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The interrelationship between landscape and nationhood has been the focus of considerable interest and critique within a range of disciplines in recent years. The evolving form and style of landscape gardening within England during the eighteenth century, for example, has been linked to the emergence of the modern state (Pugh, 1990). Landscape provided a text in which values and aspirations might be inscribed, and a medium through which competing political ideologies might be expressed (Hunt, 1992). Colonial landscapes are also potent expressions of power and ideals. As JB Jackson (1997) demonstrated, the North American cultural landscape carries within it the legacy of the Jefferson’s political vision, whilst Australian and New Zealand landscapes have also been extensively shaped by a pastoral ideal carried out from Britain by eighteenth and nineteenth century colonial settlers (Park, 1995; Seddon, 1997). These histories continue to shape contemporary landscapes.

The processes of nation building and rebuilding, and of contests between competing versions of nationhood are not only historical phenomena. They continue to shape and be shaped by current landscapes. In this issue of Landscape Review two contemporary examples of the role of landscape in shaping cultural and political identity are examined. Ayala Misgav explores the intertwining of ideology and garden design during the period leading to, and following, the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948. Her focus is upon the need to recognise the heritage value of these relatively modern gardens. Misgav does not address the relationship of historic gardens to the continuing political tensions between Israel and the Palestinian people.

In the second article, Vieda Skultans addresses the role of landscape in the relationship between conflicting political systems more directly. She examines the way narratives of landscape continue to provide a locus of memory for Latvian people, despite a long period of Soviet occupation which attempted to erase the traces of nineteenth century nationhood.

A theme common to both articles, however, is the way in which gardens and landscape symbolise a productive ideal: whether it is expressed as the paradise garden in the desert, or as a pastoral vision of temperate agriculture. They are followed by two review essays. The first continues the theme of landscape and nationhood. Giselle Byrnes, ‘Boundary Markers’, examines the role of surveying in the European colonisation of New Zealand, and is reviewed by Jacky Bowring. The second review celebrates the work of an English landscape architect who epitomised the pastoral ideal of landscape in her work. Dame Sylvia Crowe is the subject of a recent monograph from the Landscape Design Trust, reviewed by Ken Taylor.
The work of the Landscape Design Trust is part of the legacy of Ken Fieldhouse, who died recently. Ken Fieldhouse was perhaps best known as the editor for many years of the English journal *Landscape Design*, and we pay tribute to his central role in promoting landscape scholarship and publication over the past decades.

REFERENCES