Taste in Gardening* in the later part of the 18th century—and it really was an advertisement for the English landscape style. He's putting down previous movements. It certainly set the tone, though, for what is included and what isn't.

"Newton was one of the history textbook bibles for a long time and some courses still use it. I do use part of it for one of my units... It does follow the typical world history as well as art history sequences as well. There is a similar focus and bias for art and architectural history. I don't think the history of landscape architecture strays from that bias or trend."

"What gets included, in terms of garden design, is the landscapes of the privileged and part of the reason for that is we are talking about the history of designed landscapes and professionally designed landscapes and over the course of history—that was typically a luxury. The way I do the sampling is the way many do—choose the well documented, well known examples. I've heard of other classes that take diff approaches and I think there would be value in it, but perhaps not at a survey level... We look at stuff that most affects our way of thinking, so we do leave a lot of material out. When it comes to urban form, we delve a bit into the vernacular but tend to focus on the exceptional [places] because they become precedents for later work."

Text(s): He uses Rogers because it has good imagery.

Case Study #4- Ethan Carr— Roughly Chronological but Connecting Across Time

Ethan Carr has degrees in art history and landscape architecture. He has taught landscape architecture history at various universities. He has been involved in managing cultural landscapes, and he has actually taught history a bit less often in recent years as he focuses more on cultural landscape management courses. Yet, he still frequently teaches one survey class.

Classes: History of Landscape Design II (Renaissance to the Present)

Level: Undergraduate and Graduate

Time in the classroom: 35 hours (1.25 hour lecture, twice per week, 14 weeks—includes midterm, two review periods, and one guest lecture)

Credits of History Required: Undergrads are required to take 6 credits including a history of landscape architecture from the classical period to the renaissance with another professor. Grad students are only required to take 3 credits.

Class's Place in Curriculum: Graduate students take the class in the second semester of the first professional degree program; Undergrads take it in the second semester of their junior year. Notably, they are required to take a separate "junior year writing" elective.

What drives the way he teaches? What does she hope students will take away from his classes?

""There have been two major strains in using history in landscape architecture programs," Carr says. "One is art historical—that is Norman Newton and Rogers. And it's necessary. There should be an art historical part in every program because there are things people need to know about—they need to understand landscapes as works of art. Beginning in the 1970s at the GSD, that started being supplemented with a geographical approach, more vernacular—JB Jackson, John Stilgoe at Harvard. Looking at landscape as a vernacular history and not an art historical survey… A third direction is the

theory course—not a history course per se but which is in fact a history course and emphasizes history and evolution of landscape theory today." The course he teaches today is more art historical in its focus, though when he taught at another university, he paired that course with a more vernacular American landscape course.

"The big question is whether landscape history is an art historical discipline. Landscape may be taught as a series of case studies that can be useful in studio or as a cultural geography discipline. Starting in the 1980s, people reclaimed landscape history and made it a discipline that should be taught as such with some rigor and some inherent viability rather than just having studio instructors show you their favorite slides of places they've been. The problem then is no one learns anything about the history."

Giving students a broad understanding of the field is the main thing that he hopes students will take away from his classes. "I want them to know what landscape architecture is and that is the bottom line. I think it is very hard to know what landscape architecture is if you don't have a rigorous historical survey. Survey classes are sort of under attack these days—we should all be having collaborative experiences—but the fact is there is a body of knowledge that defines landscape history and students should have that experience because it is really fundamental to understanding what landscape architecture is. In some cases there is a paucity of knowledge of landscape history amongst professionals and that can be detrimental. "

His experience with cultural landscape management also drives the way he teaches to some extent. "Landscape architecture history has an applied landscape practice—that is cultural landscape management," Carr says. He notes: "It is very hard to discuss a single period of significance without having an understanding of what a landscape is and the larger history." Also, landscapes are "very different than other works of art. One of the differences is the layered complexity and that destroys the concept of periods to some extent." In his history class, he looks at many of the landscapes over time.

"In Central Park, we'll look at what was there before. How it has been reinvented over the years as its constituencies and meanings have changed. We are still going to talk about it chronologically in the 19th century but we're not just looking at the [Greensward] plan. It's a place with many layers of development and that's how we look at it when we look at it."

Carr emphasizes vocabulary in his class. "Vocab is very important. I try to give students terminology, the means for discussing landscape history and theory intelligently and that's something that has been lost. We've forgot about a lot of the types that once existed." He does not emphasize writing and research skills.

"If there is one problem the landscape history class has, it is to make itself relevant to practice," he says. "The degree to which it [is], it will succeed. If it is perceived as an academic sideline, it will fail and I think most landscape history classes today are in the latter category."

Organization: "Ideally, it is thematically but works roughly chronologically also," Carr says. "It is about ideas and places first but that can be roughly organized so you are following a chronology. For a while, I would try and bring in contemporary examples while we are talking about the renaissance. Chronologically, we are in the renaissance but we'll talk about the country place era. The chronology can be sacrificed to emphasize themes and types. In the baroque, you can bring in the city of Chicago in the early 20th century when you are talking about Versailles."

Landscapes taught: "I prefer to teach 18th century to the present and emphasize modern landscapes," Carr says. "If it's a yearlong survey vs. one semester, we'll do much more classical but landscape history is pretty sketchy until you get to the Renaissance. What do we know about medieval landscapes? Not a hell of a lot. Vernacular medieval landscapes are fascinating. But the art history of it really begins in the Renaissance. If you start in the Renaissance, you can bring in the Chinese tradition,

talk about Asia and Europe and it works quite well in an art historical outline. It's always been a hard sell for me to teach Ancient Rome, Egypt, etc. To a certain degree it's all speculative. How much does it really have to do with the fine art of landscape architecture or anything we can connect it to. But that's just my prejudice I guess."

Carr is less worried about the Eurocentric nature of landscape architecture history than some other people. He believes it is important to teach the history we know and that has influenced us. "I knowingly include Asian traditions in an art historical survey and Islamic traditions in an early medieval survey," he says. "I think Islamic and Asian traditions are very important to include. I knowingly exclude a lot of vernacular traditions we don't know a lot about. No one teaches African landscape history because no one knows enough about it, beyond a few great monuments. We're only beginning to understand it. We denied the landscape history of the new world because when Europeans arrived, they described it as wilderness, but that is an ongoing project, to understand that the new world is as much a cultural landscape as the old world was. The criticism of an art historical survey is that it is Eurocentric. But I don't think that is a reason not to teach it. Landscape architecture is a European, Euro-American idea. I think it is important to include in that survey Islamic and Asian traditions because they are part of it, but I don't think we should stop teaching landscape history because we think it is too Eurocentric.

"There is a canon and it comes from great works of landscape architecture. Could the canon be expanded?" he asked himself. He was not repeating a question of mine. "I think it has been."

When I ask him where the canon comes from. He says: "The canon doesn't come from anywhere. You travel the world and see great works of landscape architecture and it becomes a part of the canon. I don't think it comes from anything except observation. Has that left out Asian traditions in the past, to some degree but Asian and Islamic traditions are pretty much part of the canon now. The African traditions have been left out but that's not a willful exclusion as much as it is ignorance… [Newton] probably did not give enough examples of 20th century women but that has certainly been

addressed. When we criticize the canon, we should be careful because the canon is pretty inclusive at this point. We don't have to take Olmsted out to put Farad in. Mid-century modernism is only recently becoming history—being put at critical distance. It's hard to put more recent stuff into any larger historical narratives but it can and should be part of a survey."

Text(s): "When I came to [this college] and started doing this art historically oriented course, I used Rogers's book because it has a very art historical approach... I did not follow Rogers's book necessarily. But it is well illustrated. There are no other textbooks as far as I'm concerned. There's no other textbook I'd be comfortable using."

Unique Aspect of Class: His history class emphasizes sketching. **"**In survey classes, I have them keep sketchbooks," says Carr. "I ban all electronics and everyone must have a sketchbook and a pencil. I expect them to be sketching from slides I'm showing while I'm talking to them. It varies widely, but I may leave a pair of slides up for a while rather than going through many, many images. If people want images, they can get a gazillion images on their own really quickly. When I started in 1992, it was all about access to imagery. Now everyone can get access to images of anything. They can get digital models of Versailles or the pyramids and look at them on google earth. Rather than trying to compete with that flood of imagery, I'd rather have them looking at and drawing fewer images."

Issues Raised by Case Studies

The interviews raised a number of issues worth considering as I seek to work with the genius loci of existing surveys of historical landscape architecture. Some of the issues are named and some discussion of those issues occurs below.

The number of hours professional landscape architecture majors spend in required surveys of historical landscape architecture varied from program to program, but a number of programs required just one course. While some of the professors' programs required two landscape history classes for undergraduates (Professors Y and Z), other programs only required one history class for undergraduates (Carr). And all three of the programs studied where landscape architecture degrees were offered at the graduate level required just one history class for graduate students earning their first professional degree in landscape architecture.

Within those programs, the time in class varied. Students in Ethan Carr's class spent 35 hours in class. Students in W's class spent 38.5 hours in class. And students in Professor X's 4-credit class spent 60 hours in class. However, much of this difference is attributable to the fact the class also satisfied an undergraduate writing and composition elective, and its section (1/3 of class hours) focused on teaching writing and research skills.

There seems to be some demand to fit the lessons of landscape architecture history into a single required history class that spends about 35-40 hours introducing the history of landscape architecture over the course of one semester or quarter. This small amount of time in the required history class seems to be taken as a given by some tenured professors. When asked Professor W why she chose to focus on designed landscapes and not include vernacular landscapes in her class, Professor W explained: "I only have one semester."

There are major differences in the pedagogical goals of required surveys of historical landscape landscapes. There is not a consensus on how to make the history class relevant to the work landscape architects do, or even if that is a worthwhile goal. "I don't teach a *design* history of landscape architecture," Professor X said. "I teach a cultural, social and intellectual history." She says that the purpose of one required history class offered in her department history class is not to teach about design but to provide students with "frameworks for thinking about the landscape and understanding the past." She calls her class a "people's history" and focuses on issues like power dynamics and the control of resources.

This contrasts with the other professors interviewed who were teaching art surveys of historical landscape architecture. Carr argues that the landscape history class must make itself "relevant" to professional work. "The degree to which it [is], it will succeed," he said. "If it is perceived as an academic sideline, it will fail and I think most landscape history classes today are in the latter category." In a follow up discussion, he explained that by relevance, he meant the class should "convey [to students] knowledge and sensibility directly useful in the design process as they are becoming professionals." For example, he has students use GIS to organize historic maps and plans as part of a design process (Carr 2015).

Carr stated that teaching about design and teaching about social context are not mutually exclusive. Professors W, Z, and Y all seemed to combine lessons about the design of historical landscapes together with discussion of their social context. The way each professor explained their approaches varied somewhat, however this may be a result of the time constraints of the interview, and what they found most important about their own work rather than a sign of significant differences in approach. Professor W mentions that understanding how historical designers have been affected by their historical and physical contexts can serve as a lesson to modern designers. Professor Y sought to show students the "foundation" that modern work is built on. Putting the present in perspective, and

examining how we can learn from the past as we move forward were both goals of Carr. And understanding the significance of the historic landscapes we are working in was another way that the history class could be useful to designers, he said. "Landscape architecture history has an applied landscape practice; that is cultural landscape management," he noted.

The idea of making deep connections through time that allow us to see that certain things have been going on for ages was noted by Professor X. She notes that studying ancient landscapes "helps students see these deep, deep connections through time—people have always had to seek shelter, figure out what to do with the dead.

Professors Y and Z both saw providing a broad introduction to the field of landscape architecture as one of their primary goals. "I want them to know what landscape architecture is and that is the bottom line," Carr says. "I think it is very hard to know what landscape architecture is if you don't have a rigorous historical survey." There were a variety of other non-historical goals of the class as well, which are laid out in the following two sections.

Landscape architecture history classes may have secondary, non-historical learning objectives. Classes sought to expand students' vocabularies; teach students to recognize images of famous landscapes; and/or provide an experiential understanding of historical landscapes. The required landscape architecture history class seems to teach more than just history. It often serves as an introduction to built work in landscape architecture for both majors and non-majors. At the same time the class is teaching the history of the field, it is introducing many people to the field of landscape architecture.

History classes frequently teach design vocabulary that is not formally taught in other classes. Some professors see teaching vocabulary as one of their main roles while others do not. This may be related to what point in their education students take their required history class(es), but that does not always seem to be the case. Professor W and Ethan Carr both said that teaching vocabulary was one of

their objectives. Professor W notes that one of the reasons her history class tends to focus on vocab is that students take it their first semester in the program, and they don't have any design language yet. Conversely, Professor X appeared surprised when I asked to what extent she was focused on teaching vocabulary in her 300-level introduction to world history class. I explained that other people had volunteered that they considered it a major part of the history class, and she responded: "I don't think about it that way at all. If they are learning vocab, it is because it is embedded in a historical framework," she said "My emphasis is always on that framework for analysis. If they are at the university and there is a vocab word they don't know, they need to go out and find it. They learn some vocab in my course (for example terminology associated with medieval gardens) but it is not a focus. It is just sort of an expectation." Ethan Carr teaches vocabulary even though his class is offered in the undergraduates' third year.

While none of the professors identified building a vocabulary of landscape forms as one of the driving educational goals for their class, this role of the history class, intentional and/or non-intentional, seemed to be revealed in some of the work students were doing and some of the types of assessments professors were making. None of the classes are taught as reading seminars. A number of the professors were encouraging sketching of slides, including the Professor X. Ethan Carr actually requires students to keep a sketchbook as part of his history class. He has limited the number of slides he uses in recent years in order to rest on individual slides longer, so that students have more time to sketch them. Also, the professors interviewed all said they chose their primary textbook, in large part, based on its imagery, which suggests they consider providing exposure to these images and not just theories an important part of the class. They are all taught as lectures with slides. Whether or not it is a stated goal of these history classes, it seems these classes are providing an introduction to formal vocabulary, even when the approach toward teaching history isn't formalist.

Teaching about experience within landscapes in an effort to get students thinking about how design affects experience is also a feature of some history classes. **"**Because they are design students and not just history students, there is an expectation that they start to imagine what these spaces look like, feel like, and operate like," Professor W says. Others did not specifically mention this as a goal; however, I did not ask them about the subject directly, so it is unclear if it may be a secondary goal of some of the other classes.

One final non-historical goal, found in the majority of the history classes studied, was teaching students to recognize famous landscapes. Students were tested on their ability to recognize landscapes in at least 4 of the 5 classes (with no syllabi for Professor Y's class available to check). One of Professor W's stated objectives in both of her classes was "to facilitate visual recognition of significant designed landscapes. However, it is interesting that Professor X, in her social history course, also tested visual recognition of historical landscapes. As with some of these other things, while recognition of landscapes is not necessarily a historical lesson, it does facilitate one's ability to draw historical connections. And so it would seem appropriate to this study to have a place in the history class.

History classes are the main place that students learn writing, researching, and critical thinking skills in some but not all landscape architecture programs. "When I was brand new, I thought [students] would come in with [research and writing skills], but in a large public university, very, very few students have ever written a 10-page paper," Professor X says. "They don't know how to put together a bibliography or format a thesis question. That's what the sections are used for in my course. We do a whole section just on plagiarism and citing correctly. We talk about what constitutes historical evidence, look at different types of evidence and get them to think about evaluating various sources—how do we know what we know. How have historians misused evidence in the past to create erroneous histories?" For example there are "people who never read Arabic and perpetuated ideas about the four square

garden being strictly about paradise," Professor X says. "Scholars have discovered it also developed from agricultural patterns and water use."

Professor W expressed similar sentiments about the need for students to learn how to write and think as part of the history class. She seeks to teach the difference between an argument grounded in research and scholarship and one grounded in opinion—a goal Professor X shares.

Alternately, Ethan Carr, while he does encourage critical thinking and comparison of sources, does not focus on teaching writing or researching skills. "As far as writing goes, I rely on the skills graduate students bring, he says. "I do not think that a history class can be a writing class beyond a certain point." Undergraduate students in his university take a writing class in their junior year as part of their general education requirements, and his history class is not offered for writing credit.

It appeared important that teaching writing requires more labor than other ways of evaluating understanding. In our conversation last spring, Professor X noted that she is worried that under the new union regulations at her school, she will not have the budget to teach history as a writing course. She currently has two teaching assistants for the 80-100 people the class draws, and under the new contract for teaching assistants, she thinks they may not be able to maintain that number. Looking at her university's website recently, the landscape history course was showing up as a 3 credit course, rather than 4-credit, which raises questions about whether the writing section is still being offered. While encouraging critical thinking and reasoning skills will likely be a focus of any class, whether the history class should focus on more basic writing skills and how much to focus seems to depend on the role of the history class within the curriculum and larger budgetary issues.

Though occasionally maligned, the "canon" of landscapes that is often taught in history classes seems to be self-perpetuating. Because certain landscapes have typically been taught, this is what people continue to teach. Meanwhile, 20th Century landscapes and "failed" landscapes receive little or no

time within most of the required classes I reviewed. Every professor interviewed noted that what they teach is influenced by their perception of the canon. “There is sort of a canon of recognized designs from particular eras and [students] have to have a grasp of the canon,” Professor W said. Professor Y’s class similarly focused on the “well documented, well known examples” and Carr described the canon as “great works of landscape architecture.”

The canon seems to be at least loosely aligned with the images in Elizabeth Barlow Rogers’s textbook, *Landscape Design.* Asked why she used that text, Professor W responded, in part: “[Roger’s textbook] probably has the best pictures, and if I’m expecting you to have a visual understanding of the canon, it’s probably the best.”

Professor X argues the canon is too focused on the landscapes of the 1%. But despite having different educational goals for her class, Professor X also felt the need to teach canonical landscapes like Versailles and 18th century English estates in order to satisfy accreditation committees. She tended to focus on them in different ways, based on her pedagogical goals. This raised a question: Is knowing the names of certain landscapes and images of them being treated as more “canonical” than the information one might learn about them? The answer was not entirely clear.

Some professors discussed how there had been changes to the canon in an effort to make it more diverse. The cannon has been criticized in recent years for a variety of reasons including its lack of female practitioners and its strong focus on Western cultures. “Could the canon be expanded?” Ethan Carr asked. “I think it has been. When we criticize the canon, we should be careful because the canon is pretty inclusive at this point. We don’t have to take Olmsted out to put Farrand in.” While all the histories were more focused on Western traditions, they all made an effort to integrate Asian landscapes and Islamic landscapes—to show how they inspired Western traditions in some cases. This seems to reflect the idea that the classes are laying the foundation for the sort of work that students will

be involved with and most of the students are American. Professor Y noted that if he taught somewhere where there was a larger number of international students, he would probably change his focus.

Twentieth Century landscapes are not consistently given the attention that I believe is appropriate in required history courses. Professor Y's university requires all students to take a course focused on landscapes from 1800 to present and more than half of that course is focused on the 20th century. However, there are no required history courses at Professor W's university that look at landscapes built after 1930. Professor X gives three lectures focused on 20th century landscapes in the school's lone required landscape history course. And in the syllabus Ethan Carr shared, there were only 4 classes clearly focused on 20th century landscapes.

Sometimes, it seems a more modern history is offered but one must take it as an elective, as at Professor W's university. However, this is not always the case. At Ethan Carr's university his class is the modern survey. The other class stops at the Renaissance. In some situations I'm aware of, but none of the cases studied in depth here, landscape architecture students with no previous degree in the field are offered different options on what history class they take. At the University of Washington, where I study, graduate students may satisfy their 5-credit history requirement by taking a class focused on 20th century work. Yet, it is not uncommon for master's students at UW with no previous training in landscape architecture to graduate without ever encountering a 20th century landscape in a history class. The fall semester course, one of the two options students can choose from at UW, culminates with the work of Frederick Law Olmsted. While they undoubtedly are exposed to 20th century design in the studio, and through their own digging online, this is typically a more surficial treatment than such a landscape would get in a history class. While students may be getting introduced to the hottest new projects, it is less likely (in my experience taking studios at two universities) that they would be exposed to the sorts of cultural landscapes from the past 150 years that they may be asked to redesign if they are not exposed to these landscapes in a history class.

Similarly, when I asked if landscapes the professors perceived to have "failed" were included in the history class, it seemed like they were not being included consistently. I did not define the word failed for the interview subjects and allowed them to come up with their own examples. Professor W excludes failed landscapes "like Harlequin Plaza" on account of the lack of time. Ethan Carr includes some, like the failed bonus plazas and Egbert Viele's losing plan for Central Park. Professor X noted that it is not history's place to judge whether something was a success or failure. "The historian wants to understand why something is as it is and how it fits into other parts of the past," she said. "We're not interested in good or bad we're interested in why and how." Perhaps the question was poorly worded in her case, and had I been a little more on the ball I might have followed up by asking "Do you teach landscapes that have been removed because they were perceived by some to have failed in some way?" The others understood the question as I'd intended it, and these landscapes did not seem to be consistently included.

There is not much communication between professors about what designs and issues get taught in the history class vs. some other class. Curious how the landscapes taught in the historical surveys might be affected by what landscapes are covered in other classes, I asked each interview subject to what extent they coordinate with their colleagues about what they teach. Many people I spoke with were surprised by my question. "I don't think that's necessary," Ethan Carr said. This seems to be related to a common understanding of what constitutes the canon and the fact that the perception that canon does not include much 20th century design. People may also not want to appear like they are trying to dictate what others can teach.

However, a required survey of historical landscapes class that has more recent landscapes would seem to require more extensive discussion between colleagues as to what is being taught in different classes. The challenge would be how to have two courses address a similar landscape in a

coherent manner. If certain lessons and landscapes are taught elsewhere in the required curriculum, the survey of historical landscape architecture might take on other aspects or might not zoom in on them quite as extensively. Understanding how certain landscapes are being taught in other courses could relieve pressure on history classes to teach certain landscapes that may be getting adequate historical treatment elsewhere. For example, if a regularly taught brownfield redevelopment studio introduced Landschaftspark Duisburg-Nord in a manner similar to the way a survey of historical landscapes might, the survey of historical landscapes might focus on other sites that had influence (like Ghirardelli Square and Gas Works Park) and only briefly refer to Landschaftspark Duisburg Nord in order to show lineage. However, if Olin's redesign of Bryant Park was the only material on that landscape being taught in a social science class, even if this was a focus of great attention there, it might be valuable to provide a deeper historical perspective on the earlier redesign of Bryant park and some of the theory that was being discussed with relation to the space in the 1920s (Wheelwright, "The Design," 286).

Classes can be organized with different degrees of thematic and chronological organization. More than one organizational framework might be overlaid on top of each other. The frameworks used to organize history classes varied with many introducing a limited thematic organization. Professor W's graduate class was chronological and by region. Yet, this organization was overlaid with another framework meant to teach critical methodologies. Her other, more experimental class combined chronology and project type—zooming in on a period during the first class of each week and looking at a project type associated with that period on the second day of the week.

Ethan Carr's syllabus initially comes off as rather chronological, however he raised the point that any sort of discussion of a landscape beyond its initial design phase requires working across different cultural milieus. The way landscapes often accumulate layers over time "destroys the concept of periods to some extent," Ethan Carr said. And he breaks his overarching chronological and thematic organization

here and there to talk about changes to landscapes over time. “In Central Park, we’ll look at what was there before. How it has been reinvented over the years as its constituencies and meanings have changed,” he said. “We are still going to talk about it chronologically in the 19th century but we’re not just looking at the [Greensward] plan. It’s a place with many layers of development and that’s how we look at it when we look at it.” This suggests it is possible to provide enough historical context to talk about different periods in history in one class.

Thematic organization can be useful for making comparisons. However, Professor W says: “I think students have trouble making sense of the lineage when it’s thematic.” A limited use of chronology within a larger thematic organization has helped students to better understand lineage in certain classes taught by Professors W, X, and Y. Just as an overly thematic organization might make it difficult to establish lineage, a strictly chronological course could have the same issue. There may be weeks between the time when students learn about the Renaissance and when they learn about the Country Place era, which is why Professor Z often brings landscapes from the country place era into a discussion of Renaissance villas.

The main reason people have chosen the textbook they are using is its pictures. Though noted earlier as part of larger descriptions, this seemed important to emphasize. It was volunteered by every professor I spoke with. And the three who were willing to publicly identify the text they were using said it was Elizabeth Barlow Rogers’s *Landscape Design: A Cultural and Architectural History.* Some noted concerns with other parts of the book. Given that Rogers’s textbook was used so often and its pictures were the main reason it was being used, there would seem to be some value in analyzing what those pictures show.

Conclusion

As shown, the historical survey of landscape architecture can be created in many different ways and for many different purposes. Historical surveys teach how certain ideas developed over time and in response to particular contexts. They provide a grounding in the past ideas and how they were expressed that people can build on as they learn about other historical landscapes. They teach critical reading, thinking, and, often, writing skills. While the length in the history class varies, there seems to be a demand for a single 35-40 hour survey of historical landscape architecture.

Both chronological and thematic organizations have certain opportunities and limits that must be considered based on the various pedagogical goals identified. While there are some differences in the landscapes people teach, the art historical cannon seems to have strong sway over what landscapes are taught—even when the class is being taught as a social history—and at least one goal of the typical survey has been familiarity with this canon.

The historical survey class seems to have both historical and non-historical learning objectives included within it. Some of these learning objectives can be conflicting. For example, if one is seeking to provide a firm foundation of work that is influencing modern practice, one would probably want to include many more recent landscapes and theories. However, teaching the historical survey of landscapes as a rigorous history leads to the exclusion of landscapes that have not yet been studied with rigor. This can lead to the exclusion of more recent work, which may sometimes be more relevant to understanding current issues related to practice.

Both concern about discussing criticism within the historical survey class and limited time lead to the exclusion of projects that, for a professional designer, might be particularly relevant. Amongst the landscapes that tend to be excluded for this reason are landscapes that have been removed and are perceived to have been failures by the people who removed them.

Understanding Types of Professional Work Landscape Architects Do and To What Extent They Are Grounded in Elizabeth Rogers' History Text

One of the most difficult challenges for a professor looking to create a class that is relevant to designers is trying to establish what relevant means. One way of analyzing relevance might be how the work relates to the work landscape architects most commonly are understood as doing/ what contemporary practice engages. Knowing the array of projects types and design challenges landscape architects face could also be helpful if one goal of the history class is to provide a broad introduction to the field of landscape architecture, as Professors Y and Z argued.

So, what sort of work are landscape architects involved with? The Occupational Outlook Handbook, issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics states that "landscape architects plan and design land areas for parks, recreational facilities, private homes, campuses, and other open spaces" (Bureau of Labor Statistics). A more detailed description explains that landscape architects "design playgrounds;" "restore wetlands, streams and mined areas;" design green roofs and roof gardens; manage stormwater; preserve and restore historic landscapes; "design landscapes for government buildings;" "plan recreation areas in national parks and forests;" and "prepare environmental impact statements" (Bureau of Labor Statistics).

The American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) has a similar answer to the question, found on a tab on its main web page titled "Learn What Landscape Architects Do." The organization lists ten sorts of projects: parks, campuses, memorials, reuse, residential design, urban revitalization, rain gardens, ecological restoration, green roofs, and transportation (ASLA, "Learn What"). Most of those categories are very straightforward. Reuse could have multiple meanings. However, here it is exemplified by the new headquarters for Urban Outfitters, where D.I.R.T Studio "salvaged left-over materials, reworking them into something boldly new" (ASLA, "Learn What"). It seems to align

somewhat with the Bureau of Labor Statistics point that landscape architects are involved with historic landscapes, though it is describing rehabilitation rather than historic preservation or restoration.

A flyer from ASLA, developed in May 2012, has a more complete listing of the sorts of work landscape architects do. Here instead of lumping together a variety of work on campuses, it states that landscape architects are specifically involved in "academic campuses," "institutions" and "corporate and commercial" work (ASLA "Notes"). Instead of saying "reuse" here, it says "historic preservation and restoration" (ASLA, "Notes"). "Rain gardens" and "green roofs" are rolled into "stormwater management" and "green infrastructure;" and "memorials" are described as "monuments" (ASLA, "Notes"). The remaining categories of work listed by ASLA in this document are "Conservation, Gardens and arboreta, Hospitality and resorts, Interior landscapes, Land planning, Landscape art, Monuments, Parks and recreation, Reclamation, Security design, Streetscapes and public spaces, Therapeutic gardens, Transportation corridors, and Urban design" (ASLA, "Notes").

It was my perception that parks (at least landscape parks); gardens and residences; memorials and monuments; land planning; transportation; national parks; and landscape art were already fairly well accounted for in the landscape architecture history class and textbook. However, I believed that the histories for many of other project types mentioned in by the ASLA and the Bureau of Labor Statistics were not being consistently told in Elizabeth Rogers textbook. In an effort to use my time economically, I sought to develop a series of themes that I could use to test my assumptions—focusing on those landscapes that I believed to be excluded.

I renamed a few of the categories in an effort to make them more clear and useful across a large span of time. Instead of using the category "green roof" as ASLA does or "green roofs and roof gardens" as the Bureau of Labor Statistics does, I used the term "landscapes on structure," which would include a broader array of landscapes that have similar technological challenges—places like Freeway Park that may not read as roofs but are designed on structure.

Instead of using the term “playgrounds” as the Bureau of labor statistics does, I renamed that category “places designed for children to play,” It would allow for more inclusive thinking about where play occurs, while excluding places where children might play that were designed for a different purpose.

I combined academic campuses and corporate campuses into one category: “academic and corporate campuses.” Why not just say “campuses”? It seemed problematic to use the term “campus” generally if my main interest was finding past examples of academic or corporate campuses. The general category “campus” would seem to include palaces like the Forbidden City and religious campuses like Delphi. Many places where building and landscape met could be called campuses if one was talking about campuses from the formalist point of view. However, I hoped to isolate certain shared cultural meanings that tie academic and corporate campuses together (Mozingo, “Pastoral Capitalism” 12).

The categories “public spaces” and “other open spaces,” were replaced with “small urban spaces,” a term used by William H. Whyte to describe small publicly accessible spaces in urban settings (Whyte). These spaces are bigger than just a sidewalk, but not as extensive as a landscape park. They could be anywhere on the greenness spectrum between Piazza del Campo and Bryant Park. And they may be publicly or privately owned.

“Reuse” and the themes related to historic preservation and restoration were replaced with “landscapes designed in response to the historic fabric existing on a site.” This was an attempt to broaden the definition so it clearly includes rehabilitation and reconstruction, but narrow it so it does not include every historic project that has merely been maintained, every site that was changed over time, or reconstructions that only involved buildings. The emphasis is on the conscious act of designing a landscape in a way that builds on the historic structures or artifacts existing on site and not objects salvaged from other sites. Projects like Villa D’Este, which appropriated historic artifacts from elsewhere as a way of displaying one’s power and learning, and Buffalo’s Inner Harbor, which integrates its

archaeological discoveries made on that specific site, are very different sorts of projects with very different sorts of meanings and design challenges related to them. They do not seem to be of common lineage. However, Colonial Williamsburg and Buffalo's Inner Harbor do seem to be a part of the same lineage, even if the projects were created in very different times and places. How the history of the existing site was expressed at Colonial Williamsburg was very much part of the discussion of what Buffalo's Inner Harbor should be and that approach was rejected (Jost, "What Lies Beneath," 83).

Finally, the various stormwater and ecological restoration themes were rolled into one category titled "designing urban wetland or stormwater systems in a way that seeks to meet social, aesthetic, and ecological goals," since terminology like "rain garden" is relatively new and would be hard to apply across time.

Before analyzing Rogers's landscape history text, I decided to practice using these categories on projects that had won ASLA Awards in the "General Design" and "Landmark" categories. Unlike ASLA's other categories, which focus on one specific sort of design, like residential work and planning, these categories include the broad collection of work completed by the profession. 56 projects have received such honors from 2010 to 2014. While the ASLA Awards are hardly a representative sample of the prevalence of certain work in the profession (planning and residential work tends to be awarded in those categories), they might give us an idea of the sort of themes present in some of the projects considered to be the best and most cutting edge. The number of award winners in each category was noted below. However, percentages in most categories were excluded, because the awards were not selected based on the prevalence of these themes within the profession. Also, some of the project types (e.g. university campus design and play design) would seem to be mutually exclusive in many cases, while others (e.g. landscapes on structure and just about anything else) are not. I felt that showing percentages would encourage false comparisons, so I did not do so. Finally, by giving a few examples in each category, I also seek to give readers a better understanding of what recent work might be included

in each of the categories to better understand what historical landscapes and themes might be related to them.

Eighteen out of the 56 ASLA Award-winning projects studied had landscapes on structure. These included a diverse array of projects developed for very different purposes—the Highline, the National 9/11 Memorial in New York, Marsh Hall at Salem State University, and the Brooklyn Botanic Garden Visitors Center. Some places had simple extensive green roofs, while others, like the 9/11 memorial, were not obviously built on structure at first glance. The fact that these landscapes were built on structure was often celebrated prominently within the descriptions written by the firms that are posted by ASLA online, suggesting this was considered to be a major part of the design challenge. For example, the description of the National 9/11 Memorial by PWP Landscape Architecture and others explains: "Despite its apparent simplicity, the Memorial is a massive green roof — a fully constructed ecology — that operates on top of multiple structures including the PATH station and tracks, the Memorial Museum, a central chiller plant, parking, and additional infrastructure" (ASLA, "2012"). Two of the four Landmark awards given between 2010 and 2014 were given to landscapes that are at least partially on structure, Bryant Park and Norman B. Leventhal Park at Post Office Square. On Olin's redesign of Bryant Park, it is written: "Many visitors to Bryant Park are unaware that the site is a large-scale green roof—a landmark of environmental sustainability. During the design of the restoration, the New York Public Library announced additional book stacks were needed. The landscape architect, an innovator in the design of landscape over structure since the 1970s, logically suggested submerging the stacks beneath the Park" (ASLA "2010"). The awards website similarly notes that Norman B. Leventhal Park at Post Office Square was "an early, successful 'intensive green roof' project, years ahead of its time" (ASLA "2014"). The design of this site on top of a parking garage is mentioned in the third sentence of the project description. The prevalence of this sort of work among the award winners studied and the way it

is discussed in the summaries submitted seems to suggest that the existence of structures beneath many landscapes is an important and unique context for understanding a design and its history.

Thirteen of the 56 landscapes included areas designed for children or teens to play that were highlighted in the awards submissions. Canada's Sugar Beach has a leaf-shaped spray pad, where children cool off, and can get water for a sand area (ASLA "2012"). Sherbourne Common has a spray pad, as well as swings and teeter totters artfully integrated into a larger design (ASLA "2013"). Manassas Park Elementary School and Nueva School were both school yards. The Crown Sky Garden, a roof garden at the Children's hospital in Chicago, and the Gary Comer Youth Center's "Rooftop Haven for Urban Agriculture" did not have any traditional play areas, however they were counted because they were designed as places for children to recreate. The prevalence of design for children's play amongst the award winners studied, should be considered with the knowledge that many of the places that aren't designed for play are adult-centered places (university campuses, etc.). The presence of landscapes designed for play among the award winners and the unique challenges involved suggests that they might be relevant to professionals looking to ground their work in an understanding of the past.

Fourteen of the 56 projects could be described as academic or corporate campus designs. These included a new academic complex at Arizona State University Polytechnic Campus, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and Urban Outfitters Headquarters at the Philadelphia Navy Yard. Thinking about how being within the campus was differentiated from being outside the campus and how to unify sometimes incoherent structures seem to be among the unique design issues here. Understanding the unique challenges associated with this project type, and the presence of many such projects among recent award winners suggests creating campuses is a theme that might be relevant to professionals looking to ground their work in an understanding of the past.

More than half of the projects (at least 29) were urban wetlands or designed to manage (at least some) urban stormwater in a way that serves social, aesthetic, and ecological goals. Some of the project

descriptions mention “bioretention features,” “bioswales,” or “rain gardens,” such as the Underwood Family Sonoran Landscape Laboratory, Lafayette Green, and City Garden (ASLA, “2010;” ASLA “2011;” ASLA “2012”). Others have large restored or created wetlands like the Qunli Stormwater Park. Some were flood control projects meant to avoid the paving of rivers, like the Landmark Award-winning First San Diego River Improvement Project. Others involved greening a concrete river, such as “A Mother River Recovered: Qian'an Sanlihe Greenway” (ASLA, “2013”). These projects clearly offered unique challenges related to erosion and hydrological flows. Understanding the unique challenges associated with this project type, and the presence of many such projects among recent award winners suggests managing urban stormwater in a way that serves social, aesthetic, and ecological goals is a theme that might be relevant to professionals looking to ground their work in an understanding of the past.

Designing with the site’s historic fabric was clearly present on 18 of the 56 projects—about a third of the total studied. The Steel Yard rehabilitated an old industrial site. It preserved some of the buildings and some distinctive steel beams linking them, and mimicked the rusty historic industrial fabric in the design of some of its new features (ASLA “2011”). The Portland Mall Revitalization sought to build on what was working with an award-winning transit mall project from the 1970s, while altering other aspects of the project that were not perceived to be working, such as the old bus shelters. The National 9/11 Memorial and Museum integrates pieces of the fallen World Trade Center, and marks the twin towers’ former footprint. That so many of the sites given awards were designed with the historic fabric existing on site is fairly remarkable, considering that lots of sites don’t have interesting historic fabric to design with. The prevalence of such projects and the unique design challenges involved suggest this might be a theme relevant to professionals looking to ground their work in an understanding of the past.

Sixteen of the 56 projects were determined to be small urban spaces. These included three of the four Landmark awards given out in the past five years: Bryant Park, Norman B. Leventhal Park at Post Office Square, and Village of Yorkville Park. The variety of issues that were addressed in these

projects included design for security, issues about publicness, and design to push out unwanted user groups such as drug dealers. The prevalence of such projects suggest learning about such landscapes would be relevant to professionals looking to ground their work in an understanding of the past.

Though it was not one of the categories noted above, I also analyzed the ASLA award-winning projects studied to see if they mentioned the nativeness of some or all of the plantings by using Control-F to search for the word native. 39 projects out of 56 mentioned the use of native plants. Though in some cases, these project descriptions noted that the design used both native and non-native plants. The frequent discussion of nativeness suggests learning about this topic would be relevant to professionals looking to ground their work in an understanding of the past.

The selected themes are well represented among the ASLA Award winning landscapes studied. This would seem to reinforce the value of providing historical grounding in these practice areas or subjects, especially if they have a history that can be described and analyzed.

Themes in Elizabeth Barlow Rogers's Imagery

Elizabeth Barlow Rogers's textbook *Landscape Design* appears to be one of the most commonly used references for landscape architecture history courses in the United States. Professors I interviewed who used it noted that they had chosen the book for its imagery. Rogers' *Landscape Design* is also the text used for the University of Washington's two landscape architecture history classes. Given its apparently widespread use, and the interest in its imagery, I engaged in a more specific analysis of the themes represented by that imagery.

I created a spreadsheet with the same six categories used in the previous section: landscapes designed on roofs or other structures, places designed for children to play, academic and corporate campuses, small urban spaces, examples of designing in response to the historic fabric on a site, and examples of designing with urban wetland or stormwater systems in a way that seeks to meet social, aesthetic, and ecological goals. More discussion of the themes and how they were chosen is in the previous section. Then, I paged through Rogers textbook and evaluated each of the 587 distinctly numbered figures to see how many of them fit into each category. If the image did not visibly indicate the theme shown, even if I knew it was part of a landscapes' larger design intent I did not count it as fitting into the category. For example, Parc de la Villette incorporates rehabilitated buildings, however, these were not shown in any of the images of the park, so I did not count it as an example of designing in response to the historic fabric on a site.

While the prevalence of landscapes on structure has risen in recent years, there is a long history of creating roof gardens, which Theodore Osmundson explored in his book *Roof Gardens* (113-127). Yet, Rogers's text has just two figures showing landscapes on structure, Freeway Park and the Greek Theater at Park Guell (Figures 12.14 and 15.10). Seattle's Freeway Park is only described with a single sentence, which does not talk about it as a landscape on structure: "Here a dramatically naturalistic space evokes the wilderness of the Pacific Northwest while masking the sounds of the freeway," Rogers writes (Rogers

484). However, its location atop the freeway is obvious from the dramatic photograph shown, and that's why it was counted. The Greek Theater, which is a hard piazza like space rather than a roof top garden, is also not discussed as a landscape on structure, though it is shown as an open landscape that sits on top of a structure held up by columns (Rogers 411). It may surprise those who consider roof gardens to be a new thing, but Norman Newton actually showed more landscapes designed on structure in his influential 1971 text, *Design on the Land,* than Rogers did in 2001. He included two images of Mellon Square, an image of Constitution Plaza, and an image of Ghirardelli Square (Newton 651-653). That two recent ASLA Landmark Award winners from the 1980s were noted for their early experiments in creating landscape on structure (see previous section), suggests people are not understanding how recent roof garden work fits into the history of landscape architecture, and, perhaps, not looking to earlier roof gardens to see what they might learn from them.

Places designed for children to play are almost non-existent in Rogers' text. There is not a single picture of a playground; no swings, slides, nor adventure playgrounds where kids can play with loose parts. Large open lawns at Prospect Park in Brooklyn and Parc de la Villette are shown in Rogers's figures 9.42 and 15.26 respectively and are the closet she gets to representing children playing in a park. If you look hard enough at these images, you can see a 3mm tall shadow of a child in the distance. Meanwhile, Lovejoy Plaza's fountain is shown in Figure 15.9 but it is empty of people and its interactivity is not discussed in the one sentence written about it (Rogers 484). The words "play" and "playground" do not appear in Rogers's index (Rogers 540). All of this is rather baffling considering the prominent role landscape architects have played in creating and specifying playgrounds over the past century or so. Consider that I have attended 6 ASLA Annual Meetings, the largest national conference for landscape architects, between 2008 and 2014, and Landscape Structures, a playground equipment company, has sponsored the gala each one of those years. One might argue that the absence of playgrounds in Rogers's text is a matter of the book's art historical focus, but this seems like rather thin reasoning.

There has been a number of aesthetically driven works in the playground medium by designers like Richard Wheelwright, Isamu Noguchi, Aldo van Eyck, Richard Dattner, and M. Paul Friedberg, among others. Friedberg's work was already widely recognized when the book was published. In fact, Norman Newton included an image of Friedberg's Riis Houses' Plaza Playground in his text in 1971 (Newton 639). While some of Friedberg's work had been removed by the time Rogers wrote her book, much of Richard Dattner's work remained in Central Park, and remains to this day.

In her entire book, Rogers's pictures just one academic or corporate campus, the University of Virginia, laid out by Thomas Jefferson. Two images show this space, a plan and a perspective drawing (Figures 7.46 and 7.47). The University of Virginia is also the only university mentioned in Rogers index (Rogers 572). The site gets approximately 1.5 pages within a 6.5 page section on Thomas Jefferson (Rogers 271-273). There is no imagery of John Deere's corporate headquarters, Weyerhauser's headquarters, or any other corporate campus. There is no illustration showing how people have created campuses for white collar workers within urban environments, as at Constitution Plaza in Hartford, or any discussion of the social and cultural issues surrounding these places, as far as I can tell. Some of this may be because at the time Rogers's text was published, it seems there was little historical analysis of corporate campuses. A recent book by Louise Mozingo titled *Pastoral Capitalism* offers such analysis.

There appears to be only one example of a design project that seeks to design urban wetland or stormwater systems in a way that seeks to meet social, aesthetic, and ecological goals. That is the design of Rock Creek Park and Parkway (Figures 10.16b and 10.17), which has two paragraphs on it (Rogers 370). With this project, Rogers explains there was much debate over whether the polluted creek should be piped or fixed up and they eventually chose the latter approach (Rogers 370). There is no information on how they dealt with the polluted water, however. The preservation of Rock Creek is discussed as a matter of preserving scenery and to show Beaux Arts monuments were being championed alongside naturalistic landscape parks at the beginning of the 20th century (Rogers 370). When Rogers talks about

the bridge at Pont Neuf, and how it built off of the spectacle of the river, she uses an image that shows how the Seine had been enclosed by walls (Figure 4.49). However, this move to wall off the river is not discussed on the adjacent pages (Rogers 159-161). Neither the words “erosion,” “flood control,” “wetland,” “river,” “coast” or any variants of these words, appear in her index (Rogers 534-543). Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr.'s design for creating a new salt marsh landscape at the Boston's Back Bay Fens goes unreported in the section on the Emerald Necklace (Rogers 349-350). Again, this may be a result of the book’s art historical focus, however it suggests a major gap in the history of landscape architecture as a design field. As Anne Whiston Spirn explained in “Constructing Nature: The Legacy of Frederick Law Olmsted,” Olmsted’s firm transformed “urban landscapes polluted by waste into habitats that enhanced human health, safety, and welfare,” and “reintroduced a sense of the wild into the heart of the city” (Spirn 92). This project has been a strong influence on a number of prominent landscape architects including Kongjian Yu, whose firm, Turenscape, has been working throughout China to clean up polluted waterways, creating projects like Qunli Stormwater Park. For Landscape Architecture History Month in 2011, I had a number of landscape architects write 300 words about a landscape that inspired them for a photo essay in *Landscape Architecture.* Yu’s essay highlighted the Back Bay Fens portion of the Emerald Necklace—noting the way it cleaned polluted water (Yu 95). While the Emerald Necklace may be the most famous historic project of this sort, there are also some projects from the late 1970s and early 1980s that have been documented in a way that discusses hydrological performance and social perceptions over time including Pelican Bay and the First San Diego River Improvement Project (Jost, “The Soft Solution”; Jost, “Back from the Beach”). Both of these articles involved original oral histories and analysis of historical documents. However, they were not created to be pure histories and do include criticism, which might be considered problematic by some. There has also recently been a reevaluation of 18th century landscapes created by Capability Brown based on analyzing hydrological flows and historical maintenance regimes that might be useful for understanding this issue (Podolak et

al). This information was not available at the time Rogers created her text, even if she had wanted to include it.

Within Rogers's text, efforts to design with a landscape's historic fabric are also given very minimal treatment. There are three images of landscape restoration/reconstruction projects in France, two of Villandry and one of the Chateau of Courances. There is an image of three designers' 1988 plan for Munstead Wood, "after garden design by Gertrude Jekyll" (Figure 11.7); however, there is no explanation of what that means beyond the caption quoted here (Rogers 382). The rest of the text in this section is totally focused on telling us about Jekyll in her own time (Rogers 382). There are also two images of Colonial Williamsburg (Figures 6.50 and 15.2) and a few paragraphs tied to those images (Rogers 227, 475-476). However, this is it, and there are no images where landscape rehabilitation is clearly pictured. There are no images of Gas Works Park or Ghirardelli Square or any of the other famous projects that have made preserving pieces of the existing fabric while changing the function of the place, a major part of their design. There are no examples of landscapes that have had to be adapted to meet modern codes or environmental concerns highlighted through pictures. Rogers undoubtedly pictures numerous landscapes that have changed over time and have been preserved or reconstructed in some way, but she tends to talk about them in the time of their original construction without mentioning the integration of new and old as a design challenge. This seems to be related to a general focus on design intent rather than telling us what happened to a design after it opened. There is at least one example where imagery is used to show how a landscape has changed over time—the Athenian Agora is shown at different times in Figures 2.11 and 2.21—but little is known about the intent of its design or how new interventions might have been responding to some feature perceived to be historic. An 8-page section on "Preserving the Past: Place as Heritage, Identity, Tourist Landscape, and New Urbanist Community," is mostly focused on how people have created idealized versions of historic structures, plans, and landscapes on sites not at all tied to the originals, it dedicates 4 pages to New Urbanism exclusively

(Rogers 473-481). The only landscape shown in this section where an effort was made to work with existing fabric was Colonial Williamsburg, which, as mentioned above, only gets a few paragraphs of explanation. However, there is a variety of recent writing on this issue, including Thaisa Way's discussion of Gas Works Park as a thick section (Way, "Landscapes") and an article documenting the design process for Buffalo's Erie Canal Harbor, based on extensive interviews with different perspectives on the contentious design process, as well as careful study of every article published in the local press regarding this issue (Jost, "What Lies Beneath").

Of the categories studied, there were more small urban spaces than any other. Yet, just 23 of the 578 figures in Rogers's text show small urban spaces, representing 19 unique spaces. And a number of these spaces are not discussed as landscape designs so much as leftover space created by buildings, including the Athenian Agora and Piazza d'Arme, where the surface of the piazza in the drawing provided is blank, white space and the focus is on the surrounding arcade. The amount of discussion of small urban spaces, even when they are pictured, is quite minimal. Amazingly, four of the small urban spaces shown are given no specific explanation of their design or performance at all. The figure of Clinton Community Garden in New York (Figure 16.3) is referred to in a sentence where it talks about community gardens that have become "recreational centers" in addition to being "showcases of ornamental horticulture" (Rogers 509). Pall Mall (Figure 6.42) has a sentence explaining when it was designed but nothing more (Rogers 218). The Square des Innocents, by Jean-Charles-Adolphe Alphand (Figure 10.12) is included as an example of the sorts of open spaces created under Baron Haussmann's urban renovations of Paris, and Country Club Plaza (Figure 14.5), the shopping center in Kansas City, is represented by one of its open spaces in the imagery, but it is discussed at a larger scale in the body of the text and none of its open spaces or their designs are mentioned (Rogers 462).

Five of the small urban spaces pictured have only a single sentence referencing their design in the text. Lovejoy Plaza and Freeway Park (Figures 15.9 and 15.10) have one sentence that covers both

their designs in the body of the text, and Freeway Park has an additional sentence on its design in the caption (Rogers 483-484). Shockingly, there is only one sentence on the Piazza del Campo's (Figure 3.22) creation and design, which is included as part of a longer section on Walled Cities in medieval times, and only one sentence on the design of Grosvenor Square (Figure 6.41) in London (Rogers 120, 217). Having only one sentence on the Piazza d'Arme in Livorno, Italy (Figure 6.40), which describes the piazza's influence on Convent Garden in London is a little less surprising, as the photo suggests the space was just a void surrounded by an arcade (Rogers 217).

Three of the small urban spaces pictured in Rogers have just two or three sentences written about them. These are Otto Wagner's proposal for Vienna's urban center (Figure 12.5), Palace Square in St. Petersburg (Figure 6.45), and Dan Kiley's design for Fountain Place in Dallas (Figure 13.30)—the only modern small urban space pictured (Rogers 220, 406, 454). Most of the other small urban spaces get a paragraph or so. This includes the Fountain of the Triton at Piazza Barberini in Rome (Figure 6.36), Regents Park and Convent Garden in London (Figures 6.39 and 7.28); the Place du Theatre, Cours-la-Reine, and the Place de la Concorde in Paris (Figure 6.37, 6.38, and 10.3).

Three small urban spaces are discussed extensively: the Agora in Athens (Figures 2.11 and 2.21), which has more than one page of text about it, the Campdoglio (Figures 4.34 and 4.35), which gets a full page of text and two images representing it, and Olmsted and Vaux's plan for parkways in Brooklyn (Figure 9.45), which also gets about a page of text, even though the parkways were never realized. No other small urban spaces are covered. And none are given the sort of colored spread treatment Rogers gives to Hadrian's Villa, Villa d'Este, Villa Lante, Vaux-le-Vicomte, Villa Gamberaia, and Dumbarton Oaks (Rogers 92-93, 140-141, 144-145, 170-171, 190-191, 394-395). The only public space given this special treatment is Park Guell (Rogers 410-411).

Newton has a variety of images of small public spaces including 15 images of Italian piazzas and a number of more modern American spaces, including Bryant Park (the 1930s redesign), Fulton Mall,

Paley Park, and Sasaki, Dawson, and DeMay Associates' model for Copley Square (Newton xi-xix). It is worth noting that two of those designs had been changed or ripped out by the time Rogers wrote her book and Fulton Mall has long been controversial (Greenbury 10). But these would seem to be stories to tell. And whether or not one thinks Paley Park is the project worth including, it's hard to explain the complete lack of pocket parks in Rogers's history.

Overall, it is not clear why these themes are minimized in Rogers's text. As discussed above, in some cases, the art historical nature of the survey may be to blame—though at times, particularly during later chapters, Rogers does break this art historical focus to discuss community gardens and strip malls (Rogers 509, 511). In some cases, it may stem from a reluctance to discuss landscapes that have been removed—especially since she tends to focus on design intent in most cases rather than performance. To talk about the performance of one landscape when you have ignored the performance of others overtime would stick out like a sore thumb. The reason could also be related to how Rogers defined landscape. Rogers identifies three "categories of landscape" in her Foreword: "cities, parks, and gardens" (Rogers 16). While the terms city and park are potentially quite inclusive, it is easy to imagine how such a definition might leave out ecological infrastructure.

In some cases, the exclusion of certain landscapes could also be a result of the organizational framework she uses, which tends to focus on the spirits of various periods and the work of a few famous designers. Rogers seeks to provide an understanding of different "different styles and periods," and she notes that "all three subjects of landscape [cities, parks, and gardens] were almost always subject to a prevailing Zeitgeist" (Rogers 16). Could this be leading her to ignore certain projects because they do not reflect the spirit or style of their age? If Boston's Fens and Riverway was a work by Ian McHarg rather than Olmsted, a work of the 1970s rather than the 1880s, would it have been treated a different way? If she wasn't focusing on the walled nature of medieval cities and gardens in her section on that period (Rogers 118-123), would she have written more than a single sentence on the Piazza del Campo?

The next step of this investigation, if I was to truly understand how history is being taught, would be to analyze the slides used in the lectures for surveys of historical landscapes currently being taught. Some landscapes may be taught in lectures even though they are not included in the text. For example, Theodore Osmundson's work on the Kaiser Center Roof Garden is included in Thaisa Way's modern history of landscape architecture class, for which I was the teaching assistant, and we quizzed undergraduate students on this project even though there are no readings on the project in the syllabus. It would also be important to consider the visual resources available to faculty- what visual aids are made available of playgrounds or stormwater infrastructures. As so few landscape images form significant portions of the visual collections of most design schools, faculty most often must rely on their own collections. This often requires them having visited the sites and thus failed landscapes and those that are not easily accessible may be difficult to include.

Literature on Historical Surveys, Making History Relevant, and Non-Linear Histories

The literature on developing historical survey courses is rather thin in the field of landscape architecture. However, the topic has been the subject of intense debate in the related discipline of architecture. Reviewing literature for both fields, a number of issues that have received intense discussion in recent decades are revealed, and were deemed worthy of consideration for developing a required history course.

The Subjective Nature of What is Included in Any History

No historical survey, however small, is ever complete. "Space and time are limited commodities and an author must choose between competing approaches," Christy Anderson writes (353). Because the creator of a survey must choose what to teach within a small amount of time, surveys are by their nature subjective. "Simply by including a work as one of a limited number of illustrations and examples, any book raises what might be an isolated example or a minor architectural footnote to the level of 'masterpiece," Anderson writes (C. Anderson 353).

The subjective nature of what is included in historical surveys is not just a matter of what the historian *decides* to include but what the historian can know. Anderson cites Deborah Howard, who revised a famous survey of 16th century Italian architecture in 1995. In an introduction to the book, Howard recognized the limits of even limited surveys of this sort, writing it was "hopeless for any one scholar to be an authority on the whole of Italy for the entire 16th century" (C. Anderson 354). If there is no hope for a single historian to understand all the materials available on 16th century Italian architecture, what hope is there for a single historian trying to understand the history of landscape architecture?

Anderson's approach to the challenge of inclusion is to create surveys that encourage students to think critically about what the canon includes and how it was created. "[T]exts can acknowledge that the notion of a masterpiece changes as history evolves through the lens of reinterpretation," Anderson writes (C. Anderson 354). She was editing a series of books on art and architectural history for the Yale University Press at the time she wrote her article. The series, she wrote, "addresses the need for classroom texts that raise questions and open debates, rather than imposing unified interpretation" (C. Anderson 354). Explaining the limitations of the survey class, she argued, it would be important for students to realize that what you are teaching is not the history of landscape architecture but a history of landscape architecture.

Making Historical Narratives that are "Useful" for Designers

In the interview previously discussed, the landscape architecture professor Ethan Carr noted that "If there is one problem the landscape history class has, it is to make itself relevant to practice. The degree to which it [is], it will succeed. If it is perceived as an academic sideline, it will fail, and I think most landscape history classes today are in the latter category," he said. To what extent history classes should be created to be useful to designers has been the subject of much contention, both in the landscape architecture and architecture fields. As has the question of what is relevant.

The question of whether history should be "useful" was the subject of rather contentious articles in *Landscape Journal* during the 1990s, with two academics with design backgrounds at one extreme arguing that the history class should be dispensed with and history should be integrated into design studios to inform the design process and a historian at the other extreme arguing that that the history class should not be judged based on its applicability to the design studio at all. Some of the most intense discussion that took place seemed to involve whether history's purpose was to provide approaches that students could use. Many historians reject the idea that history might provide the sort

of design lessons often offered by social scientists and design critics. There is a distinction however, between this sort of usefulness that provides simple answers and another sort of usefulness that questions whether students are receiving historical grounding in a broad range of design problems they may face as professionals. Providing simple, actionable answers tends to be antithetical to the way many historians think; however, focusing on design issues facing modern designers is not necessarily in opposition to the methods that professional historians use.

In a Fall 1995 *Landscape Journal* article titled "What History Should We Teach and Why?" the landscape architect Robert B. Riley argued that within the landscape architecture history course offered to professionals, "the history we teach must be relevant to design" (Riley 221). He argued that history "must make the students reflect upon decisions that they make in the design process," (Riley 221).

Catherine Ward Thompson and Peter Aspinall followed up in 1996 with a piece that argued for teaching "history as design studio." They wrote that "If designers demonstrate the value of history in their discussion of design, then the dialogue between tradition and contemporary experience can inform students in a way that is both accessible and productive." (Thompson and Aspinall 46). This approach was strongly criticized by Dianne Harris, who argued that the mixing of history and practice would encourage demagoguery. Harris quoted Spiro Kostof who argued "The critic speaks of architecture as it should be… the historian as it was" (Harris 192).

Teaching about historical landscapes was closely linked to design at the time landscape architecture was first emerging as a profession in the early 20th century. This was discussed at a symposium on teaching landscape architecture history in 1994, where Daniel J. Nadenicek presented his analysis of the sorts of histories of landscape architecture published in *Landscape Architecture (Quarterly/Magazine)*, between 1910 and 1981, and *Landscape Journal,* from its founding in 1982 to 1994 (Nadenicek 9). Nadenicek notes that between 1910 and 1929, descriptions of historical landscapes intended to inspire design frequently appeared. "There was a direct purpose to this journey into the

past," Nadenicek writes. "It was to provide precedents for the work at hand" (Nadenicek 11). I have read through all the issues of *Landscape Architecture* from that period myself, and Nadenicek's classification description appears accurate. For example, a January 1915 article in *Landscape Architecture* used Villa Gamberaia to teach about subtleties regarding symmetry and axial relationships. The author, Henry V. Hubbard, was both a founder of the magazine and a landscape architecture professor at Harvard University, where he had also been the first person to earn a degree in landscape architecture. "In the plan of almost every Italian villa there are a surprising number of deviations from rectangularity and from symmetry, motivated by practical requirements of the situation and passing unnoticed in the design," Hubbard wrote. "And there are also many refinements of form which have great and successful esthetic (sic) effect in reality but which look little short of absurd when correctly represented on plan" (Hubbard 57-58). When it is impossible to see two faces of a building or gate post or pedestal from the same point, there is no reason for them to be symmetrical and many aren't, Hubbard notes (58). Clearly, this description was meant to be applied. And it could possibly provide insight into how Hubbard approached historical precedents in his classes at Harvard as well.

But while Hubbard's approach was deeply practical, the 1910s and 1920s also revealed historical writing within *Landscape Architecture* that was not meant to be applicable, but were meant to narrate (and sometimes clarify the truth about) the past, such as Theodora Kimball's 1922 article "American Landscape Gardening in 1857" (Nadenicek 12-13). This article showed that there was a number of landscape designers at work in the United States at the time when Frederick Law Olmsted entered the scene. Nadenicek writes that Kimball, the landscape librarian at Harvard who later married Hubbard, "was perhaps the first real scholar of the history of landscape architecture" (12).

Examples of cultural landscape management appear in *Landscape Architecture* during the late 1920s. Fiske Kimball did work on the gardens at Monticello that was discussed in an unsigned editorial in April 1927, Robert Wheelwright discussed his firm's work restoring the Garden at Goodstay in October

1929, and Arthur Shurcliff discussed his approach to the gardens at Colonial Williamsburg in January 1937 (Jost and McIntyre 149). However, it is not clear to me when and to what extent cultural management ever gets recognized as an "applied landscape practice" related to the history class, as Ethan Carr argues it is. Some landscape architecture historians who taught history classes, including Norman Newton (who taught at Harvard from 1939-1967) and David Streatfield (a history professor from 1964-2012) were advocates for historic preservation and restoration (National Park Service "Profiles," College of Built Environments, Jost and McIntyre 152).

Some concern about teaching history that is relevant to designers appears to stem from the idea that history will revert to a totally formalist approach. Formalist analysis, developed by Heinrich Wolfflin in the early 20th century was the most common approach to teaching art history classes between the 1920s and 1960s (R.G. Wilson 38). As Richard Guy Wilson explains it, Wolfflin's formalist analysis "reduced Renaissance and Baroque art—painting, sculpture, and architecture—to a type of visual analysis using categories such as 'linear and painterly,' 'plane and recession,' [and] 'closed and open form,'" (R.G. Wilson 37). Michael Hatt and Charlotte Klonk write that formalism "concentrates solely on the formal properties of works of art" and separates works from their contexts and content (Hatt and Klonk 66-67). Formalist analysis focused on finding "the style characteristic to an epoch or culture in works of art" and how to distinguish one style from another rather than trying to understand some of the thinking and meaning embedded in it (Hatt and Klonk 65). Wolfflin also wrote about "national differences of the eye" (Hatt and Klonk 65). There was a strong reaction to such lineage in the years that followed (R.G. Wilson 38). However, Wolfflin's approach seems to have shaped the way landscape architecture history has been taught. For example, its influence can be found in the history created by Geoffrey and Susan Jellicoe, *The Landscape of Man,* which looks at how specific epochs and national and racial affiliations have shaped landscape design over time. The formalist approach strongly influenced architectural history as well. Christy Anderson writes that historical surveys prior to World War II mainly

focused on “the history of style, tracing the development of form through time in order to define a pattern of visual norms… there was little sense of how meaning was formed in architecture.” (Christy Anderson 352).

Formalism did have some value to designers. One of the original reasons for teaching the history of fields like art and architecture was to give people a library of forms they could draw on in their design work, notes Richard Guy Wilson (R.G. Wilson 41). Teaching formal vocabulary in history classes has frequently been associated with connoisseurship that conflicts with the historian’s desire for “disinterested study.” (R.G. Wilson 41). Wilson observes the close connection between many history classes and design schools has sometimes led to history classes presenting certain styles as better or more ‘relevant’ than others. “The ‘style wars’ continue unabated in many schools of design,” he wrote in 1994 (R.G. Wilson 41). However, form does not need to be critiqued to be included within the class.

In more recent years, historians have placed more attention on “social, political, and historical contexts,” Anderson wrote (C. Anderson 352). This often involves integrating information from other disciplines and using “theoretical frameworks from literature, sociology, history [generally], and technology [studies] in the analysis of architecture,” Anderson writes (C. Anderson 352).

The recent controversy over purpose of landscape architecture history classes, has taken place at a time when there has been increasing professionalization of landscape architecture history, and an effort by professional historians to make history classes more grounded in historical research. In the past (and still in many departments today), landscape architecture history has been taught by designers with no special training in landscape architecture history. Riley noted the increasing “dissatisfaction with sabbatical slides serving as the substance of history curriculum” in 1995 (Riley 220). He questioned how the history class, which was considered “an indispensable requirement,” had also become “a subject almost anyone can teach when faculty rotations are required” (Riley 221).

At the same time, there has been an increase in concern among some design professionals about whether history is being taught in a way that is helpful for designers. Ward Thompson and Aspinall argued in 1996. "The danger of simply leaving history to the historians (which is not to say that we don't need good historians as much as ever) is that designs from the past become something "other," to be picked apart as a specialist diversion, rather than forming an integral part of the continuous stream in which our tradition is placed" (Ward Thompson and Aspinall 46).

In "An Historian's Response," to Riley's question, published in 1997, Dianne Harris argued that "if our history courses are to have rigor, they must be taught by rigorously trained historians." Harris writes that landscape history teachers do not always need to be "card-carrying historians," however she argues that they must have extensive training similar to those who hold Ph. D. degrees (Harris 193-194).

Charles Moore and Wayne Attoe sought to quell a similar sort of debate in the field of architecture at a time the teaching of architectural history was becoming more professionalized. In a 1980 edition of the Journal of Architectural Education, Wayne Attoe and Charles W. Moore divide architectural history teachers into two categories—"miners" and "geologists" (1). As they described it, the miners dig through the past for whatever they feel is valuable as precedents for the students' designs (Attoe and Moore 1). The geologists, typically architectural historians, were more focused on carefully documenting the stratigraphy (Attoe and Moore 1). This is of course an oversimplification of the many ways that both professional designers and historians have approached teaching architectural history, but it shows how the usefulness of history for professionals has been the subject of debate in that field as well. Attoe and Moore, for their part, argued that both approaches had value: "[N]either group could function well without the other, though sometimes the brotherhood seems shaky," they wrote (1).

However, the lack of brotherhood between designers, historians, and, in recent years, theoreticians, has come up again and again in architectural history journals. In an article from 1991,

Stanford Anderson, who had, at that point, spent 17 years as director of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Ph. D. program in History, Theory, and Criticism of Architecture, Art, and Urban Form, blamed the distance between historians, theoreticians, and designers on the professionalization of architecture, architectural history, and, increasingly, architectural theory as separate disciplines. He singled out the historians for special scorn, writing: "Historians are the more culpable party in the estrangement of history and architecture" (S. Anderson, "Historiography," 130).

Unfortunately, his reason for singling out historians is not stated in that paper. Anderson has written that in earlier periods it was the modernist practitioners who had rejected architectural history. As late as 1967, Sibyl Moholy-Nagy wrote that history was "a discipline generally rejected by practitioners," Anderson wrote in another article (S. Anderson, "Architectural" 283-284). Perhaps Anderson believed it was self-evident that historians have more flexibility to change course than design professionals, who typically have clients and must address a range of economic, social, and technical challenges. Historians can narrate history that has relevance to the problems designers are facing today, if they so choose.

The issue was raised again by architectural historian and theorist Eve Blau in 2003. "Increasingly, in recent years, history, theory, and design appear to engage few common concerns," Blau wrote in March 2003. "…The challenge for our field is to discover sites of research where the discourses and practices of history, theory, and design intersect, and where new intradisciplinary methodologies might be generated within architecture itself" (Blau 128). Of note is that the practice of architecture was at this time increasingly theoretical—at least the scholarship—fewer published about actual built design.

While the debate within the architectural history field has frequently been argued along professional boundaries, finding ways to make history useful to design does not require a rejection of the values historians consider core. In his 2002 book *The Landscape of History*, John Lewis Gaddis, a history professor at Yale University, wrote that the purpose of history is "to interpret the past for the

purposes of the present with a view to managing the future." He argued that historians can distill the past in a in a purposeful way to make it relevant to their readers, without losing their credibility, as long as the person creating them approaches their task with a certain amount of humbleness and seeks to find patterns rather than imposing their own theories on unaccommodating facts. People should seek to learn from the past "systematically," he wrote (Gaddis 9).

Gaddis provides a number of examples to show this approach has historical grounding. He draws on the work of E.H. Carr, noting that while portions of Carr's work has been controversial, he finds his arguments in *What Is History?* inspiring. In that book, Carr argued (as paraphrased by Gaddis) "that if we can widen the range of experience beyond what we as individuals have encountered, if we can draw upon the experiences of others who've had to confront comparable situations in the past, then—although there are no guarantees—our chances of acting wisely should increase proportionately" (9).

Recognizing that this approach was likely to face skepticism from those who see much of history as malleable, based on who is telling it, Gaddis notes that talking about "lessons" of history does not require agreement among historians, "a consensus can incorporate contradictions," he writes. "It's part of growing up to learn that there are competing versions of truth and that you yourself must choose which to embrace" (10). Contexts are important and while Gaddis is arguing for a history that is useful, he does not consider that as a history that would provide simple or universal answers. He argues that in seeking to give lessons, history should not ignore "the particular circumstances in which one might have to act, or the relevance of past actions to them" (11). He argues that "to accumulate experience is not to endorse its automatic application, for part of historical consciousness is the ability to see differences as well as similarities, to understand that generalizations do not always hold up in particular circumstances" (Gaddis 11).

Non-linear and Non-Period-Based Histories

The architectural historian Richard Guy Wilson writes that the stylistic organization of landscape architecture and architecture history has its roots in both the natural sciences, with its focus on categorizing animals and plants into species, and the nationalism of 18th and 19th century historians, who would often associate styles with countries (Wilson 37). Wilson argues that the way landscape architectural historians have often adopted architectural labels has been detrimental to the understanding of landscapes (Wilson 37). "Part of the problem is the ambiguous nature of stylistic labels: what is the modern style? The picturesque style?" Wilson writes (Wilson 37).

Within landscape architecture history textbooks, separating landscapes by period and/or region has generally been the accepted way of organizing history. But within the field of history more generally, there has recently been interest in non-linear histories that do not focus intensely on a particular period and look at one region's history side by side with another's. Both John Lewis Gaddis and Manuel De Landa have encouraged approaches to historical narrative that are not limited by place or period.

Gaddis argues against what he calls the "time machine" approach to history, where the historian tries to recreate events as they happened (Gaddis 22). He encourages historians to think of history as a "landscape," and argues their purpose is providing a "wider view," as if you are flying above the landscape in a plane (Gaddis 4-5). "Precisely because of their detachment from and elevation above the landscape of the past, historians are able to manipulate time and space…they can compress these dimensions, expand them, compare them, measure them, even transcend them," Gaddis writes (Gaddis 17).

Gaddis proclaims the advantages of embracing "simultaneity" as a tool and looking at different places and times at the same time. "Historians routinely frequent many places at once," Gaddis writes, "…their investigations of the past can extend to multiple subjects within the same period… or to multiple points in time within the same subject, as traditional narratives do, or to some combination of

both" (Gaddis 24). Gaddis compares narrating history to mapping. It is not necessary to have only one map, there may be many maps of the same area that highlight different things, from topography to populations to the volume of automobile traffic on certain roads (Gaddis 34).

When thinking about how Gaddis's approach might be applicable to a landscape history class, it is also useful to ponder whether landscape architecture is one subject or many. I would argue it is both. The term landscape architecture is used to describe project types that have many differences like a wetland design and an urban plaza. Each of those project types would obviously have their own history. Using Gaddis's approach of looking at the same subject across time, we might examine the social vitality of many centuries of Italian piazzas over time together with the emptiness and perceived failure of many American piazzas designed in the 1960s and look at similarities and differences in various contexts. Presenting piazzas along with wetland destruction or restoration efforts that happened to occur around the same time would probably confuse things and make it difficult to focus on the specific lessons we might take away by examining these subjects separately.

Yet, to argue the lineages of urban plazas and wetland restoration were never linked would also be incorrect. Perhaps, in part, because of the way both have been put under this umbrella of landscape architecture, the histories of wetland and plaza design have informed each other. For instance, Tanner Springs Park in Portland by Atelier Dreiseitl could be written up as part of the histories of both urban plazas and wetland design. It might not be terribly odd for a history of wetland restoration to be tied together with a few piazza designs as part of a history of drainage. Such a unit might include the Piazza del Campo and its stormwater centric design, as well as Director Park in Portland, an impermeable piazza that drains to cisterns, along with more obvious flood control and water moving projects like the First San Diego River Improvement project. Yet this is not a good argument for an entirely chronological approach. Studying the history of how small urban spaces get used at the same time you are trying to focus on the history of drainage would be difficult, because studying these things requires examining

different contexts. Mapping these issues separately, to borrow Gaddis's metaphor, in order to highlight the things about them that are unique would seem to open up new possibilities.

What would be necessary to make sure that such a class was a history class rather than something else—a random selection of landscape philosophies? By being based in historical sources and not connecting dots that don't exist. Gaddis argues that historians can alter how they focus on a subject, but not the subject itself. "Imagination in history… as in science, must be tethered to and disciplined by sources," Gaddis writes, "that's what distinguishes it from the arts and all other methods of representing reality" (Gaddis 43).

Gaddis argues that creating history is an iterative process that must then be fit to reality. He quotes the global historian William H. McNeil describing the method he used for writing history. McNeil explained, that he typically began by reading up on a problem he was curious about. "What I read causes me to redefine the problem," McNeil said. "Redefining the problem

> causes me to shift the direction of what I'm reading. That in turn further reshapes the problem, which further redirects the reading. I go back and forth like this until it feels right, then I write it up and ship it off to the publisher (Gaddis 48).

Intriguingly, Gaddis argues that many branches of science have developed in a similar way, citing E.O. Wilson's statement that "Scientists… do not think in straight lines" (Gaddis 49). He notes that history already shares much in common with natural sciences, such as evolutionary biology, and much less in common with the social sciences (Gaddis 51). This thinking is mirrored by De Landa who writes that a "top-down approach" to generating history "needs to be *complemented* with a bottom-up approach" and in his approach he attempts to be "as bottom-up as possible" (De Landa 18).

Gaddis argues that how historians use theory in their work is what differentiates them from social scientists (Gaddis 62). He claims historians as a group tend to prioritize explaining the past "therefore, we subordinate our generalizations to it" (Gaddis 62). Alternately, for social scientists, "theory comes first, with explanation enlisted as needed to confirm it," according to Gaddis (Gaddis 63).

However, it is not clear to me why good social science and good history wouldn't be similar—it would not seem to matter as much whether theory or examples came first as long as one has looked at lots of examples and one is not using examples selectively to prove their point and actively seeking examples that counter it.

Gaddis argues that historians tend to avoid "universal generalizations." For him this does not seem to mean they completely avoid generalizing across time and place (Gaddis 63). It means that historians acknowledge that there are often many independent variables at work that may affect things, and so they try to avoid making big predictions about what will happen in the future when a certain circumstance is present (Gaddis 64, 66). "[I]t's not clear to us how any variable can be truly independent," Gaddis writes. "…We see history as proceeding instead from multiple causes and their intersections" (Gaddis 64-65).

This would definitely seem to hold true for landscape architecture history where many different contexts seem to affect the projects, sometimes to a greater or lesser degree depending on other factors. For example, one might consider William Whyte's observations of plazas in the late 1970s. He noted that many plazas that were raised or lowered considerably from street level did not attract users; however he went on to explain that Rockefeller Center had in fact attracted users and it seemed to be related to certain activities that went on there and the way the plaza functioned as an amphitheater for viewing those activities (Whyte). Classes might cover this type of complexity by prioritizing examples where one thing might be expected to happen based on some criticism or theory but what happens is something else entirely.

Manuel De Landa's book *A Thousand Years of Nonlinear History,* published in 2000, both explains and models his method for creating a "nonlinear and nonequilibrium history" (De Landa 14). At the beginning, De Landa describes his book as "a deeply historical philosophy" rather than a "book of history" (De Landa 11). It may seem like he is separating his work from the work of other historians, but

this is not totally clear, as a few sentences later, he notes that "those who write history, however scholarly, do so from a given philosophical point of view" (De Landa 12) and he describes his chapters as "historical narratives" (De Landa 14). Perhaps his statement that the book was a philosophy was meant to emphasize that the book's main purpose was to encourage people to think about the way they wrote and organized historical information.

De Landa breaks the history of the world into three categories "Lavas and Magmas," "Flesh and Genes," and "Memes and Norms." Within each of these categories, his history is actually somewhat chronological, though not linear in the sense that it shows a line of progress. It seeks to show how geology, biology, and language and customs each influenced global history. It also moves from culture to culture, describing similarities and differences. This way of separating these different themes but then presenting their histories together seems to have some benefits—mainly that it allows more focus on these specific themes and to understand how they seem to be affecting things. However, when narrating in this manner, it seems one would need to be careful not to isolate things too much and to have developed this history based on a complex understanding of the individual cases studied in their own times and places.

De Landa is intrigued by Arthur Iberall's idea that what we commonly think of as historical "stages," might be explained as "phase transitions" (De Landa 15). And he expands upon this thinking in a way that could be particularly useful in thinking about landscape architecture history. "If the different stages of human history were indeed brought about by

> phase transitions, then they are not 'stages' at all—that is, progressive developmental steps, each better than the previous one, and indeed leaving the previous one behind. On the contrary, much as water's solid, liquid, and gas phases may coexist so each new human phase simply added itself to the other ones, coexisting and interacting with them without leaving them in the past" (De Landa 16).

It is intriguing to think of garden innovations in this way. As certain styles of gardening have fallen in and out of favor—perhaps coming to represent their time based on their association with some rich and

powerful ruler of that period—older gardens have continued to hold on in their niche, and new gardens in older styles, have frequently been created at the same time more "modern" ideas were being explored.

Rather than being a single line of evolution that progresses over time (as with the old diagram showing the evolution from ape to human) or from one zeitgeist to another, the history of landscape architecture might be imagined to have more branching patterns, with many different species of apes persisting and continuing to evolve on separate tracks and occasionally showing recessive genes once thought lost. There's the piazza line, which, from its strong ecological niche in Italy, has migrated to other countries, where the line was apparently not as well adapted. There is a nature-inspired landscape line with roots in China that migrated via porcelain and etching to England and France in the 18th century.

Of course this is not a perfect metaphor. Design ideas cross-pollinate and reproduce across styles and types much more easily than biological entities do across species. And projects such as Post Office Square in Boston or Freeway Park have multiple lineages. To attempt to represent the history of landscape architecture, the diagram would be like Charles Jencks's famous Evolutionary Tree to the Year 2000 (published in *Landscape Architecture* in April 1971) put into Grasshopper and iterated into a three dimensional billow pad like object that can't be viewed all at once.

Whenever we are trying to map something so complex, there will be mistakes. Gaddis argues that as we seek to map history, we must just keep testing our assumptions. He extends his mapping metaphor, noting that the first maps we made were not always terribly accurate, but there was a "verification" process over time as people sought to "[fit] these representations to reality" (Gaddis 34). Gaddis notes that methodologies seeking "*adequate fit* between theory and experiment" are used by many scientists (Gaddis 49). The key is to constantly iterate and test one's assumptions.

Creating a Survey of Historical Landscape Architecture

Deciding What to Include

Whenever someone is making a decision on what is worth learning (and by extension, what isn't), that decision is likely to be controversial. Yet, every instructor who teaches a survey of historical landscapes (or any class) must choose to include some landscapes and ideas and exclude others. If a goal of the class is to give young designers a historical grounding for work they will do, and a secondary goal is giving people from other backgrounds an introduction to the field and its history, I would argue that there are certain ways of testing whether a class meets these goals.

One way is to examine whether the class is addressing a broad range of design problems that modern professionals are addressing in their work, as both Professors Y and Z sought to do (Professors Y and Z). Of course, a single required survey of historical landscapes cannot be expected to address *every* design problem landscape architects face. The field is just too broad. And modern professionals' failure to address certain problems should not disqualify them from study if they continue to be problems. For example, just because most landscapes in Las Vegas are not designed to encourage walking wouldn't justify ignoring this design problem in a class taught there. But if the sole required history class is excluding many design problems that seem to frequently appear in projects today, like how to create places for children to play, then it is probably not as useful as it could be. My class aims to address the broadest possible swath of design problems while still examining those problems in enough depth that studying them is useful.

Another way of considering the class's value to designers is to ask whether it is including precedents created in contexts similar to those that modern landscape architects are working in. For example, landscapes created 100 years ago have many lessons to offer on a range of issues but it is unlikely they will offer teachable moments on public participation in the design process or universal

accessibility. In many situations, it is helpful to focus on the more recent past if we want to explore some of the issues we are dealing with today.

The class laid out in the pages that follow focuses on examples from the past century or so. Every class includes at least one project completed in the 20th century, and many will include more recent landscapes. However, I am not just creating a modern landscape history course. In my class modern landscapes will be presented side by side with earlier landscapes that continue to have a major influence within the profession. Students will get brief introductions to traditional Chinese, Japanese, and Islamic landscapes that have had significant influence internationally that they likely wouldn't get if their one required class was focused exclusively on modern design.

The significance of teaching certain design problems would seem to intensify, even if they are not particularly common, if they are frequently the source of controversy or debate among the public at large and they are often faced by firms not specialized in that work. For example, the way we memorialize traumatic events in the landscape is frequently the source of controversy, and many of the firms responsible for memorial design are not specialists in that field. This has been true of national memorials to a large extent. For example, the three national 9/11 memorials have all been carried out by generalist firms (See *Landscape Architecture's* September 2011 issue). The Columbine Memorial was created by DHM Design, which does not include memorial design among the services listed on its website, nor among the project types can one view in their portfolio. The memorial is listed with other "civic" work including the design for a number of library landscapes. Other categories of projects they do include recreation and hospitality (DHM Design Website).

Design problems that are usually handled by specialists, like golf course design, are probably less important to focus on if there is only one required class. As the American Society of Golf Course Architects website explains, "Golf course architecture is a highly specialized field" (ASGCA). When generalist landscape architects are involved in golf course design, they tend to be in a secondary role,

and they are usually dealing with similar sorts of issues as they would in other landscapes—like planting design. They are typically not solving the unique design problems associated with golf course design like how to lay out holes in a way that provides the proper amount of challenge. And most clients would not hire them for this purpose.

This brings us to another reason why a certain issue or case study might be prioritized: if an understanding of its history tends to benefit an underserved community or cause that is not typically the main priority for landscape architects' powerful clients. "Ethical questions are at the core of landscape architectural practice and so have real importance," Dianne Harris wrote in 1997 (193). She quotes a report by Ernest Boyer and Lee Mitang which says that "to understand the ethical choices entailed in *any* profession, students should be exposed to how the great figures in history, literature, philosophy and the arts have struggled with life's moral dilemmas" (Harris 193). For example, many of the people who hire landscape architects seek design solutions to push homeless people out. Clients frequently propose creating more orderly plantings or less comfortable seating as a way to address the homeless problem in the landscape—approaches that can have negative social and ecological consequences (See Jost "You're Making Me Uncomfortable;" Jost "The Soft Solution). A landscape architect who is familiar with some precedents where such approaches have been carried out will be able to raise questions about their effectiveness. And a landscape architect who knows of some spaces where the homeless sit side by side with middle class users and no one seems to mind, would be more effective at proposing solutions to serve a diverse set of users and not just those favored by the client. In order to educate their clients on such matters, landscape architects need to be educated themselves.

The audience that a landscape architecture class is speaking to should affect what lessons are prioritized. In the interviews above Professor Y noted he would teach his history class differently if his school had a large number of international students from Asia. A class taught in the American Southwest or California would be remiss if it failed to spend a significant amount of time exploring landscapes

created in desert regions. If the students in a program are mostly Americans, it might be useful to discuss how American designers have sought to creatively respond to this country's safety standards and the Americans with Disabilities Act, while a similar class in Japan would be less likely to take that focus.

Providing a diversity of design forms in the required history class is just as important as providing a diversity of design problems and lessons. Both of these are inherent in the argument that the class should be to provide a broad look at the field, as noted by Ethan Carr and Professor Y. For some students, the survey of historical landscapes may be one of the first places they will be exposed to diversity of forms they might pull from. This is one reason I have decided to condense my discussion of the forms found in Ancient Roman Villas, Renaissance Villas, Baroque Palaces, and China's Forbidden City into a single class, so I can spend more time focusing on other forms and other pressing issues. Many surveys of historical landscapes spend a week on each of these periods of European history, with the Forbidden City being part of a larger unit on Asia.

My class does not just aim to show a diversity of forms, but how an understanding of historical forms has aided in creative expression in the past. Some have theorized that borrowing and remixing ideas is at the heart of the creative process. "Copy, Transform, and Combine—that's how you remix," declares the director Kirby Ferguson in a TED talk titled *Embrace the Remix.* "You take existing songs, you chop them up. You transform the pieces, and combine them back together again... I think these aren't just the basic components of remixing. I think these are the basic elements of all creativity. I think everything is a remix, and I think this is a better way to conceive of creativity" (Ferguson). Kirby notes that luminaries like Henry Ford and Mark Twain described the creative process in a similar way. He quotes Twain saying: "All ideas are secondhand, consciously and unconsciously drawn from a million outside sources. We are constantly littering our literature with disconnected sentences borrowed from books at some unremembered time and now imagined to be our own" (Ferguson). Copying forms and

remixing forms in new ways has historically been one of the ways that landscape architects and other design professionals use historic precedents. For example, OLIN's work to hide the defensive barriers and roadways at the Washington Monument drew on the ha-ha, the sunken fence that visually blended and functionally separated the pleasure lawns and pastures in 18th century English estates and French country estates (Mays 78). I teach these landscapes together in the third week of my class in an effort to encourage students to think about ways they can creatively steal from past landscapes and repurpose old forms for new functions.

This class also places emphasis on examining controversial landscapes, perceived by some to be failures. One of the most common reasons given for studying history generally is George Santayana's quote: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it" (R.G. Wilson 41). Yet, many landscape architecture history classes don't teach landscapes perceived to be failures (see interviews section), so students are unable to learn from the "mistakes" of the past… or to begin evaluating whether they are truly mistakes. This is one of the reasons I spend a whole day on pedestrian malls and transit malls. Many students who have traveled to places like Copenhagen have seen how successful pedestrian malls are in these countries. Most incoming undergraduates and many of the grads these days will probably not know from personal experience how many American cities have torn out pedestrian malls viewed as failures over the past few decades. This leaves them at a significant disadvantage if they are asked to work on a downtown streetscape plan. They may foolishly propose the very thing that was torn out a few blocks away and have no response when the client or members of the public with slightly longer memories than they have raise questions about their judgement. Designers who are familiar with some of these controversies will not walk into these situations blind. They may still propose a pedestrian mall, but will realize the need to arm themselves with precedents, and historical theories about why many pedestrian malls haven't worked to make their case.

This brings us to another important reason I selected the sites I did. In a few classes, including the ones on pedestrian malls, we will examine and compare sites in a way that will help us to better understand how different contexts might be affecting the performance of a design. This is another reason why pedestrianization of streets is given a whole class—it gets students thinking about how different sorts of contexts may affect how a design performs. Not all pedestrian malls are viewed as failures in the U.S, and many suburbs have brand new lifestyle centers that are physically very similar to the pedestrian mall. This would suggest that the presence or absence of automobiles from the street may not be the key issue here as some have suggested (a common solution to failing pedestrian and transit malls such as Main Street in my hometown of Buffalo, New York has been the reintroduction of cars). But if pedestrianization is not the problem, what is? We will explore a variety of options, though we will not come to a simple solution. We will look at the historical context in which many of these places were often first declared as failures— a time when the U.S. was undergoing what Scott Macek has called a "moral panic" related to cities and their low-income, minority residents (Macek XII). We can also explore how the economic context may have played a role in pedestrian malls' demise—how the glut of retail in many regions, as new stores opened closer to high income populations, may have driven the decline of pedestrian malls. We will explore how the building types along pedestrian malls may have affected their success (Jost, "Mall Brawl"). It seems pedestrian malls anchored by local department stores required much greater efforts to revitalize when their occupants failed, leaving holes that were hard to mend; while smaller shops that failed, could be more easily replaced by a quirky specialty store or a restaurant, though this theory needs more rigorous historical analysis. We may also look at how maintenance regimes, programming, detailing, interest in the latest thing, and degree of publicness might have played a role. A similar examination of the contexts involved in the success and failure of spaces will be conducted as part of a class on the Italian piazza and the often failed attempts to imitate it in the U.S.

By teaching about the limits of our current understanding about issues such as the removal of pedestrian malls and American piazzas in surveys of historical landscapes, one might begin to talk about how scholarship within the field is generated as historical research, other sorts of research, criticism, and theory inform each other. Teaching landscapes perceived to have "failed" for which little true historical analysis is yet available, might actually be a useful way of teaching students about the difference between historical analysis and criticism while also encouraging further historical analysis on pressing questions.

The existing "canon" as I understand it, played a role in my decision about what to teach as well. Certain landscapes show up again and again in literature, and for students to be able to understand the references people are making, they will need to know of these places. Also, because students will likely be employed by people who have taken a more traditional landscape history class, they need to have at least passing familiarity with certain landscapes that are often emphasized so they do not appear uneducated when they are brought up. One professor I interviewed mentioned that she included certain landscapes in part because she felt an accreditation committee would freak out if they were not included. However, it is worth noting that the Landscape Architecture Accreditation Board's requirements for history education are not very specific. While it requires education in the history of landscape architecture, it does not require that this education take place in a history class, for instance, according to LAAB Administrator Ron Leighton (Leighton). LAAB's *Accreditation Standards and Procedures*, last modified in spring 2013, merely lists "History, theory and criticism" as subjects that need to be covered in the curriculum (Landscape Architecture Accreditation Board. There is no list of landscapes LAAB requires students to be exposed to.

One final criteria I used in evaluating what to study is what has been documented and how it has been documented. Are there good illustrations and photos that speak to the design issues on the site? I agree with Ethan Carr that focusing a lot of time within the survey of historical landscapes on pre-

historic landscapes in sites with social and cultural contexts that are not well understood is probably not the best use of the short time available within the required history course, when there are many better documented sites available for study. That does not mean these places shouldn't be introduced. As Professor X notes, there is value to understanding that people have been doing certain sorts of things (like burying the dead) since ancient times. But when there is little available documentation, it seems better to just graze over ancient landscapes so there is more time to focus on landscapes with more familiar and knowable contexts.

The available documentation also drove my choices about which modern landscapes to study. Was there an article about the site written by a critical observer that was not just repeating the platitudes of the designer but evaluating some of them? Is the writing on the subject completed after the design has been allowed to mature—did it go back and look at the site 3 or 30 years after it was completed—after the initial hype had worn off? Too much of design writing is completed right after a project opens, and so it cannot discuss performance thoughtfully. In a 1991 essay, Dell Upton criticized himself and other architectural historians for acting "as the public relations branch of the [architecture] profession" (195) Upton questioned the discipline's focus on intent. "The meaning of a building is determined primarily by its viewers and users," he argues. "This process of creation goes on long after the crew leaves the site…Yet so much of architectural history is directed toward identifying the pure form, the original condition, the architect's intention. How relatively unimportant these are!" (Upton 197). He notes that even the designers of 19th century prisons—some of the most coercive structures ever built—were unable to imagine the meanings and uses their buildings would come to have (Upton 197). So, it would be foolhardy for us to base our understanding of spaces on the design intent when the people who use them are given more freedom to use and imagine the buildings as they please. The existence of a critical observer is also very important "The historian's job is not to glorify the individual designer, nor is it to promote the profession of landscape architecture," Dianne Harris writes "Quite the

contrary, good historians value their objectivity, their ability to analyze with the distance afforded by lack of embedded interest." (Harris 193)

Another consideration, when determining how well something had been documented was looking at the extent to which existing documentation focuses on the design versus the designers. One of the major things that will be cut from my survey of historical landscapes is a lot of the time typically spent giving biographies of individual designers. Much of the information typically provided feels like trivia in the context it is given. For example, introducing Lawrence Halprin's work by saying he studied at Cornell, the University of Wisconsin, and then Harvard to students who don't yet know about his concrete fountains is unlikely to make any sort of impression. However, there is a value to certain types of biographical details—especially those that students are likely to identify with personally, such as Maya Linn winning the competition to design the Vietnam Veteran's Memorial as an undergraduate student. Other biographical details might offer clear lessons themselves. An example would be Bob Anderson's failure to diversify his firm's design work during the boom times prior to the recession and how this created problems for him when his work designing shopping centers dried up. These biographical details are a secondary focus of my article *Shopping's New Clothes* (Jost, "Shopping"), which I've assigned, and I will likely interrupt our discussion of pedestrian malls and lifestyle centers to spend a few minutes talking about them.

While my class does not provide deep biographies of most designers, it will provide at least a quick introduction to the authors we read in the first week or two, and the readings will include copies of the author's bio whenever it is available. The purpose of this is to get students in the habit of evaluating their sources and get them thinking about what sorts of biases someone might bring to their work that one should be on the lookout for. Some students come in trusting everything they read and not questioning case studies. I have selected Kathy Madden's article looking at two parks in Paris and my letter to the editor in response to it, which was published in LAM, for the student's first reading. It will

give students a chance to see how imagery can be deceptive, how methods of looking at spaces might influence what you find, how preconceived biases can affect what we see, and how different contexts that students don't always think of might be affecting how a design performs. By giving them my obviously flawed letter and admitting its flaws (it was the first thing I ever wrote in a magazine and looking back I think I was overly aggressive), I think it helps students to become more comfortable questioning some of the articles I've written as well. I have made a point to tell them that readings are to be dissected and played off of one another rather than accepting them as an authority without question and that that goes for the pieces I've written too.

Organization

I have sought to organize my class based on what can be learned from different landscapes—the contexts that seem to be most relevant to understanding a project's design or how it performed. The class is not indifferent to the value of chronological organization in certain instances, but it also isn't a slave to it. Below, I explain in greater depth why I have organized the class as I have.

There are certain benefits to chronological organization. The designers we learn about in history classes were often drawing from or reacting against previous landscapes when they created their work. It is helpful to understand a project on its own terms before we get introduced to people who rejected it. It would be odd to read James Rose's article rejecting the axis found in Beaux-Arts landscapes (See Rose's article "*Freedom in the Garden"*) before earlier works featuring axes.

Providing a certain amount of historical context is also important to help students understand why something was designed as it was and why it performed as it did. When trying to understand the naturalistic expressions found in 18th century English landscapes, it is helpful to know about the landscape painters of that period and the Inclosure Acts. To understand what led many pedestrian malls in the U.S. to fail, one might examine the cultural and economic milieu they it failed within.

Chronological organization can, at times, allow for an economical introduction to this sort of historical context.

However, it is not necessary for a class to be organized chronologically from front to back to get the benefits associated with chronological organization. As my interviews with professors noted, breaking chronology may actually be useful in showing lineage The evolution of forms over time and how one designer builds off of another's work can be taught within focused modules that draw on various formal and thematic lineages. In fact, breaking chronology can actually be very useful when seeking to show how projects from different periods inspired one another. By putting projects from different times side by side, it is also easier to see how subtle changes in the historical context may be affecting design. One can also get a sense of the more web like character of history.

It also seeks to study landscapes in the contexts that appear to be most helpful for understanding them. When historians organize projects by period, they are tipping their hat to the Theory of Period Styles, which argued that the prevailing style in the period a project was created in was the most important context for understanding that project (Betts 4). And this doesn't always seem to be the case. Landscape design is influenced by site specific challenges—topography, climate, hydrology, and the wealth and power of the clients. It is also largely influenced by the function a site is supposed to serve.

When histories are organized around certain periods or styles, they often end up ignoring some of the major project types that landscape designers are involved with and the unique issues they raise, because these projects are not seen as key to understanding the style of the period highlighted. As noted, this may be one reason Rogers doesn't show many playgrounds. My class groups landscapes with certain similarities together regardless of the period they were created. Comparing similar landscapes directly lets us see how subtle differences in their design and their social, ecological, and historical contexts may affect how they've performed over time.

The organization of my survey of historical landscapes is deeply inspired by the way I learned to identify and design with plants in Peter Trowbridge and Nina Bassuk's "Urban Eden" class. Our first unit forced us to look really closely at the differences between two rather similar looking shrubs and small trees—the dogwoods and viburnums—and differentiate them from each other. This sharpened our observational skills and our ability to perceive differences between things. Most later classes featured a selection of plants that were known to be adapted to certain landscape conditions—high pH soils, saturated soils, etc.—so we were learning how we might choose to use these plants in our designs even as we were learning to identify them. For example, we learned *Quercus palustris,* the pin oak, along with other species that favor acidic soils and suffer chlorosis in high pH soils. And to this day, it is the first association I make whenever I think of the tree. By teaching a historical landscape amongst other landscapes that solve similar problems, and have a historical lineage that is somewhat distinct from the larger stylistic lineage, students begin to think about these landscape when they are faced with similar sorts of problems. They may choose to use it as a supportive example or they may choose to react against it. They may take some idea about why a landscape performed as it did at face value or they might offer some alternate interpretation and add to the research on the subject.

While the lessons are not organized chronologically, they do build on each other. The first readings encourage students to consider different lenses for viewing landscapes and different contexts that may be affecting how a landscape performs. They make it clear that the readings we will be doing are not to be considered the ultimate sources on things but rather are meant to be critically examined and pulled apart at times. And they encourage students to think critically about the pictures that they are seeing in their readings.

A class on roof gardens is followed by a class on the difficulties adapting the Italian Piazza in the U.S. Many of the stark spaces that will be studied were actually built on structure. So, students will have some understanding why they couldn't suddenly add plants to a plaza built over structure that could not

support them (a key point to understand with many of Martha Schwartz's controversial projects like Jacob Javitts Plaza, as well as Director Park in Portland, which we will study in more depth). Prior to the class on pedestrian malls and lifestyle centers, where we will try to dissect some of the different contexts that have led to their being torn out in many places, while people are building similar looking "lifestyle centers" in others, we will discuss campuses, degrees of publicness, and concerns about safety and undesirables in the landscape. Those discussions will be able to inform our discussions of pedestrian malls when we get to that class, and students will be encouraged to look and see if the historical record matches their expectations.

The Assignments

One of the challenges for any class will be how to engage students in writing and researching. Many students enter history classes with limited writing and researching skills, as Professor X noted. At the University of Washington, where I have acted as a teaching assistant in history classes, many of the students did not speak English as their first language, and many others also had difficulty writing in a manner that was clear, much less grammatically correct or involving proper citations. If writing and researching skills are to be evaluated as part of a history class, they need to be taught first. It is difficult to do this well if only one history class is required, and that class is limited to 35-40 hours.

In an ideal world, I would argue that the landscape history class is not where writing and researching skills should first be taught to students, rather it should be a place where students build on previous training on the subject and hone those skills. It would be great if students entered their history courses with at least some basic writing skills—the ability to cite sources for example.

At Cornell, writing and researching skills are taught during the freshman year in small seminars with no more than 17 people (Cornell University). With smaller class sizes, the faculty members or graduate students grading the papers are able to turn around papers quickly and students are able to

build on their work in previous assignments. When the graduate student teaching assistant is required to grade 53 4-5 page papers, 53 5-7 page papers, and then revisions on both of these previous assignments in the course of 5 weeks, as I did last semester, at the same time they are preparing weekly quizzes and discussion sections, either the quality of the feedback or the grad students own classwork might suffer.

Trying to spread out the papers more really isn't an option, because students do not have enough background on the subject matter to write about it in the first few weeks. Even in the fifth week, there was confusion as to what qualifies as landscape architecture, with some students submitting essays on buildings and being forced to rewrite them entirely.

Students in my survey of historical landscapes will have a variety of different sorts of assignments meant to build different sorts of skills. 50% of the grade is based on reading reflections, 30% is based on in-class sketching and participation in discussions, and 20% is based on a photo essay, created as part of a field trip.

The majority of the grade in my class is based on reading reflections and in class discussion. I believe that in a class of this sort that will be serving as an introduction to the field for many students, it will be more beneficial for students to engage with readings that have been chosen to serve a specific educational purpose rather than trying to find their own sources, which may or may not offer opportunities for the sorts of explorations I'd like the students to do. For example, if I just sent the students loose to write a paper about pedestrian malls, chances are they would not find readings that address some of the contexts I'd like them to consider with regard to why pedestrianization of downtowns was often perceived as problematic through simple key word searching for pedestrian malls. They may end up with a rather one sided paper based on sources that have not considered the issue of pedestrianization in a systematic way.

I could give students free reign to look at any project that interested them in a systematic way, but they may choose a subject or project for which this sort of systematic thinking is not available. I think providing a diversity of sources to students who have little research experience and evaluating the sources' strengths and weaknesses together may actually be a better way to get them thinking about how to critically engage different sources than a typical research paper.

In my experience as a student in seminar classes and as a teaching assistant, students will often be unprepared for discussions on those weeks when research papers are do—suggesting they did not do the readings. I think that if there were not research papers, students might be more likely to do the assigned readings and learn from the diverse range of perspectives offered. Quizzes could be conducted to make sure students read, but quizzes do not seem to encourage critical thinking in the same way a reading reflection could. In my experience, quizzes are good for checking if students recognize a landscape, but it is difficult to test material on which there is a diversity of opinions like why certain plazas failed to attract users. You often end up having to ask very specific reading comprehension style questions that require students to spend a bunch of time searching out very specific lines in the text, which may not be worthwhile and may discourage a more thoughtful reflective approach to reading as students scan the writing for the answer (or, if you are giving them the readings digitally, use Control-F to find the key word or phrase)—a method I've seen my other classmates use when it is possible in an attempt to be efficient. Reflections allow more processing and reasoning for the same amount of effort. And, compared to more extensive essays, it is much easier to get students feedback fast that will help them improve their work.

Throughout the semester, in every class, students will be required to make at least one sketch that shows an understanding of some feature of a space that is being presented. The purpose of this assignment is for students to begin incorporating formal vocabulary that they find interesting into their own mental databases, so that they can draw on this information, both consciously and unconsciously as

they complete other work. Daily sketching assignments also provide an easy way to take attendance in a large class to make sure people are showing up. Without these sketching exercises, quizzes might be necessary to make sure people attend the participatory lectures in a large class. By sketching, students begin to make the information presented their own. They will get practice at sketching (which would be especially helpful in schools like the University of Washington where undergrads typically take history before they are officially part of the program, and need to submit a portfolio to get into the program).

The final assignment for the class I taught this semester was a photo essay, based on a field trip we took to a local landscape. This was meant to encourage students to think about how they can combine imagery and text to narrate the history of a site, its design, and how its design has been received. I provided students with a variety of primary and secondary sources they could use to explore the original design intent, the reception to it, and some of the changes made on the site over time. Students were also given a lecture on earthworks that explained Bayer's place in a lineage of other designers and land artists and in developing their essay, they were encouraged to talk about this. Highly graphic presentations with captions are a common form of writing in the field of landscape architecture that is often ignored in academia. There is a certain amount of skill involved in framing photos and making sketches so that they tell stories about a design and its history. And there is also skill involved in writing short descriptions that work with these pictures to tell stories. The assignment will get students to practice writing their ideas in a concise way and for those students with poor English language skills, it will give them an opportunity to really work hard on all their sentences and refine them in a way that might not be possible for them in a larger piece.

The assignment, and some of the readings that lead up to it will help students to think about how they might read the imagery they see in magazines and on blogs with an awareness of the way the imagery is used to make statements, and be aware that such imagery might not be telling the full story. Throughout the quarter, we will be looking at a number of photo essays by others, including parts of

Thomas Church's *Gardens are for People,* M. Paul Friedberg's *Play and Interplay,* and *Common Ground*, edited by William Cronon (which has a photo essay on the manufacturing of the natural experience at Niagara Falls). We'll look at how magazines like *Landscape Architecture* have used captions to provide a sort of cliffs notes version of a story for someone who is skimming the captions. And our first reading will involve looking at the photographs found in an article from *Landscape Architecture* that are framed in a way that is deceptive.

The photo essay will encourage students to use a format that is easy to understand to tell stories that are based in more rigorous research than your typical blog post. It will also let them practice the sort of concise captioning skills they might use on their own projects or on design competition boards.

Syllabus for Course Taught

ARC 498D/598D

Spring Quarter 2015

A Non-Chronological Survey of Historical Works of Landscape Architecture

Meets: Tuesdays and Thursdays, 3:30-4:50pm
Location: Gould 100

Instructor: Daniel Jost
Email: djost@uw.edu

Instructor of Record: Thaisa Way
Email: tway@uw.edu

Class Website: https://canvas.uw.edu/courses/980609

Office Hours (Jost): T/Th 5-6pm, Gould Café.
(Please let me know at the end of class if you want to talk. I am happy to hang around when needed. I will leave if no one shows up.)

Photo by Daniel Jost

Course Overview

Landscape architecture is a diverse field that encompasses a broad array of project types and design problems. This class will explore overarching themes and forms that can be traced through much of landscape architecture history. It will also examine specific design issues and project types that have a history of their own. The examples we study will mainly be 20th century examples from the United States, though we will also look at projects from other times and countries that are deeply rooted in the landscape architecture profession's collective memory.

Why, you might wonder, isn't this class organized chronologically? A non-chronological history course allows us to focus in on some of the special design challenges associated with certain types of projects—like play areas or memorials. It allows us to compare similar landscapes directly and see how subtle differences in their design and their social, ecological, and historical contexts may affect how they've been received. For example, we will explore why the treeless American piazzas of the 1960s and 1970s were often viewed as failures and ripped out after a very short time when many apparently similar Italian piazzas have persisted for centuries and some more recent American examples are considered to be successes.

Objectives

By the end of this course, students should be able to:

- explain various ways that studying historical landscapes has value for designers today
- demonstrate an understanding of some of the specialized vocabulary used for describing landscapes
- identify influences on the design of past landscapes, and different ways these landscapes have been received
- thoughtfully engage in debates about how design and programming influences performance
- explore how different historical, social, and ecological contexts may have impacted how landscapes performed
- identify certain influential projects by name when discussing what might be learned from those sites
- create a visual essay that uses thoughtfully composed imagery and captions to describe a work of landscape architecture
- employ lessons learned when creating and defending your own designs

Organization and Requirements

STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES

- Regular attendance and active engagement in class
- Completion of readings before the appropriate class
- Quality and timeliness of all assignments
- **Academic honesty** The University takes the offenses of cheating and plagiarism very seriously. Plagiarism is representing the work of others as your own without giving appropriate credit to the original author(s). If you are unsure, ask.

SUMMARY OF REQUIRED ASSIGNMENTS

- Weekly Reading Reflections
- Participation in Classroom Discussions
- Sketchbook from Lectures
- Sketch/Photo Essay based on Saturday Field Trip (Date and location to be discussed during the second class.)

Grading

- Weekly Reading Reflections (10 total): 50%
- Participation (Discussions/Sketchbook): 30%
- Field Trip and Photo Essay: 20%

Reading reflections that are not turned in when due will have 0.5 points out of 4.0 deducted (So you start with a 90%). The class depends on all students actively participating and completing assigned readings prior to each class. Late photo essays will lose 0.1 point on a 4.0 scale for each day they are late.

Course Content

READINGS

All readings for the class will be available on the class website. Students are encouraged to buy Elizabeth Barlow Rogers textbook. Students are also encouraged to print the readings, mark them up, and bring copies to class. Readings are to be completed prior to the class period they are associated with, and students should be prepared to talk about the readings in class. Every effort has been made to carefully select pages within the readings so that they focus on the topics being considered. However, in some cases, material that is not necessarily relevant to the week's discussion is mixed in with relevant material on a single page. Where the readings (from Rogers especially) are exploring subjects that are outside of the week's theme, feel free to skim those parts, as you would if you were writing a research paper on the week's subject. There is currently no history of landscape architecture textbook that is organized around what people might learn from historic sites, and Rogers has been used as a primary text because it allows the instructor to quickly introduce some projects and ideas and to provide imagery. Finding reliable, brief, image filled sources on many of these subjects is difficult.

Students are encouraged to time and report back to the instructor on how long the readings are taking each week. Small changes to the syllabus with regards to the readings may be made during the course. There are no quizzes, exams, or large research papers for this class. Please take advantage of this and spend about 5 hours each week reading and reflecting on your reading.

READING REFLECTIONS

Reflections that engage the assigned readings for that week should be completed prior to the beginning of class on Thursday. These reflections should be 400-500 words and strive to be specific rather than abstract. They should not just be simple opinion statements about what you liked (for example: "I like how James Rose talked about getting rid of the axis"). Instead, consider how specific things in the readings might be of value for your current studio project or other design projects (for example had you never pondered some specific way an axial landscape might be experienced or some specific way that concerns about the homeless have affected design?). Show connections between different readings, and/or areas where readings conflict. With each week's readings, there are a number of prompts related to what you will be learning in that class. You can choose to

respond to some of that week's prompts or make your own observations and connections not related to the prompts. Note that the readings, including those written by the instructor, are not to be considered as the ultimate authority on a subject, but have been chosen with the understanding that they will be pulled apart and examined.

Metrics for Evaluating Reading Reflections

- Do reflections mention at least three of the week's readings? (On weeks where there is a discussion section, at least two of the readings must be from the discussion class).
- Do they quote from the readings or paraphrase them?
- Do they show a comprehension of the material that they focus on?
- Do reflections make connections between readings, critically examine one reading using another, or critically examine one reading using the student's previous experience?
- Is the writing clear and original?

LECTURES AND CLASS PARTICIPATION

Students are expected to attend all classes and participate in discussions of the course material. Some classes will have short lectures followed by open ended discussion of readings. Some classes will be "participatory lectures." For these classes, the instructor will develop a lecture with associated imagery that covers the much of the class period; however he will ask questions at regular intervals to engage students in the material. In the participatory lectures, students may be asked to identify landscapes featured in their readings for that day based on an image of the space that appears on the screen or to explain some issue or idea they've learned about. There will occasionally be in-class activities that are meant to reinforce ideas in the readings and lectures.

SKETCHING/NOTES

Students should take all their notes for the class in a sketchbook, specifically designated for this class alone. **During each class, students must make at least one simple sketch of something they see in the lecture slides that find interesting or inspiring** so that they can begin to internalize the form or design solution shown. (Additional sketching will not be required, though it is encouraged). Time will be set aside in some cases so that students may sketch a relationship or detail. Sketchbooks/notebooks will be collected twice during the semester—on the Thursday of the 4th and 9th weeks, and will be given points based on whether students are showing up and engaging the course content through sketching. Sketches will not be assessed based on the quality of the drawings. Notes will just be examined by the instructor to see what people are latching onto and what seems to be interesting them.

SATURDAY FIELD TRIP AND SKETCH/PHOTO ESSAY

The Seattle Area is home to a number of masterpieces of 20th century landscape architecture. During the first week of class, the students and the instructor will collectively decide on one or more landscapes that they are interested in visiting and will be asked to note what Saturdays they are available. We will then visit and explore the site(s) together, possibly with a guest speaker, on a Saturday. You will sketch the site and photograph it. I will bring copies of a couple of readings about the project, which we will read on site. And then you will be asked to create an illustrated essay that uses imagery and short blurbs to talk about some of the ideas discussed in the readings and that you observe. The purpose of the assignment is to explore how combining imagery and short blurbs can be used to narrate the history of a site, its design, and how its design has been received. The assignment is meant to get you thinking about how photos can be used to promote ideas and represent experience, as well as how photos found in blogs and magazines can be deceptive—creating visions of a site that are much different than the reality. Each essay must include an introductory blurb between 150 and 400 words and a minimum of 15 original images (including a site plan, at least two sketches analyzing detail or section, and 3-5 images that show a specific sequence you've moved through within the landscape). Each image should be associated with a blurb or caption of 1 to 4 sentences. At least 5 references must be made to the readings provided on the site or some other reliable source found by the student. All text and images should be uploaded to the class blog within a week of the field trip. Students will get feedback on the photo essay and will be able to resubmit. All photo essays must be turned in by June 2nd.

Metrics for Evaluating Sketch/Photo Essay

- Are illustrations created and combined with text in a way that helps make a point about design or reception?
- Does the essay capture major design moves and issues related to reception as expressed by the readings?
- Are the descriptions descriptive—do they use specific language and ground ideas in design moves rather than making abstract statements about the designers' intent? (For example, instead of saying that the designers sought to make a design grounded in natural systems, you might explain how they created 30 foot wide setbacks alongside a river that

would allow it to move freely as material was scoured from one area and deposited in another).
- Does essay expand on readings using student's own powers of observation and analysis?
- Are the images and captions original? Is the writing clear and concise?

REQUIRED TEXTS / TOOLS
- Elizabeth Barlow Rogers (2001) ***Landscape Design: A Cultural and Architectural History of Landscape Architecture***. New York: Harry Abrams.
- Reader – Electronic version on the class website: https://canvas.uw.edu/courses/980609

DISCLAIMER
During the quarter, there may be changes to the schedule as needed. Some readings, ideas, films, guest lecturers and projects presented in this course may challenge the opinions, experiences and/or beliefs of some individuals. Please remember that this course is an open forum in which we challenge assumptions and practice critical thinking, as well as respect for all voices and tolerance of diverse views.

COURSE CALENDAR

Week 1: The Value of History and the Importance of Context

Tuesday, March 31st: How do designers learn from historical precedents? (Group Brainstorming Activity, Discussion of Class and Assignments, Short Presentation on various ways landscape architects in have learned from historical landscapes.)

Thursday, April 2nd: Different lenses for viewing the landscape, the importance of understanding different contexts and the sometimes deceptive nature of imagery (Discussion)

Class will begin with a discussion of this week's readings. What are some different ways that people perceive the same landscape? What are some of the contexts that affect how a landscape performs? How can the imagery that appears with stories be deceptive? What sorts of things should we consider when evaluating the credibility of sources? We will collectively choose what influential work of landscape architecture in Seattle to visit. Finally, we'll discuss what subjects students are interested in learning about in the final weeks of class.

- Meinig, D.W. "The Beholding Eye: Ten Versions of the Same Scene" in *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes,* edited by J.B. Jackson and D.W. Meinig. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979. Pages 1-9.
- Madden, Kathy. "One Day, Two Paris Parks." *Landscape Architecture.* February 2006.
- Jost, Daniel. "Letter to the Editor." *Landscape Architecture.* April 2006.

Week 2: Integrating Buildings into the Landscape

Tuesday, April 7th: A Short History of the Axis—Different Types, Experiences, and Meanings *(Participatory lecture)*

What meanings have been associated with the axis? How have designers copied and alluded to historical landscapes to make different sorts of statements? How are different sorts of axial designs experienced differently? How have designers created the element of surprise in axial landscapes? And what did early 20th century designers learn by measuring gardens and comparing the plans and their experiences?

- Rogers p. 28 (Axis Mundi), 40-41 (Queen Hatshepsut's Temple, Egypt), 47-48 (Avenue of the Dead, Mexico), 51 (Pueblo Bonito, Arizona), 84 (House and Garden of Octavius Quartio, Ancient Rome), 90-95 (Hadrian's villa, Ancient Rome), 133-145 (Bramante and the Rediscovery of Axial Planning: Gardens of Sixteenth Century Italy—Villa Giulia, Villa D'Este, Villa Lante), 112-114 (Mughal Tomb Gardens), 159 (Louvre—caption and image only), 168-178 (Le Notre's work—skim and focus on images—you will read more about his work in the Weiss reading), 291-293 (Forbidden City,

China), Rogers 385-388 (The Influence of Italy in England and America—Charles Platt, Edith Wharton), 229-230 (L'Enfant's plan for Washington, DC), 368-371 (The City Beautiful and the McMillan Plan)
- Hubbard, Henry V. "Note Taking in Italian Gardens: Villa Gamberaia" *Landscape Architecture.* January 1915.
- Weiss, Allen S. "Vaux-le-Vicomte" in *Mirrors of Infinity: The French Formal Garden and 17th Century Metaphysics.* New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1995. Pages 33-51. (2 pages per sheet and lots of images).

Thursday, April 9th: Modernist Ideas about Integrating House and Garden (Participatory lecture)

What led designers to seek out new ways of relating the house and the garden between the 1920s and 1950s? What are some of the methods they experimented with?

- Steele, Fletcher. "New Pioneering in Garden Design." *Landscape Architecture.* April 1930.
- Rose, James. "Freedom in the Garden." *Pencil Points.* October 1938. (Reprinted in *Modern Landscape Architecture: A Critical Review.* Pages 68-71.)
- Greg Bleam. (1993) "Modern and Classical Themes in the Work of Dan Kiley," MLA pp. 220-239
- Church, Thomas D. *Gardens are for People, Third Edition.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983. Pages 182-186 (Donnell Garden), 202-203 (Martin Residence at Aptos).

Week 3: Screening and Opening Views, Zoos, and the Influence of Terrorism on Landscape Design

Tuesday April 14th: Screening and Opening Landscape Views—What is hidden and what's revealed? *(Participatory lecture followed by a Quick Site Visit to Rainier Vista and Nine Spaces, Nine Trees)*

How might we read a landscape by looking at what views/functions are celebrated and what views/functions are hidden? What strategies have designers used to open up expansive views in different sorts of landscapes? How has an 18th century technology been repurposed in the modern zoo? The lecture will also touch briefly on efforts to obscure suicide barriers through design.

- Rogers 118-123 ("Walled Cities and Walled Gardens in the European Middle Ages"), 127-131 (Petrarch and Villa Medici at Fiesole), Rogers 166-167 (Le Notre's Infinite View), 168-170 (scan images only), 287-288 (Ji Cheng's Garden Manual—borrowed scenery and moon gates), 307-308 (Shugakuin Rikyu), 226-229 (Middleton Place and Mount Vernon)
- Ackerman, James. "The Early Villas of the Medici," in The Villa: Form and Ideology of Country Houses." Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990. Pages 67, 70-71 (images of Early Medici Villas); 74-78 (On Views and Lack of Defensive Architecture at Villa Medici Fiesole—many images).
- Horace Walpole, "The History of the Modern Taste in Gardening (1771)," in *The Genius of Place,* edited by John Dixon Hunt and Peter Willis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988. Pages 313-314. (First two paragraphs only… see image in Church's reading.)
- Church Thomas in *Gardens are for People, Third Edition.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983. Pages 16-17 ("How to Enjoy Land You Don't Own"), 21, 59 ("Screen a Seasonal Garden")
- Coe, John Charles. "The Genesis of Habitat Immersion in Gorilla Exhibits, Woodland Park Zoological Garden and Zoo Atlanta, 1978-88." Unpublished, 1989. Published 2006 at: http://joncoedesign.com/pub/PDFs/GeneisHabitatGorilla1989.pdf. Pages 1-8.

Thursday, April 16th: Fighting Terrorism on Two Different Levels: Against Bombs and Fear (Part Lecture/Part Discussion)

What is the influence of terrorism on landscape design? How have designers sought to sustain normality while preventing attacks? What do zoo design and efforts at preventing terrorism have in common? To what extent does FEMA's reference manual for mitigating terrorist attacks against buildings reflect similar thinking?

- Blumenauer, Earl. "Taking the Public Hostage: Do unsightly makeshift barriers in our nation's capital mean that terrorists are winning another battle?" *Landscape Architecture.* September 2002. (continues)

- Mays, Vernon. “Invisible Barriers: After getting by for too long with makeshift security arrangements at the Washington Monument, the National Park Service has embarked on a plan to do something more permanent—and more dignified.” *Landscape Architecture.* September 2002.
- Enlow, Claire. “Design is the best defense: at the U.S. Courthouse in Seattle, the landscape is the first layer of security.” *Landscape Architecture*. August 2005.
- The Department of Homeland Security. “Site and Layout Design Guidance” in *FEMA 426, Reference Manual to Mitigate Potential Terrorist Attacks against Buildings.* December 2003. Pages 2-1 to 2-59. (Note the odd page numbering system… text is large and there are lots of charts/illustrations).

Weeks 4-5: Nature as Muse

Tuesday, April 21st: Degrees of Naturalness Part: Natural Aesthetics as Muse (Participatory lecture)
How have some designers of landscapes drawn on the aesthetic qualities of nature by representing, concentrating, and abstracting its aesthetics? How have representations of scenic landscapes informed landscape design? And how has the design of certain nature-inspired landscapes been affected by the mediums landscape designers use in their design process?

- Rogers 282-287 (Introduction to Chinese gardens), 290-291 (Garden of the Master of the Fishing Nets), 293-294 (Yi He Yuan), 295-297 (Intro to Japanese Garden design and Shinto Shrines), 299-302 (Saiho-ji, Kinkaku-ji, Ryoan-ji), 234-257 (18th century English Picturesque—skim, focusing on this week’s topic), 378-380 (The Victorian War of Styles and the Wild Gardens of William Robinson), 427-430 (Jens Jensen). 444-447 (Roberto Burle Marx)
- Horace Walpole, The History of the Modern Taste in Gardening (1771), in *The Genius of Place,* edited by John Dixon Hunt and Peter Willis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988. Pages 314-316.
- Knight, Richard Payne. “The Landscape, a Didactic Poem,” in *The Genius of Place,* edited by John Dixon Hunt and Peter Willis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988. Pages 342-350.
- Danadjieva, Angela. “Seattle’s Freeway Park: Danadjieva on the Creative Process.” *Landscape Architecture.* September 1977. Pages 399-406.

Thursday, April 23rd: Meanings Associated with Native and Exotic Plants (Part Lecture/Part Discussion)

Is the movement of plants from region to region a modern phenomenon? What are some arguments that have been made historically for using native plants? How has using native plants been seen as an expression of democratic values and anti-imperialism, as well as nativism and racism? Is the language used to talk about native plants problematic?

- Grese, Robert E. “Introduction.” *The Native Landscape Reader*, edited by Robert E. Grese. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011. Pages 3-22.
- Gleason, Kathryn. “Porticus Pompeiana: A new perspective on the first public park of ancient Rome.” *Journal of Garden History.* 1994. Pages 13 (name/historical context of project), 19 (plane trees as spoils of war), 20-21 (images)
- Rogers 315-316 (Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew)
- Jensen, Jens. *Siftings.* 1939, reprinted 1990. Pages 17-24 ("Art has its Roots in the Soil"), 44-60 ("Our native Landscape"), and 61, 78-79 (Selection from "Compositions”).
- Marx, Roberto Burle. “A Garden Style in Brazil to Meet Contemporary Needs: With Emphasis on the Paramount Value of Native Plants.” *Landscape Architecture Magazine.* July 1954. Pages 200-208
- Oudolf, Piet and Noel Kingsbury. *Planting: a New Perspective.* Portland, Oregon: Timber Press, 2013. Pages 18-19, 73-75 (On using native and exotic plants).
-

Tuesday, April 28th: Going with the Flows? Towards Design with Natural Systems for Social Goals *(Participatory lecture)*

How have some designers sought to preserve natural vegetation and systems within developed areas? How have they sought to create spaces that perform both ecological and social functions? How have some natural looking landscapes failed to function in a systematic way or continued to require extensive maintenance in order to maintain that function? What might we learn from

these spaces? What problems might be associated with simply drawing lines around areas based on observable natural features in a landscape and preserving those features? How can changing social goals and ownership within an ecologically-oriented community diminish its functionality over time?

- Rogers p. 160 (Image of Seine River, 1734), 492-493 (Ian McHarg)
- Podolak, Kristen, ET. al. "Designing with Nature? The persistence of Capability Brown's 18th Century Water Features." *Landscape Journal.* Volume 32, Number 1, September 2013. Pages 51-64 (Read summary/conclusions and skim technical explanations as interested).
- Spirn, Anne Whiston. "Constructing Nature: The Legacy of Frederick Law Olmsted" in *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature,* edited by William Cronon. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1996. Pages 91-113 (Yosemite, Niagara Falls, Biltmore, The Boston Fens), 161-167 ("Album: Sublime Nature"—imagery that goes with Spirn's piece.)
- Jost, Daniel. "Back from the Beach." *Landscape Architecture.* June 2010 Pages 74-89 (Revisiting John O. Simond's environmental planning at Pelican Bay more than 30 years later)
- Jost, Daniel. "The Soft Solution." *Landscape Architecture.* October 2011. (Revisiting the First San Diego River Improvement Project, a multi-use flood control project from the early 1980s).

Thursday, April 30th: The Three Magnets: Desire for a Hybrid between City and Country Living (Part Lecture/Part Discussion)

Is escaping the city a modern phenomenon? What has historically attracted people to the city and the country? How have people sought to hybridize city and country life? How did Olmsted seek to bring a more country-like atmosphere into dense urban areas? What are some of the characteristics of early suburbs like Riverside that are similar to 19th century parks? How were their inspirations similar? To what extent were their designs meant to serve similar purposes? How do Howard's garden city idea and Olmsted's plan for Riverside differ from many modern suburbs? What are some of the social benefits people were trying to create by making cul-de-sacs?

- Pliny the Younger. "Letter to Gallus," Book 2, Letter 17 in *The Letters of the Younger Pliny,* translated by Betty Radice. Baltimore, Maryland, 1969. Pages 75-79. *(Elites escaping cities in Ancient Rome.)*
- Ackerman, James. "The Early Villas of the Medici," in *The Villa: Form and Ideology of Country Houses."* Princeton, NJ: 1990. Pages 63-64, 73. *(Elites escaping the City in the Renaissance)*
- Rogers 267-268, 269-271 (Jefferson's Anti-Urban Attitude and His Escape at Monticello)
- Frederick Law Olmsted, "Public Parks and the Enlargement of Towns" (1871) http://www.fandm.edu/david-schuyler/ams280/public-parks-and-the-enlargement-of-towns. (Bringing the country to the city through parks and street tree planting).
- Rogers 348 (Riverside, Illinois), 404-406 (Garden City Movement), Rogers 413-416 (Le Corbusier's Radiant City)
- Howard, Ebenezer. "Garden Cities of To-morrow." *Garden Cities of To-Morrow* (London, 1902. Reprinted, edited with a Preface by F. J. Osborn and an Introductory Essay by Lewis Mumford. (London: Faber and Faber, [1946]):50-57, 138-147.

Week 6: Landscapes on Structure and the Troubles Adapting the Italian Piazza in the U.S.

Tuesday, May 5th: Landscapes on Structure—The roof garden and the green roof (Participatory Lecture)

What technological innovations have supported the green roof—quite literally in different periods? What are some of the different reasons that roof gardens have been used? What are some of the challenges of designing on structure? How have designers used these challenges as design inspiration or worked around them, not letting them dictate form? What is the difference between intensive and extensive roof gardens? How do sloped green roofs create additional challenges and how have people addressed them?

- Osmundson, Theodore. *Roof Gardens: History, Design, and Construction.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1999. Pages 9-33 (different uses of roof gardens), 112-127 (History of Roof Gardens), 41-43 and 50-53 (roof gardens used in historic landscapes), 132-134 (Rockefeller Center), 56-58 (Mellon Square), 92-95 (Kaiser Center)
- Yocom, Ken. "Gary Comer Youth Center." *Landscape Performance Series.* Landscape Architecture Foundation. Available at: http://landscapeperformance.org/case-study-briefs/gary-comer-youth-center#/project-team.
- Mcintyre, Linda. "*High Maintenance Superstar," Linda McIntyre, Landscape Architecture, August 2009. (Article on the Academy of Sciences Green Roof in San Francisco by SWA and the challenges of working on a green roof with a slope.)*

Thursday, May 7th: Troubles adapting the Italian Piazza in the U.S. during the Modern Period and Efforts to Make Greener and More Social Urban Spaces (Part Lecture/Part Discussion)

What function did historic piazzas serve? How did their context differ from the modernist piazzas? Examine Sasaki's design for Copley Square in the 1960s and the redesign of that space two decades later, as a result of a competition involving William H. Whyte. What were some of the changes made in an effort to make that space more people-oriented? Since the redesign of Copley Square, many piazza-like spaces have been greened in an attempt to bring them back to life and many new urban spaces, like Chicago's Millennium Park, the new Skyline Park, and Houston's Discovery Green have been notably greener. How is the reception to Portland's Director Park different? How do Director Park's context and design differ from piazzas typically considered to be failures, like Boston's City Hall Plaza? What unique design and construction details have contributed to the Success of Canada's Sugar Beach? How did the project build on lessons learned from a previous project involving the same firm?

- Newton, Norman. "The Piazza in Italy" in *Design on the Land.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press, 1971. Pages 132-153
- *Chabrier, Yvonne V. "The Greening of Copley Square." Landscape architecture.* November/December 1985. Pages 70-76.
- Thompson, J. William. "Land Matters: Can This Urban Plaza Be Saved? Should It Be?" *Landscape Architecture*. July 2008. (1 page on Boston City Hall Plaza).
- Jost, Daniel "This American Piazza. Director Park, a rather stark urban plaza, packs in people. In that regard, it succeeds where so many like it have failed." *Landscape Architecture Magazine.* April 2013. Pages 114-125.
- Jost, Daniel. "How Sweet: There's no swimming at Canada's Sugar Beach, but the crowds come anyway." *Landscape Architecture.* January 2013. Pages 62-75.

Weeks 7-8: Degrees of Publicness—Semi-Public Campuses and Public Parks

Tuesday, May 12th: Creating Campuses—Inside and Outside the City (Participatory Lecture)

What are some of the different ways that people have created campuses that are coherent, yet separated from their surroundings? How did the university campus inspire the designers of corporate campuses? How were open spaces at universities and corporate research centers created to encourage interaction and retreat? How have these spaces sought to accommodate both private and public users? How did Sasaki take the same ideas he was using in suburban corporate campuses and create a campus in Hartford, Connecticut's downtown?

- Rogers p. 271-3 (University of Virginia)
- Mozingo, Louise. "Pastoral Capitalism: A History of Suburban Corporate Landscapes." Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2011. Pages 1-3, 6-17 (General Intro), 21-27 (Reasons for Leaving Cities- A-bombs and space), 51-64 (Nela Park and Bell Labs-Olmsted Brothers), 86-90 (Ramo-Wooldridge), 112-136 (Connecticut General Life Insurance Company and John Deere Headquarters), 140-143 (Weyerhauser), 158-161 (The first office parks), 195-197 (Google) (Note: All pages are fairly light on text, heavy on images and white space)
- Osmundson, Theodore. *Roof Gardens: History, Design, and Construction.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1999. Pages 47-49: Constitution Plaza- Sasaki Associates- completed 1964-interesting example of public plaza as

elevated podium connecting buildings—first of its type constructed—constructed to isolate insurance companies from city)

Thursday, May 14th: Degrees of Publicness—Towards and Away from the Public Park (Part Lecture/Part Discussion)

The places we think of as public parks emerged in the 19th century. Prior to that, however, there was a tradition of public use of privately owned spaces. What might we learn by examining these spaces about the design and use of privately owned, publicly accessible space? What led to the creation of the first public parks in the 19th century and how public were these places really? How did their designs both isolate them from the city and encourage a reading of them as public spaces? How were certain uses by the public limited in the name of the public good? How was the publicness of Central Park continuously threatened by private schemes and efforts to remake its spaces for the use of special interest groups? How did concerns about safety lead to the privatization and "militarization" of public space in the 1980s and 1990s? What forms did this lead to and what questions did it raise?

- Coffin, David R. "The 'Lex Hortorum' and Access to Gardens of Latium during the Renaissance." *Journal of Garden History, Volume 2, Number 3, Pages 201-232.*
- Rogers 318-319 (Derby Arboretum), 322-325 (Prince's Park, Birkenhead Park, and Crystal Palace Park), 329-330 (Andrew Jackson Downing's Advocacy for a public park in New York), 332-337 (Rural cemeteries as public spaces), 337-350 (Olmsted's public parks).
- French, Jere. (October 1971). "The First 'People's Park' Movement." *Landscape Architecture.* October 1971.
- Wheelwright, Robert. "The Attacks on Central Park." *Landscape Architecture.* October 1910. Pages 9-21.
- Gabriel, Nate. "The Work that Parks Do: Towards an Urban Environmentality." *Social and Cultural Geography.* Volume 12, Number 2, 2011. Pages 123-141.
- *Davis, Mike. "Fortress Los Angeles: The Militarization of Public Space in Los Angeles," in* Variations on a Theme Park.
- Thompson, J. William. "In Search of Public Space: An LA Forum explores the confusing mix of public and private spaces in Downtown Boston to debate the question: are people being served?" *Landscape Architecture.* May 2001.

Tuesday, May 19th: Concerns about Safety and People "Out of Place" (Part Lecture/Part Discussion)

How have concerns about safety, a desire to hide uncomfortable realities, and an interest in removing "undesirable users" like drunks and the homeless influenced the design and programming of landscapes? How has Bryant Park been rethought twice in an effort to drive out undesirable users? Why did the effort to design out the drunks and old men in Sacramento backfire? What were the different approaches taken at McCauley Square, Runyon Canyon, and Lafayette Square? Are concerns about homeless in public space concerns about safety?

- Wheelwright, Robert. "Notes: Small Parks." *Landscape Architecture.* April 1919. 2 pages *(Designing the drunks out of Tunnel Park in Hartford)*
- Wheelwright, Robert. "The Design of Playgrounds in Small Parks." *Landscape Architecture.* July 1927. Pages 281-286. *(Proposal to redesign Bryant Park to make it more formal and trim up bushes in an effort to earn respect of its users).*
- *Thompson, J. William. The Rebirth of Bryant Park.* Washington, DC: Spacemaker Press, 1997. Pages 7-34.
- Sommer, Robert and Franklin D. Becker. (January 1969). "The Old Men in Plaza Park: Inept City Effort to Design Out the Drunks Backfires in Sacramento." *Landscape Architecture.* January 1969. Pages 111-113.
- Mozingo, Louise. "The Homeless in Urban Parks: Is Exclusion the Solution?" *Landscape Architecture.* 1994. Page 112.
- Marcus, Clare Cooper. "Unexpected Company." *Landscape Architecture.* June 2003. (Lafayette Square by Walter Hood)

Thursday, May 21st: Pedestrian Malls, Transit Malls, and Lifestyle Centers (Part Lecture/Part Discussion)

What is the difference between a pedestrian mall, a transit mall, and a lifestyle center? What led many cities to create pedestrian and transit malls from the late 1950s through the early 1980s? How are these places similar and different in form, context, and management? What led to many pedestrian and transit malls being perceived as failures? Can we see any patterns concerning the landscapes' contexts and their management that could be related to how they've been received? What traits do we see in pedestrian malls and transit malls that were successes? How have even some of the more successful projects been adjusted over time? How might the cultural milieu during the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s have affected the way these spaces were perceived?

- Carlson, David. "The pedestrian mall: its role in the revitalization of downtown areas." *Urban Land.* Volume 22, Number 5, May 1974. Pages 3-9.
- "Wondering about pedestrian malls." *Urban Land*. Volume 43, Number 7, July 1984 July. Page 40.
- Stern, Julie D. "From lackluster pedestrian mall to lively streetscape." *Urban Land.* Volume 50, Number 11, November 1992. Pages 8, 10.
- Greenbury, Brad. "Letters: Rethinking the Fulton Mall." *Landscape Architecture Magazine.* February 2015. Page 10.
- Macek, Steve. *Urban Nightmares: The Media, the Right, and Moral Panic over the City. 2006. Pages i-xvii.*
- Jost, Daniel. "Mall Brawl." *Landscape Architecture Magazine.* October 2008. (Main Street Mall in Charlottesville, VA)
- Jost, Daniel. "Changing Lanes." *Landscape Architecture Magazine.* April 2013. (Portland Transit Mall)
- Jost, Daniel. "Shopping's New Clothes." *Landscape Architecture Magazine.* August 2010. (The Domain and La Canterra and the rise of lifestyle centers—some of which look a lot like pedestrian malls.)

Week 9: Specialized Spaces in the Public Realm—Designing for Rowdy Play and Quiet Reverence

Tuesday, May 26th: Creating Playscapes for Children—Changing notions of safety and the value of play as drivers of design (Part lecture/Part Discussion)

What led to the creation of special play areas for children in the late 19th century? How have concerns about safety influenced the design of playgrounds over time? How did M. Paul Friedberg and Richard Dattner, two of the most influential playground designers of the 1960s and 1970s, view playground design similarly and differently? To what extent did each conceive of the playground as a place for all ages? How did their ideas about safety and how children play inspire their innovative designs? How did public participation influence their design processes? How might Dattner's writing on Adventure Playground in Central Park be used as a model by other designers looking to tell the story of their work? Does a project write up have to be entirely positive for it to inspire people to hire you? How have Central Park's playgrounds from the 1960s and 1970s been redesigned in recent years in an effort to meet modern standards? How is Teardrop Park similar to and different to the Dattner and Friedberg's work? What different values does it espouse?

- Cleveland, Horace William Shaler. "Influence of Parks on the Character of Children (1898)," republished in *The Native Landscape Reader*, edited by Robert E. Grese. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011. (2 pages)
- Friedberg, M. Paul and Ellen Perry Berkeley. *Play and Interplay.* New York: McMillan Company, 1970. Pages 35-47 (On evolution of his own playground work as he came to understand how children play… mostly text/large font), 48-89 (full page images with captions), 161-163, 167 (On mixing of ages at playgrounds…mostly text/large font), 168-185 (full page images with captions).
- Dattner, Richard. "Adventure Playground- A Case History." *Design for Play*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1969. Pages 65-91 (heavily illustrated).
- Jost, Daniel. "Resurrecting the 'Adventure-style' Playground." *Landscape Architecture Magazine.* March 2010 (*Recent work to redesign two of Central Park's "Adventure-style" playgrounds to meet ASTM, CPSC, and ADA.)*
- Frost, Nick. "Chapter 8: History of Playground Safety in America" in *Play and Playscapes,* Albany, NY: Delmar, 1992. Pages 191-209
- Hines, Susan. "Abstract Realism: At Teardrop Park in Battery Park City, all the park's a playground." *Landscape Architecture.* February 2007.

Thursday May 28th: Commemorating and Memorializing (Part Lecture/Part Discussion)

How have designers celebrated events and leaders in the landscape? How have they sought to remember great tragedies? How do different sorts of traumatic events tend to be commemorated differently in the U.S.? What are some of the different ways memorials have been designed? How has a shift toward memorial spaces in many cases provided different opportunities for experience? How do meanings and design opportunities change based on where the memorial is located? How have the artifacts of tragedies been incorporated into memorials? Should memorials seek to cheer us up or create a somber atmosphere? How might they allow meanings to change over time as communities heal? What aspects of memorial designs have been controversial? How have some designers sought to work with various interests to guide the design process?

- Rogers 331-332 ("The Commemorative Landscape"—Mid-19th Century), 498-499 (Vietnam Veterans Memorial)
- Steele, Fletcher. "Worthy Memorials of the Great War. *Landscape Architecture.* January 1920.
- Elwood, Jr., P. H. "American Soldier Cemeteries in France." *Landscape Architecture.* July 1920
- Foote, Kenneth E. *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy, Revised and Updated.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003. Pages 1-35 (Introduces how different sorts of traumatic events have tended to be commemorated differently in the U.S.),114-122 (Bunker Hill), 42-47 (McKinley Memorial in Buffalo by Daniel Burnham), 85-92 (New London, Texas School Explosion of 1937; Collinwood, Ohio Elementary School—Garden in footprint of burned school- 1908); 90-96 (meaning in placement of memorials), 337-340 (recent spate of memorials)
- Lyndon, Donlyn. "The Place of Memory" in *Spatial Recall: Memory in Architecture and Landscape*, (Marc Treib, editor) [PAGES TK]
- Thompson, J. William. "Land Matters." *Landscape Architecture.* July 2009. (1 page)
- Olin, Laurie. "The FDR Memorial Wheelchair Controversy and a 'Taking Part' Workshop Experience." Pages 183-197

Week 10: Students' Choice (Turn in Revised Photo Essay in Class on June 2nd)

Choice A: Solar Planning On and Off the Grid

- Rogers 69-70 (Miletus), 75-83 (Ancient Hellenistic and Roman urbanism/cardo and decumanus) , 297 (Grid in China and Japan), 221-226 (Law of the Indies, Philadelphia, New Haven, Savannah), 229-230 (Washington, DC), 267- 268 (The National Grid- Jefferson), 345-346 (New York's grid)
- Butti, Ken and John Perlin "A Golden Thread: 2500 years of Solar Architecture and Technology." New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1980. Pages 1-27, 159-171
- Francis, Mark. "Village Homes: A Case Study in Community Design." *Landscape Journal.* Volume 21, January 2002. Pages 23-40

Choice B: Planned and Unplanned Suburban Development in the U.S.

- Rogers 417-422 (Radburn and Usonia), 459-461 (Levittown), 477-481 (New Urbanism)
- Shurtleff, Flavel. "The English Town Planning Act of 1909." *Proceedings of the Second National Conference on City Planning and the Problems of Congestion, Rochester, New York May 2-4, 1910.* Boston: National Conference on City Planning, 1910):178-182.
- Way, Thaisa. "New Projects and New Horizons." *Unbounded Practice.* Pages 222-253*. (Cautley's work on Sunnyside, and Radburn)*
- Kaplan, Sam Hall. "Summerlin: A master-planned community of 25 'villages' in the Las Vegas Valley." *Urban Land.* Volume 53, Number 9. September *1994.* Pages 14-18.
- Duany, Andres, Elizabeth Plater-Zyberk, and Jeff Speck. *Suburban Nation.* Chapter 1.

Option C: Importing Water as a Medium for Design (This Could Potentially Be Expanded to Two Classes--One focused on fountains and another focused on swimming pools and interactive features.)

- Rogers 103-111 (Islamic Gardens in Spain and Kashmir)

- Sullivan, Chip. “Book IV: Water,” in *Garden and Climate.* San Francisco: McGraw-Hill, 2002. Pages 191-246.
- Johnson, Jory. “Presence of Stone.” *Landscape Architecture.* July/August 1986 (Tanner Fountain)
- Jost, Daniel. “Water Less: *this seaside garden in Southern California offers lessons for Southern Californians looking to lower water use in their gardens*.” *Landscape Architecture.* April 2009. Pages 110-117.
- See Slideshow of Water Features on Class Website.

Option D: Design in Cultural Landscapes (This Could Potentially Be Expanded to Two Classes—One on Working with Former Industrial Sites and One on Parks and Gardens)

- Rogers 470-476 (Covers some basics—mentions Williamsburg).
- Lynch, Kevin. *What Time is this Place?* Boston: MIT Press, 1972. [PAGES TK.]
- Osmundson, Theodore. *Roof Gardens: History, Design, and Construction.* New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1999. p. 77-78 (Ghirardelli Square).
- Way, Thaisa, “Under the Sky: Landscapes of industrial excess: A thick sections approach to Gas Works Park.” Journal of Landscape Architecture (JOLA) Vol. 8.1 (Spring 2013): 28-39.
- Walmsley, Anthony. “The First Historic Landscape Report for the Ravine.” *Landscape Architecture.* September/October 1983. (Prospect Park Restoration plan)
- Kunst Vavro, Lisa A. and Patricia O’Donnell. “Historic Landscape Preservation Deserves a Broader Meaning.” *Landscape Architecture.* January 1981.
- Birnbaum, Charles. “Preface: Sharp Angles or Curves? You Decide,” and “Preserving Contemporary Landscape Architecture: Is Nothing Permeant But Change Itself?” in *Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture: Papers from the Wave Hill-National Park Service Conference.* Washington, DC: Spacemaker Press, 1999. Pages 4-8.
- Jost, Daniel. “Degrees of preservation: three residential landscapes by Thomas Church face challenges under new ownership.” *Landscape Architecture*. January 2009. Pages 30, 32-41.
- Jost, Daniel. “What Lies Beneath?” *Landscape Architecture.* October 2008.

Option E: Planting with and Against Nature

- Rogers 380-383 (Gertrude Jekyll), 390-391 (Norah Lindsay).
- Hobhouse, Penelope. “The Origin and Development of French Formality” in *Gardening through the Ages: An Illustrated History of Plants and their Influence on Garden Styles—from Ancient Egypt to the Present Day.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992. Pages 163-189
- Rehmann, Elsa. "An Ecological Approach" Landscape Architecture (July 1933). Pages 239-245.
- Page, Max. “The Unnatural History of Natural Disaster.” *Journal of Planning History*. Volume 2, Number 4, November 2003, Pages 356-361 (A book review of three books including *Republic of Shade: New England and the American elm).*
- Bassuk, Nina, Peter Trowbridge, and Carol Grohs. “Visual Similarity and Biological Diversity: Street Tree Selection and Design.” Available at: http://www.hort.cornell.edu/uhi/outreach/pdfs/visually_compatible_trees.pdf.
- Oudolf, Piet and Noel Kingsbury. *Planting: a New Perspective.* Portland, Oregon: Timber Press, 2013. Chapters 1-2. (Massing Plants vs. Intermingled Planting).

Option F: Pushing Boundaries: Avante Garde Landscapes and Land Art

- Rogers 408-413 (Gaudi), 436-442 (1920s France and Fletcher Steele),447-449 (Luis Barragan), 487-493, 495-500 (Land Art and Parc de la Villette)
- Eckbo, Garrett. *Landscapes for Living.* 1950 (Bottle Garden)
- Beardsley, John. “Earthworks: The Landscape after Modernism.” Pages 110-117.
- Johnson, Jory. “Presence of Stone.” *Landscape Architecture.* July/August 1986 (Tanner Fountain)
- Johnson, Jory. “Martha Schwartz's 'Splice Garden': a warning to a brave new world.” *Landscape Architecture.* July/August 1988. Pages 100, 102, 104.
- Mays, Vernon. “A well-bleached solution: how backroom decisions usurped an open public process - and drained the life from a scheme resplendent with color.” *Landscape Architecture*. July 2001. Pages 28, 30, 32, 34-35.

- Marcus, Clare Cooper. “Can there be too much seating? A day spent observing Jacob Javits Plaza reveals many seats, few takers.” *Landscape architecture*. February 2007. Pages 132, 129.
- Padua, Mary G. “A fine red line: design tests the boundary between art and ecology.” *Landscape Architecture*. January 2008. Pages 90-99.
- CMG Landscape Architecture. “The Crack Garden” and “Panhandle Bandshell.” ASLA 2009 Professional Awards. Available at: http://www.asla.org/2009awards/330.html and http://www.asla.org/2009awards/315.html.

Other modules that could easily be developed based on student interest: 1. Landscapes of Burial: The Evolution of Cemeteries, Crematoria, and Green Burial; 2. Educating the Public about Plants and other purposes of the Botanical Garden; 3. Siting Sculpture and Designing Sculpture Gardens; 4. Creating Parks on Contaminated Sites and Landfills; 5. The Landscape Architect and the Freeway—Designing Parkways, Reconnecting Neighborhoods Bisected by Freeways, and Creating Land Bridges for Ecological Purposes; 6. Making the Desert Bloom with Less Water; 7. The History of Landscape Architecture as a Profession; 8. National and State Parks as Design Problems; 9. An Additional Lecture on Children’s Playgrounds. 10. An Additional Lecture on Memorials. 11. A more biographical lecture looking at Frederick Law Olmsted or Lawrence Halprin, meant to better understand these pivotal figures in the history of the profession and how their career and work evolved over time. 12. Remediating Former Mines and Mining as Design Process. 13. New Technologies, Materials, and Social Functions as Design Inspiration. 14. Artful Accessible Design. 15. A grab bag of interesting projects not connected by any theme that gives people an idea of what other areas are out there that we didn’t get to.

Possible video for last week: *Maya Linn: A Strong Clear Vision (1994): On the competition to design the Vietnam Veteran’s Memorial*

Reflections

The survey of historical landscapes I've created is a first step toward a historical survey class that is more focused on the aspiring designer and their needs. It is undoubtedly imperfect, and will require tweaking as I see what is working and what is not. As noted, I taught the class during the spring of 2015 at the University of Washington. I encouraged open dialogue between myself and the students, in an effort to learn what was working and what wasn't working as well. Around the middle of the semester, I asked students to provide me their reflections on what they felt was going well with the class and what was not going as well and how it might be improved. This was done anonymously, and was modeled on a similar approach used by landscape architecture professor Lynne Manzo in her Landscape Theory class at the University of Washington. Reflecting on the experience, I was able to identify a few issues.

Students Generally Seemed to Appreciate the Thematic Organization

Most of the students volunteered that they liked the thematic nature of the class. The "themes based organization really worked for me," one student noted. Another noted: "I like that the classes are grouped by subject."

However one student told me that while she really liked how it highlighted themes, she felt she was missing an understanding of lineage between landscapes taught in the different classes, which she wanted to understand. She suggested it would be a good idea if there was a sort of graphic expression of the landscapes in the class—either provided to students or that they created—that would show the order of things. Having the students create a graphic like that sounds intriguing, and is similar to an activity that Professor X uses. If I was to do it in the class, I think I would need to spend some more time talking about lineage as an issue and about how we know things are connected, so that students didn't just start making connections of lineage between things that did not necessarily grow out of one

another. For example, while I think teaching the Forbidden City alongside the Villa Lante allows us to see there are some really interesting parallels between East and West, trying to show the hereditary relationship between them would seem to be problematic. Frankly, even with Western landscapes, it would be hard to establish direct lineage in many cases where it is not mentioned in the reading materials provided. Looking at Walter Hood's design for Lafayette Park, it sure seems like he was probably inspired by the earthworks movement, but one would need to have documentation to know this for sure or to know what specific work(s) may have inspired him.

Another issue that was raised was how themes in a single week related to one another. I think having two themes in one week when I was only having one reading reflection confused a couple of people into thinking I wanted them to make connections between the two themes. This can probably be explained easily enough at the beginning of the class. I think that it will be important to explain to people that I don't expect them to make links between playgrounds and memorials, for example, just because I put them in the same week (though they can try to make connections if they see them!).

The thematic organization I've created may not be ideal for everyone. I'm not sure it would be the best sort of history class to inform cultural landscape managers about period of significance, for instance. But it did seem to engage both the designers and non-designers in the class.

The Practical Time-Related Realities of Teaching and Writing a Thesis Were a Challenge

One of the biggest issues was the time involved in creating a history class. I was initially naïve about the amount of time class preparation would take up each week—particularly the first time I taught a class. I easily spent 40 or 50 hours per week working on the class. This is something students seeking to undertake similar projects might want to consider.

I typically spent much of a day each week just locating, scanning, and posting the reading material I'd assigned for the following week. I wanted to provide full color scans for students that would

allow them to understand the imagery—as I know from experience how frustrating it can be when you are trying to learn about something with a strong visual component like landscapes from poor quality black and white photocopies. However, scanning in color and at a decent quality so I could add the images to my slides added to the amount of time spent scanning significantly, as compared to making black and white scans or photocopies. Luckily, all of these scans are now available if I wanted to teach the same material again.

I spent about 5-8 hours a week carefully reading the readings I'd assigned, printing out copies of them and marking them up. I timed myself to see how long the readings would take and if the amount of readings in each week was going over what students would expect given the number of credits assigned. I looked for any unexplained information that students would need to be given the context for. And I noted questions I might be able to ask about as part of our participatory lectures. Some of this time seems to be a "startup" issue. Now that I have made notes and underlined on my copies, this should save a lot of time if I was to teach the same material again. I won't need to time how long the readings are taking again.

Creating the participatory lectures took 15 to 30 hours apiece, depending how much I was lecturing and how much of the lecture was discussion. It often involved doing additional readings in an effort to fit in new landscapes and perspectives that were not covered in the readings because I could not find a reading that would cover them well. Finding imagery that could be used to talk about certain design issues was often difficult. For a while I was trying to use only images that had creative commons licenses or were available in the public domain, and I was trying to provide proper attribution for all the imagery, which clearly added additional time to this effort. Now that I have this foundation to build off, I would be in a much better place if I was to teach this material again. I would still spend time reworking these slides and updating them as I find new information.

The amount of time I spent grading papers was variable. I spent between 5 minutes and 30 minutes on each of the weekly reading reflections—depending on how well they were written, and whether there was some odd interpretation of the readings that I had to track down and make sure I was not improperly marking off. Grading the reflections and putting the grades into canvas typically took around 2 hours a week. The photo essays took on average about 40 minutes apiece to grade.

The class included a few events that were not weekly. It took the better part of a day to set up all of my assignments on Canvas. The field trip took about 15 hours of preparation and 10 hours for the trip itself. This included emailing people who could talk to the class, preparing plans for the day, organizing transportation, and getting essays and articles that students could read about the site and photocopying them. This would likely take a similar amount of time in future classes organized in this manner.

While teaching the class was challenging, it was doable. I generally felt competent regarding the information I was presenting. However, the amount of time I spent preparing for the class led me to push back much of the writing work on my thesis, at least initially. This situation is similar to the way that many academics are pulled between their teaching and their research. And if I am to be successful as an academic, I will need to be more realistic in understanding the amount of time it takes to do certain types of teaching, and the need to preserve time for other activities. If I hope to create good quality research as a professor, I will need to set aside more time for this aspect of my work.

Given the time constraints I was facing in this first round of teaching the class. I probably should have had fewer participatory lectures and more discussion sections based around the readings I'd assigned. This would have allowed me to spend less time corralling imagery. I also probably should have had students lead discussion sections, at least in this initial round of teaching, in order to give myself more time to work on the written parts of my thesis. This was not initially done for a few reasons: In many student-led discussion sections I had been in as a graduate student, people spent much of the

time talking about their own abstract opinions rather than grounding things in the material we'd read. On the other hand, I had really enjoyed my research methods class with Bob Mugerauer where he had more actively led all the discussions himself to make sure the important parts of the material were brought out. The way I had organized the classes also seemed to require that I teach for at least part of most of the classes. I was introducing material from multiple periods, instead of just one, I still needed to figure out exactly how I would order the class and how much context I would provide. Having such unknown variables made me nervous about setting specific times for the amount of discussion in each class. Looking back, it probably would have been better to have students lead some discussion sections. Inviting a guest lecturer or two might have been a way of cutting back the amount of time I would have to spend preparing.

The time spent corralling imagery that highlighted spaces suggests an online resource where faculty from various programs could share their imagery might be helpful. It seems like finding imagery was often a very time consuming process, and images of certain materials and views one would want to teach a place are not always available. By sharing imagery, faculty would be able to show landscapes they had not visited themselves and that aren't widely photographed or aren't photographed from the desired angle. This would be particularly helpful for landscapes that have been removed for one reason or another and that are difficult to get to.

The Time Spent Needed for Readings

At the beginning of the class, I encouraged students to time the readings and let me know how long they were taking; however no one took me up on this the first week. So, throughout the quarter, I timed how long it would take me to read each of the readings myself. And in a few of the weeks, the amount of time spent reading was more than the 5 hours I had told students I expected them to spend on readings each week (based on the class being 3 credits and having a field trip/photo essay). This was

particularly clear in Week 4, when we discussed how nature is filtered through art, myth, and design mediums to create naturalistic landscapes. I took about 8 hours on those readings—the Rogers reading alone took 5 hours—and a couple of students mentioned the amount of time needed for the readings as an issue that week. However, when I asked one of those students what reading she would cut, she told me she wasn't sure because they were all good. In a semester system I might expand this theme over two class periods. It might also make sense to raise the number of credits for the class, at least in a quarter system. The class was taught as a 3-credit class because it was not going to include a term paper and provide writing credit as the 5-credit histories at the University of Washington do.

On Participatory Lectures

There was a lot of participation in the class. People seemed to be doing the readings even on the days they were not submitting a reflection. I would frequently ask students to identify images of landscapes in class, and while I would often get silence, usually someone would eventually volunteer an answer. I heard from some of the students that they liked how I was asking them questions to have them try to recall information. One student told me that even if there was silence, he preferred that I asked the question. There was also a lot of good discussion related to the readings. Students would talk about the landscapes in the readings and compare them to landscapes they were more familiar with as they were seeking to understand them.

I tried to use a small number of slides and rest on a few slides for a while, following Ethan Carr's approach. And apparently this was working. One student commented to me that she had really appreciated the way I moved through slides to allow for sketching. She told me my timing was perfect.

Some issues with Assessment of Historical Knowledge

If students are taking only one required history course, I don't think the methods of assessment I initially proposed are adequate. I received a number of thoughtful reading reflections that should both critical thinking and an understanding of the sites. However, as noted in earlier sections, one of the issues with teaching a landscape architecture history class is how little students already know about landscape architecture as a field and the vocabulary regarding landscape architecture. Because students are writing the reflections before we talk about subjects, there was occasionally some issues with misunderstanding of terminology. The Week 10 reading responses were probably the most problematic. A number of students were confused about the meaning of the term "adventure playground."

There is no problem with this if the reflections are being used to make sure students are participating in reading. However, this made the reflections more problematic than I had realized they would be as a means of assessing what students knew and their ability to think critically. In many cases, I would see some incorrect information on a paper or misunderstanding of terminology that we covered in class the day the reflection was turned in and I knew that in class, the student had had that aha moment and had come to understand what they had written was incorrect already. One way of easing this problem may lie in getting ahead of it by sending out a vocab sheet with some of the specialized vocabulary that is not defined. But I think I would cut down the percentage of the grade that involves these reflections.

Also, the Photo Essay, was problematic in certain ways. Students clearly enjoyed taking a field trip and documenting a site. But I should have created a model of the photo essay for students that would have shown how it could be done in a way that was more historical. I had hoped to have students describe the landscape and some sort of movement through it, talk about its place in history, the reception to the project, and how it had changed over time rather than providing their own critique. I even provided primary sources on Herbert Bayer's intentions for the Mill Creek Canyon earthworks, the

site we were visiting, that they could include. But while some students seemed to have understood my intentions, many were apparently confused. I think the metrics for evaluating the photo essay may have added to the confusion. While the need to discuss design intent and reception was written in the project description. It was not clearly written in the metrics. Any confusion students may have had was probably not helped by the fact the first student to post on the blog had not done the assignment as I'd expected and most others did not post until the last minute. While students were allowed to revise the essays, this was more problematic than with a traditional essay, because if the students did not have their imagery to make the points they wanted to make from the field trip we took, it was going to be more difficult for them to alter. I wonder if providing the readings I provided on the field trip site earlier and having them discuss them in the class before we visited the site would have encouraged people to read the site in a more historical way. I'm not convinced the photo essay as a format doesn't have potential for historical narrative, however I can see how it might confuse students to be more focused on form. And I'm not sure I would recommend it as a tool for assessment in a history class again without experimenting with it myself as a writer in a more in depth way. Testing and term papers have drawbacks but they may be better suited to assessing historical knowledge and history writing skills.

I might use the photo essay in another class, like a studio. I would likely change the method of submittal based on students' feedback. I would definitely not have students post their illustrated essays to WordPress, as students felt it was "fussy," and I found it difficult to grade. I had hoped that by working in this space, there would be a more studio-like atmosphere where students saw each other's work and improved their own, but that didn't seem to happen, perhaps because of the programs' fussiness.

Moving Forward

The landscape architecture history class has often been taught by whoever is available to teach it. As noted above, Dianne Harris has argued that the required landscape architecture history class should be taught by someone who has a Ph. D. or equivalent experience. Based on my experience teaching a history class, I would similarly argue that it is not a class that can be taught by just any faculty member. Even with my experience writing about historic landscapes and historic landscape architects, I frequently felt underqualified to talk about certain things—particularly ancient history.

When I was searching for an image of the Hanging Gardens of Babylon, for instance, just to mention it quickly as part of a larger class on landscapes on structure, I soon fell into a wormhole of historic documentation that contradicted some of Theodore Osmundson's account in his history of roof gardens. Osmundson repeated the British archaeologist Leonard Wooley's idea that the Ancient Mesopotamians planted trees on the landings of their ziggurats (Osmundson 112). Wooley believed that the perforations he found at regular intervals in the structure were signs of drainage (Dalley 6). However, according to the historian Stephanie Dalley, this argument has fallen out of favor. Dalley notes that recently discovered representations of the ziggurats suggest that they were not actually planted with trees or bushes (Dalley 6). She argues that "Quite apart from the structural problems of planting large plants to grow on a mud-brick tower, and the mechanical problems of raising water so high, it would have been almost impossible to supply them enough water without washing away the mud brick tower" (Dalley 7).

In the end, I know this exploration has a number of shortcomings and I think many of them are based on the fact I did this project with limited input from others. Rather than trying to put together a history course that crosses time by oneself, it might be better to have a team of people who have specialized knowledge in different periods or regions working together. In retrospect, after I'd created my framework, rather than teaching a whole history class, I think my time would have been better spent

creating parts of it and more rigorously getting feedback on those from people with different backgrounds.

While I agree with Harris, I also agree with Ward Thompson and Aspinall that the history of landscape architecture should not be left to the historians. Designers and historians should work together to create histories that are both rigorous and relevant to modern work. We cannot expect history to provide simple universal answers, but by examining the past, we can learn lessons that can help us to make more informed decisions in the present. I hope the work I have done can be built on by others. There are undoubtedly issues with it. However, I hope it can provide a good first step.

List of Interviews and Syllabi Obtained Through Interviews

Carr, Ethan. “History of Landscape Design.” Handout. October 2010. Print.
Carr, Ethan. Personal Interview. 21 May 2014.
Carr, Ethan. Personal Interview. 9 June 2015.
Leighton, Ron. Personal Interview. April 14, 2010.
Professor W. “Syllabus.” Handout. Spring 2012. Print.
Professor W. “Syllabus.” Handout. Fall 2012. Print.
Professor W. Personal Interview. 6 May 2014.
Professor X. “Syllabus.” Handout. Spring 2011. Print.
Professor X. Personal Interview. 23 May 2014.
Professor Y. Personal Interview. 29 May 2014.

Bibliography

Ackerman, James. *The Villa: Form and Ideology of Country Houses*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990.

American Society of Landscape Architects. "Learn What Landscape Architects Do." American Society of Landscape Architects, n.d. Web. 6 June 2015.

American Society of Landscape Architects. "Notes & Numbers." Handout. May 2012. Print.

American Society of Landscape Architects. "ASLA 2009 Professional Awards." n.d. Web. 8 February 2015.

American Society of Landscape Architects. "ASLA 2010 Professional Awards." n.d. Web. 1 June 2015.

American Society of Landscape Architects. "ASLA 2011 Professional Awards." n.d. Web. 1 June 2015.

American Society of Landscape Architects. "ASLA 2012 Professional Awards." n.d. Web. 1 June 2015.

American Society of Landscape Architects. "ASLA 2013 Professional Awards." n.d. Web. 1 June 2015.

American Society of Landscape Architects. "ASLA 2014 Professional Awards." n.d. Web. 1 June 2015.

Anderson, Christy. "Writing the Architectural Survey: Collective Authorities and Competing Approaches." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*. Volume 58: Number 3 (1999): 350-355. Print.

Anderson, Stanford "Architectural History in Schools of Architecture." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*. 58.3 (Sep., 1999): 282-290. Print.

Anderson, Stanford. "Historiography and Architecture I." *Journal of Architectural Education*. 44.3 (1991): 130-130. Print.

Attoe, Wayne and Charles W. Moore. "Prologue: On Mining History." *How Not to Teach Architectural History*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Architectural Education*. 34.1 (Autumn 1980). Print.

Bassuk, Nina, Peter Trowbridge, and Carol Grohs. "Visual Similarity and Biological Diversity: Street Tree Selection and Design." Urban Horticulture Institute at Cornell University. n.d. Web. 6 June 2015.

Betts, Richard. "Historical Determinism, or Historical Precedent Be Damned." *How Not to Teach Architectural History*. Spec. issue of *Journal of Architectural Education*. 34.1 (Autumn 1980). Print.

Birnbaum, Charles. *Preserving Modern Landscape Architecture: Papers from the Wave Hill-National Park Service Conference.* Washington, DC: Spacemaker Press, 1999. Print.

Birnbaum, Charles and Stephanie S. Foell, editors. *Shaping the American Landscape: New Profiles from the Pioneers of American Landscape Design Project.* Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2009. Print.

Bleam, Greg. "Modern and Classical Themes in the Work of Dan Kiley." *Modern Landscape Architecture: A Critical Review.* Ed. Marc Treib. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1993. Print.

Blumenauer, Earl. "Taking the Public Hostage: Do unsightly makeshift barriers in our nation's capital mean that terrorists are winning another battle?" *Landscape Architecture.* September 2002: 140, 139. Print.

Boults, Elizabeth and Chip Sullivan. *Illustrated History of Landscape Design*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2010. Print.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. "What Landscape Architects Do." Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2014-15 Edition. n.d. Web. 22 May 2015.

Butti, Ken and John Perlin. *A Golden Thread: 2500 years of Solar Architecture and Technology.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1980.

Carlson, David. "The Pedestrian Mall: Its role in the revitalization of downtown areas." *Urban Land*. Volume 22, Number 5, May 1974.

Church, Thomas. *Gardens are for People, Third Edition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983. Print.

Coe, John Charles. "The Genesis of Habitat Immersion in Gorilla Exhibits, Woodland Park Zoological Garden and Zoo Atlanta, 1978-88." Unpublished, 1989. Web. 5 March 2015.

Coffin, David R. "The 'Lex Hortorum' and Access to Gardens of Latium during the Renaissance." *Journal of Garden History*, 2.3 (1982): 201-232. Print.

Cornell University. "John S. Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines." N.d. Web. 8 June 2015.

Chabrier, Yvonne V. "The Greening of Copley Square." *Landscape Architecture*. November/December 1985: 70-76. Print.

Cleveland, Horace William Shaler. "Influence of Parks on the Character of Children (1898)." *The Native Landscape Reader*. Ed. Robert E. Grese. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011. Print.

Dalley, Stephanie. "Ancient Mesopotamian Gardens and the Identification of the Hanging Gardens of Babylon Resolved." *Garden History*. 21.1 (Summer 1993): 1-13.

Danadjieva, Angela. "Seattle's Freeway Park: Danadjieva on the Creative Process." *Landscape Architecture.* September 1977: 399-406. Print.

Davis, Mike. "Fortress Los Angeles: The Militarization of Public Space in Los Angeles." *Variations on a Theme Park.* Ed. Michael Sorkin. New York: Hill and Wang, 1992: 154-180.

Dattner, Richard. *Design for Play*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1969. Print.

Department of Homeland Security. "Site and Layout Design Guidance" in FEMA 426, Reference Manual to Mitigate Potential Terrorist Attacks against Buildings. December 2003. Web. 10 Mar 2015.

Eckbo, Garrett. *Landscape for Living (1950).* Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2009. Print.

Enlow, Claire. "Design is the best defense: at the U.S. Courthouse in Seattle, the landscape is the first layer of security." *Landscape Architecture.* August 2005: 44, 46-49. Print.

Elwood, Jr., P. H. "American Soldier Cemeteries in France." Landscape Architecture. July 1920: 165-171.

Ferguson, Kirby. "Embrace the Remix." TED. August 2012. Web. 4 March 2015.

Francis, Mark. "Village Homes: A Case Study in Community Design." *Landscape Journal.* 21.1 (January 2002): 23-41.

Foote, Kenneth E. *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy, Revised and Updated.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003. Print.

Friedberg, M. Paul and Ellen Perry Berkeley. *Play and Interplay*. New York: McMillan Company, 1970. Print.

Frost, Nick. *Play and Playscapes*. Albany, NY: Delmar, 1992. Print.

Gabriel, Nate. "The Work that Parks Do: Towards an Urban Environmentality." *Social and Cultural Geography. 12.2* (2011): 123-141. Print.

Gleason, Kathryn. "Porticus Pompeiana: A new perspective on the first public park of ancient Rome." *Journal of Garden History.* 4.1 (1994): 13-27. Print.

Greenbury, Brad. "Letters: Rethinking the Fulton Mall." Landscape Architecture Magazine. February 2015: 15. Print.

Grese, Robert E., Ed. *The Native Landscape Reader*. Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011. Print.

Harris, Dianne. "What History Should We Teach and Why? A Historian's Response." *Landscape Journal.* 16.2 (Fall 1997): 191-196. Print.

Hatt, Michael and Charlotte Klonk. *Art History: A Critical Introduction to Its Methods.* New York: Manchester University Press, 2006. Print.

Hines, Susan. "Abstract Realism: At Teardrop Park in Battery Park City, all the park's a playground." *Landscape Architecture.* February 2007: 94-103. Print.

Hobhouse, Penelope. *Penelope Hobhouse's Gardening through the Ages: An Illustrated History of Plants and Their Influence on Garden Styles—from Ancient Egypt to the Present Day*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992. Print.

Howard, Ebenezer. *Garden Cities of To-Morrow*. London: Faber and Faber, 1946.

Hubbard, Henry V. "Note Taking in Italian Gardens: Villa Gamberaia." Landscape Architecture. (January 1915): 57-66. Print.

Jellicoe, Geoffrey and Susan. *The Landscape of Man: Shaping the Environment from Pre-History to the Present Day*. New York: Viking Press, 1975. Print.

Jensen, Jens. *Siftings.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1990. Print.

French, Jere. (October 1971). "The First 'People's Park' Movement." *Landscape Architecture*. October 1971: 25-29. Print.

Johnson, Jory. "Martha Schwartz's 'Splice Garden': a warning to a brave new world." *Landscape Architecture*. July/August 1988: 100, 102, 104. Print.

Johnson, Jory. "Presence of Stone." *Landscape Architecture*. July/August 1986: 64-69. Print.

Jost, Daniel. "Back from the Beach." *Landscape Architecture*. June 2010: 74-89. Print.

Jost, Daniel "Back to the Source." *Landscape Architecture Magazine.* April 2011: 102-117. Print.

Jost, Daniel. "Changing Lanes." *Landscape Architecture Magazine*. April 2013: 102-113. Print.

Jost, Daniel. "Degrees of preservation: three residential landscapes by Thomas Church face challenges under new ownership." *Landscape Architecture*. January 2009: 30, 32-41. Print.

Jost, Daniel. "How Sweet: There's no swimming at Canada's Sugar Beach, but the crowds come anyway." Landscape Architecture. January 2013: 62-75. Print.

Jost, Daniel. "Letter to the Editor." *Landscape Architecture.* April 2006. Print.

Jost, Daniel. "Mall Brawl." *Landscape Architecture.* October 2008: 60, 62-71. Print.

Jost, Daniel. "Resurrecting the 'Adventure-style' Playground." *Landscape Architecture*. March 2010: 44-63. Print.

Jost, Daniel. "Shopping's New Clothes." *Landscape Architecture.* August 2010: 64, 66, 68-70, 72, 74, 76-78, 80-81. Print.

Jost, Daniel. "The Soft Solution." *Landscape Architecture*. October 2011: 170-179. Print.

Jost, Daniel “This American Piazza. Director Park, a rather stark urban plaza, packs in people. In that regard, it succeeds where so many like it have failed.” *Landscape Architecture Magazine*. April 2013: 114-125. Print.

Jost, Daniel. “Water Less: this seaside garden in Southern California offers lessons for Southern Californians looking to lower water use in their gardens.” *Landscape Architecture.* April 2009: 110-117. Print.

Jost, Daniel and Linda McIntyre. “Looking Back.” *Landscape Architecture*. October 2010: 22-197. Print.

Kaplan, Sam Hall. “Summerlin: A master-planned community of 25 'villages' in the Las Vegas Valley.” *Urban Land.* 53.9 (September 1994). Print.

Knight, Richard Payne. “The Landscape, a Didactic Poem,” in The Genius of Place, edited by John Dixon Hunt and Peter Willis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988. Print.

Kunst Vavro, Lisa A. and Patricia O’Donnell. “Historic Landscape Preservation Deserves a Broader Meaning.” *Landscape Architecture*. January 1981: 53-55. Print.

Lewis, Pierce. “Research and Teaching in the Study of Ordinary Landscapes.” *What Do We Expect to Learn from our History?* Ed. Daniel Joseph Nadenicek and Eliza Pennypacker. State College, Pennsylvania: Center for Studies in Landscape Architecture History at The Pennsylvania State University. 1996. Print.

Lynch, Kevin. *What Time is this Place?* Boston: MIT Press, 1972.

MacDonald, Eric. “Land 2510 / Edes 6550 — History of the Built Environment Syllabus.” Fall 2011. Web. 6 June 2015.

Macek, Steve. *Urban Nightmares: The Media, the Right, and Moral Panic over the City*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2006.

Madden, Kathy. “One Day, Two Paris Parks.” Landscape Architecture. February 2006: 128, 126-127. Print.

Marcus, Clare Cooper. “Can there be too much seating? A day spent observing Jacob Javits Plaza reveals many seats, few takers.” *Landscape Architecture*. February 2007: 132, 129. Print.

Marcus, Clare Cooper. “Unexpected Company.” *Landscape Architecture.* June 2003: 68-75. Print.

Marx, Roberto Burle. “A Garden Style in Brazil to Meet Contemporary Needs: With Emphasis on the Paramount Value of Native Plants.” *Landscape Architecture*. July 1954: 200-208. Print.

Mays, Vernon. “A well-bleached solution: how backroom decisions usurped an open public process - and drained the life from a scheme resplendent with color.” *Landscape Architecture*. July 2001: 28, 30, 32, 34-35. Print.

Mays, Vernon. “Invisible Barriers: After getting by for too long with makeshift security arrangements at the Washington Monument, the National Park Service has embarked on a plan to do something more permanent—and more dignified.” *Landscape Architecture.* September 2002. Print.

Mcintyre, Linda. “High Maintenance Superstar.” *Landscape Architecture.* August 2009: 74-79. Print.

Meinig, D.W. “The Beholding Eye: Ten Versions of the Same Scene.” The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes. Eds. J.B. Jackson and D.W. Meinig. New York: Oxford University Press (1979): 33-48. Print.

Miller, E. Lynn. (1996). “Symposium Welcome.” *What Do We Expect to Learn from our History?* Ed. Daniel Joseph Nadenicek and Eliza Pennypacker. State College, Pennsylvania: Center for Studies in Landscape Architecture History at The Pennsylvania State University. 1996. Print.

Mosser, Monique and Georges Teysott, editors. *The History of Garden Design: The Western Tradition from the Renaissance to the Present Day*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1990. Print.

Mozingo, Louise. *Pastoral Capitalism: A History of Suburban Corporate Landscapes.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2011. Print.

Mozingo, Louise. “The Homeless in Urban Parks: Is Exclusion the Solution?” *Landscape Architecture*. 1994: 112. Print.

Nadenicek, Daniel Joseph. (1996). “Stone Soup: Thoughts on Historiography of Landscape Architecture.” In Joseph Nadenicek and Eliza Pennypacker (Eds). *What Do We Expect to Learn from our History?* State College, Pennsylvania: Center for Studies in Landscape Architecture History, The Pennsylvania State University. Print.

National Park Service. “Profiles in Preservation: Norman T. Newton, Landscape Architect.” n.d. Web. 2 June 2015.

Newton, Norman T. *Design on the Land.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press, 1971. Print.

Oudolf, Piet and Noel Kingsbury. *Planting: a New Perspective*. Portland, Oregon: Timber Press, 2013. Print.

Olmsted, Frederick Law. “Public Parks and the Enlargement of Towns.” 1871. Web. 15 April 2015.

Osmundson, Theodore. *Roof Gardens: History, Design, and Construction*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1999.

Padua, Mary G. “A fine red line: design tests the boundary between art and ecology.” *Landscape Architecture.* January 2008. Print.

Page, Max. “The Unnatural History of Natural Disaster.” *Journal of Planning History.* 2.4 (November 2003). Print.

Pliny the Younger. “Letter to Gallus,” *The Letters of the Younger Pliny.* Trans. Betty Radice. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1969.

Podolak, Kristen, et. al. “Designing with Nature? The persistence of Capability Brown’s 18th Century Water Features.” *Landscape Journal*. 32.1 (September 2013): 51-64.

Rehmann, Elsa. "An Ecological Approach" Landscape Architecture (July 1933). Print.

Riley, Robert B. "What History Should We Teach And Why?" *Landscape Journal*. Volume 14, Number 2 (1995): 220-225. Print.

Rogers, Elizabeth Barlow. *Landscape Design: A Cultural and Architectural History*. New York: Abrams, 2001. Print.

Rose, James. “Freedom in the Garden.” *Pencil Points*. October 1938: 639-643. Print.

Shurtleff, Flavel. "The English Town Planning Act of 1909." *Proceedings of the Second National Conference on City Planning and the Problems of Congestion, Rochester, New York May 2-4, 1910.* Boston: National Conference on City Planning, 1910. Web. 3 February 2015.

Sommer, Robert and Franklin D. Becker. “The Old Men in Plaza Park: Inept City Effort to Design Out the Drunks Backfires in Sacramento.” *Landscape Architecture*. January 1969: 111-114.

Spirn, Anne Whiston. “Constructing Nature: The Legacy of Frederick Law Olmsted.” *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*. Ed. William Cronon. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1996. 91-113. Print.

Sullivan, Chip. *Garden and Climate*. San Francisco: McGraw-Hill, 2002. Print.

Steele, Fletcher. “New Pioneering in Garden Design.” *Landscape Architecture.* April 1930: 158-177. Print.

Steele, Fletcher. “Worthy Memorials of the Great War. *Landscape Architecture*. January 1920: 57-64. Print.

Stern, Julie D. “From lackluster pedestrian mall to lively streetscape.” *Urban Land*. 50.11 (November 1992). Print.

Turner, Tom. *European Gardens: History, Philosophy, and Design.* New York: Routledge, 2011.

Thompson, Catharine Ward, and Peter Aspinall. "Making the past present in the future: the design process as applied history." *Landscape Journal*. 15.1 (1996): 36-47. Print.

Thompson, J. William. “In Search of Public Space: An LA Forum explores the confusing mix of public and private spaces in Downtown Boston to debate the question: are people being served?” *Landscape Architecture.* May 2001: 68-73, 88-91. Print.

Thompson, J. William. “Land Matters: Can This Urban Plaza Be Saved? Should It Be?” *The Dirt.* 25 June 2008. Web. 4 April 2015.

Thompson, J. William. “Land Matters.” *Landscape Architecture*. July 2009. Print.

Thompson, J. William. *The Rebirth of Bryant Park.* Washington, DC: Spacemaker Press, 1997. Print.

Upton, Dell. “Architectural History or Landscape History?” *Journal of Architectural Education*. 44.4 (1991): 195-199. Print.

Walmsley, Anthony. “The First Historic Landscape Report for the Ravine.” *Landscape Architecture*. September/October 1983. Print.

Walpole, Horace. “The History of the Modern Taste in Gardening (1771).”*The Genius of Place*. Eds. John Dixon Hunt and Peter Willis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1988. Print.

Way, Thaisa, “Under the Sky: Landscapes of industrial excess: A thick sections approach to Gas Works Park.” *Journal of Landscape Architecture*. 8.1 (Spring 2013). Print.

Way, Thaisa. *Unbounded Practice.* Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia Press, 2009. Print.

Weiss, Allen S. *Mirrors of Infinity: The French Formal Garden and 17th Century Metaphysics.* New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1995. Print.

Weiss, Robert. *Learning from Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1995. Print.

Wheelwright, Robert. “Notes: Small Parks.” Landscape Architecture. April 1919: 152-153. Print.

Wheelwright, Robert. “The Attacks on Central Park.” *Landscape Architecture.* October 1910: 9-21. Print.

Wheelwright, Robert. “The Design of Playgrounds in Small Parks.” Landscape Architecture. July 1927. Print.

Whyte, William Hollingsworth. *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces*. 1980.

Wilson, Richard Guy. “Clio Explicates: Divinity, Science, and Tales.” *What Do We Expect to Learn from our History?* Ed. Daniel Joseph Nadenicek and Eliza Pennypacker. State College, Pennsylvania: Center for Studies in Landscape Architecture History at The Pennsylvania State University. 1996. 31-46. Print.

“Wondering about Pedestrian Malls.” *Urban Land.* Volume 43, Number 7, July 1984. Print.

Yocom, Ken. “Gary Comer Youth Center.” Landscape Performance Series. Landscape Architecture Foundation. n.d. Web. 6 May 2015.