

## TRANSCRIPT

**SCRC Series:** Lewis Clarke Oral Histories Project – MC 00191

**Field Notes:** Linda Jewell (compiled May 4, 2012)

**Interviewee:** LINDA JEWELL

**Interviewer:** Yona R. Owens

**Interview Date:** Tuesday, May 1, 2012

**Location:** Raleigh, North Carolina to Berkeley, California via Skype

**Length:** Approximately 54 minutes

YO: Today is Tuesday, May 1, 2012. My name is Yona Owens and I'm interviewing Linda Jewell via Skype for the Lewis Clarke Oral Histories Project. In 1970, Linda graduated from the North Carolina State University School of Design in architecture. In 1975, she earned her master's in landscape architecture from the University of Pennsylvania. Her distinguished career in education, practice, and publication is well recognized. For instance, she received the Presidential Award in Communications for her ten years of construction articles in *Landscape Architecture* magazine, and in 2008 she was awarded the Jot D. Carpenter Teaching Medal. Since 1991, Linda has been a professor of landscape architecture and urban design at the University of California-Berkeley. She has been a fellow of the ASLA since 1994.

YO: Hello, Linda.

LJ: Hi, how are you?

YO: Fine, fine. To start us off tell me a little bit about where you're from and what kinds of interests you had as you were growing up.

LJ: Well, I was raised in Sanford, and my father and grandfather owned a construction firm. They had both studied engineering at NC State. So, I grew up around the construction industry, and designers, and architects so I had always had an interest in architecture, even though at the time it was not something that women were usually interested in. [Laughs]

YO: I can imagine. So, you were drawn to NCSU School of Design because your family had been there, I guess. Is that right?

LJ: Oh, yes. [Laughs] Yes. I was a third generation and there have been some after me.

YO: That's wonderful. Well, what kind of discrimination against women architecture students did you run into?

LJ: Oh, there was nothing—it wasn't so much blatant discrimination other than things like limited bathrooms [Laughs] and all of that. You just felt like such an odd duck, I think. There were certainly assumptions that you were not going to make it. There were assumptions that if you did that you were somehow not feminine. I had one, in my fourth year, an instructor call me

in, and say that he had only met three women that were good architects, and two of them he didn't consider women. [Laughs]

YO: Oh my gosh.

LJ: So, there were also on occasions issues of not so much direct harassment, but more attention than one might want from faculty and senior people that were around.

YO: What was your strategy in how to handle things like that?

LJ: Just to focus on my work, and I had really good relationships with my colleagues, my fellow students, and I think that was the most important thing, and those friendships have lasted a lifetime.

YO: Oh, that's wonderful.

LJ: I had always been, growing up, kind of one of the boys. Most of my friends in high school—I had two very close girlfriends, but I had a lot of close friends that were men when I was growing up in high school. I wasn't exactly a tomboy, but I was just very comfortable with male friends, and I think that helped me a lot, to be in a classroom full of men.

YO: Right.

LJ: One of the things I do remember, and it wasn't in the Design School, but we used to take some of our preliminary structures courses, engineering mechanics, down in Engineering, and I remember once having in that class—there was one other woman, and she had actually been my college roommate for awhile, who was still in architecture through the third semester as a classmate, and then she transferred out into math. So, we were the only two women in that class and there must have been over a hundred men, and you had to enter behind the instructor and the way the—I've forgotten, one of those engineering buildings. Of course, I had swimming the class beforehand so I was always late. I always had to enter this room with over a hundred men, and it was just a horrendous experience. [Laughs]

YO: Very self conscious.

**04:57**

LJ: So, I have memories of, you know, some of it has to do with being on the State campus more than it has to do with being in the School of Design.

YO: Really?

LJ: Because of just, you know, there were just so few women on campus. So, when you were out of the shelter of people that you knew well, that made it very awkward. I also had a couple of funny run-ins with Dean Kamphoefner. At the time—this is a good story—the dorm had opened, the one dorm with ninety women over at Watauga Hall, but we had to be in at 11:00 or you had to stay out all night. It was one or the other. They locked the doors. So, on charrettes sometimes I

would stay out overnight and then if I wanted to get a nap would go down—there was a woman's restroom down below with a little couch in it and I slept there. I had left my sheets on the couch [Laughs] and someone had turned them in to Dean Kamphoefner, and he called me, he put a note on my desk in my studio—it was in Bob Burns' studio—and I had to go in and sit and talk to Kamphoefner, and he had my polka dotted sheets with my nametag in them on his desk.

YO: Oh no. [Laughs]

LJ: I'd been up for nights and a little tear started coming down my eye as he was asking me what I was doing, and he didn't believe that I had to stay out all night.

YO: Really?

LJ: He called the dean of women. When I told him he said, that can't be. They wouldn't make a rule like that. I said they do. And he called the dean of women about it, and I remember him saying well, that's ridiculous, and slamming down the phone. And by that point the little tear was coming down my eye and then he thought that I thought that he was indicating something improper that I was doing, [Laughs] something unladylike.

YO: Right. [Laughs]

LJ: And he became all apologetic and concerned. [Laughs] So, there are lots of little stories. I think any woman in that period that was in the School has funny stories like that, but often what kept you going were the guys in your classes.

YO: Really?

LJ: And the few women that were around. But they usually weren't in your own class. They were above or below you.

YO: Right. Well, Lewis Clarke was still teaching when you first arrived. Did you have him for any studios or classes?

LJ: No, I didn't, but I did have him for critiques. At the time I was there in the second year you did a series of studios. Whatever your major you did at least half a semester in one of the other majors. So, I did half a semester in landscape architecture and I had Bob Phillips, who was an excellent teacher, and he had Lewis in on several reviews.

Also Roberto Burle Marx visited that semester and he came in and did critiques and talked to us in our studio. So, I was very well aware of Lewis as an architecture student, and after that studio, which I did well in, I remember—I guess he was chair at that point, but I remember he and Bob, and maybe Bob Moore was around too, they were all kind of mysterious faces. I didn't know them that well. I remember sitting in one of [their offices], and I think it was Lewis', and they were trying to convince me that I should study landscape architecture.

YO: [Laughs]

LJ: And I passed on it at that point.

YO: Right.

LJ: Anyway, I actually finished out the year as a product design major, and then went back in to architecture at the beginning of my third year.

YO: You changed over to product design?

LJ: Just briefly. [Laughs] The lure of Vince Foote. I had Vince Foote as an instructor as well during that series, and I thought, well, I think product design would be nice and visual design. It was a very colorful group, you know, that were teaching in there. So, that was very brief. I don't know if Vince even remembers I was briefly a product design major probably.

YO: I think that's news to a lot of people.

LJ: [Laughs] It didn't last long. By the beginning of third year, I was hurrying around trying to get back into a studio so that I wasn't out of sequence, so that I didn't lose any time.

YO: Well, I think we're all glad that you dropped product design and came back over to the architecture side of the house at that point. So, what I'm hearing here is that you had a little exposure to landscape architecture.

LJ: Yes, definitely.

**10:00**

YO: So, I know that when you graduated in '70 somehow you went through a transition or a meeting with people. I'm not sure. You'll have to tell me. How did you end up going to the University of Pennsylvania to get your master's in landscape architecture?

LJ: Wow. Well, it was kind of a sequence of things. After I graduated, my first job actually was with Ligon Flynn. He had at times just myself and at other times one other employee and we hung out in the ramp under Dick Bell's gallery out there. So, most of our work came in through Dick's office actually.

So, I became familiar with what was going on in that office and they were doing a lot of interesting work and there were a lot of colorful people, some of them teaching at State at that point, and that had started when I was in my fifth year. The whole time I was in architecture at State during that period, landscape architecture had a very high visibility within the total school. So, it was always kind of hanging out there as an interest. Partially because of some of the personalities I saw it as exciting. I was still primarily interested in architecture though. So, I worked for Ligon for about a year and then—

YO: What kind of projects did you work on?

LJ: Worked on Baldhead Island.

YO: It was that time at Bell's office then.

LJ: Yeah, and also on—not Baldhead Island, I'm sorry, Figure Eight Island.

YO: Right, right.

LJ: Baldhead was my own firm later. Worked on Figure Eight Island, worked on the Pawley's Island—when I was first hired, I did drawings for the Pawley's Island condominiums that Ligon was doing, and Dick had worked on that as well though that was primarily Ligon's project, and a couple of houses down at Figure Eight and in the Wilmington area. It was all kind of resort oriented work.

So, then I moved to Washington, D.C. and I worked for a couple of architecture firms there and one of them was a larger firm and there were a number of—there were two architects-landscape architects who had gone to Penn and we worked on a national competition for a corporate headquarters out in Colorado. It was an invited competition. These landscape architects-architects had started pulling out the soils maps and doing all of these things that I knew nothing about and I thought, ooh, there's a whole world here that I don't quite understand.

I had gone through that once before. In part of my fifth year I had done a studio over at Chapel Hill. It was a planning studio for a new town, and there had been a landscape architect who was doing his Ph.D. in planning on that team, and during that process he would pull out the soils maps and talk about the watershed, and how the hydrology was working, and it was all very mysterious to me. So, I was aware that there was this whole area of knowledge that was important to design that I didn't know about.

In my fifth year at State, I had heard McHarg speak, and I think anyone that ever heard him speak was moved to do something about the quality of our landscapes. So, McHarg was always there in my mind.

So, after working in Washington and just turning out construction drawings and getting a little bit bored, I began to think about going back to graduate school and I wasn't sure if I was interested in urban design or architecture or landscape architecture and I visited some schools. I considered going back to State to do my master's in architecture, but it seemed maybe it wasn't new enough for me. I visited Penn and I was both interested in Lou Kahn's studio and McHarg and the urban design program. McHarg had heard me in the office. I mean I now know this is his strategy, but just by happenstance, he got on the elevator with me as I went up to the urban design office and of course by the time I got off I was going to apply for landscape architecture.

[Laughs]

**15:10**

YO: [Laughs] Well, tell me some more about McHarg. He was a rather charismatic person, as I understand.

LJ: That's an understatement, and he had a really interesting relationship with Lewis. My contact with Lewis has been fairly askance. He's been there for a long time, but I never worked with him or had him as an instructor or anything like that. I'd just known him. Then when I did start at Penn, the first day when we do the go-around of where everyone was from, and they did the two-year people with background in architecture as a separate group from the three-year students, and all but one of my classmates were international students. It was right at the peak of *Design With*

*Nature* getting out into the world, and everybody wanted to come and study with McHarg, so it was a very, very impressive group of people, and they were all men. So, here I was, with my Southern accent, and I explained where I'd come from and what my background was, and the first thing McHarg says oh, well, you must know Lewis Clarke.

YO: Really? [Laughs]

LJ: Yes. I was very aware in all my contact with McHarg that Lewis had played a key role in his work. They went through a period where there was a conflict that I'm aware of, I never knew the details. It had something to do with one of the projects down on the coast, and I don't know the background on that. Ian would often get huffy about Lewis, but it was also very clear, and he very often said well, you know, he's the one that sort of got me started on this whole ecological analysis, and even in his biography he mentions that.

YO: Right.

LJ: That when he had Lewis come up to teach at Penn that was their first ecological inventory study, and the fact that Lewis had worked for Brian Hackett, and that Lewis then brought the thinking behind doing an ecological analysis to his work, and I guess Lewis had probably been teaching it and using it at State before Ian started at Penn. I don't know.

YO: Well, as I understand it Lewis was going around the country frequently visiting universities to describe the reconnaissance methodology and the overlay strategy, and he has said in the past that McHarg invited him up when the department was first getting started and they had given him three years to get the department back in line again since it had been kind of defunct for awhile.

So, he said he remembers that he and McHarg would talk about things, but that they never really discussed what Lewis discussed in his lectures or his presentations at Penn. But he said it wasn't very long after he stopped going up there—you know, he finished his semester of work and everything—it wasn't very long after that where he started realizing that McHarg was actually understanding what he was talking about and was starting to develop in a different direction, a compatible direction, but just a slightly different direction than what Lewis was doing.

LJ: Yes. I do know—

YO: It was an important meeting, I'm glad you brought that up because it's a very important intersection in the history of landscape architecture.

LJ: Absolutely, absolutely. It was key I think, and my understanding—I don't if you've looked at Fritz Steiner's biography of McHarg, but in there he speaks to that period, so you might want to take a look at that.

YO: Okay.

LJ: My understanding is that Lewis did some kind of short studio project or something where some kind of inventory was taken.

YO: They did the Schuylkill River.

**19:41**

LJ: Maybe that was it, maybe that was it and that that influenced Ian. I mean several times over the years from when I was a student and he says oh, you must know Lewis Clarke, and he started talking to me about Lewis' work to years later, just before I left NC State when I was teaching there in the late '70, early '80s—I don't remember when the lecture was—and Ian said in the lecture that he gave Lewis credit again, and I heard him do it, and he does in his biography as well, as having influenced him to start in that direction.

YO: I think that's really—I'm really glad we're bringing this—

LJ: It's really significant.

YO: Yes, it is tremendously significant. Well, after graduating from Penn you joined the NCSU School of Design faculty as an assistant professor, and by that time Dean Kamphoefner had retired and Claude McKinney had been dean for about two years. How did the School of Design reflect this change in leadership?

LJ: Oh, wow. Well, McKinney was certainly more of a collaborative—set up more of a collaborative environment. I mean, you know, it's no secret that Kamphoefner was an autocrat and proud of it. [Laughs]

YO: Right. [Laughs]

LJ: And McKinney operated in a different way. I mean he came out of the sort of, you know, the focus group culture, and the sort of let's hear everyone's opinion and try to reach some consensus here. It was much more of that environment, I guess. But, you know, in the trenches I'm not sure how much difference it really made. It was still, to me, a pretty similar place, and now I was in landscape architecture so mostly—I don't know. I'm not sure I had enough insight to really understand because my role was so different as an instructor from having been a student.

YO: Right.

LJ: It still was a vital and creative place, which it still is.

YO: Oh yeah.

LJ: I mean it's a pretty amazing institution.

YO: It really is. Well, you nominated Lewis Clarke for his ASLA Fellow, which he received in 1980, and there's quite a bit of work involved in the process, and Lewis has certainly been

grateful to you ever since then for doing what you did, but what about Lewis' work did you feel was important to have recognized?

LJ: Well, that's interesting. I was motivated—you know, I was kind of shocked as a young person, having not that many links in the area any longer, though I had some, I was shocked to find out that neither he nor Dick Bell were Fellows. So, as a new officer I thought, well, I should do something about this, because I saw them both as significant figures in the field and was so aware through Ian of Lewis' work.

I had known of Lewis' work a long time. I know Lewis did a lot of work with Tommy Hayes and Tommy Hayes was a family friend, such as it could be. [Laughs] He had a very powerful personality, also. I mean my grandfather had known him when he was a kid. He and my dad did I don't know how many projects together, a lot. He had designed the renovation of a house that I lived in.

So, I had always for a long time known of Lewis' work partially because of having worked with Hayes, partially just because he was a colorful figure at the School of Design, and I think having come from architecture and studied landscape architecture in the mid '70s when everyone was so focused on ecological analysis and environmental planning, I also saw Lewis as someone that was still advocating design of the landscape, that this was an important part of what we did. We didn't just do analysis and master plans, of which obviously he did a great deal, but he was a modernist, and I had grown up with that sensibility having grown up in a Tommy Hayes house. I mean this was the era of—I watch *Mad Men* and I say oh, well, there's my life I grew up with. [Laughs] This looks all very familiar to me.

**25:03**

So, I saw Lewis as an advocate for design of the landscape and that the landscape was more than just a sort of leftover space where you place modern buildings as well, that you actually organized and modified and highlighted a site.

I think that is one of the key roles of the landscape architect, is to understand the natural systems and the ecology of a site in a way so that then when interventions are made into that landscape that they are thoughtful about how they accommodate and in fact highlight the natural features of a landscape.

I saw his work as doing that. Most of the work I was familiar with through images, awards images, you know, for the local AIA. I mean I was just kind of aware of what the office was doing, or had been doing, and I would talk to people through the ASLA, and I would see the awards, and it just seemed that he was the person that was really plugging for both design and ecological analysis, and that it was a single entity, that it was not one thing and then something else.

YO: Right.

LJ: So, he interested me for that reason.

YO: Well, I haven't ever heard anybody really put it in those words, but I think that's the differentiation there of what was going on, the trend towards reading statistics as opposed to what do they mean for the design.

LJ: Well, you know, it was Ian's determinism, and I was very close to Ian and I adored him but the determinism drove me crazy. He had convinced himself—and the funny thing is Ian was a very intuitive person who drew beautifully. I think he was a talented designer, which most people don't realize. Having worked with him on a couple of projects, I saw that through firsthand contact. But he was on a mission, and I understand that mission, and as a part of that mission he had resorted to a very deterministic philosophy and he was convinced, boy, if you had enough data, it would tell you exactly what to do except maybe the paint color.

YO: Really?

LJ: And if you had a little more data it would tell you the paint color. [Laughs]

YO: [Laughs]

LJ: You just couldn't always get all that data.

YO: Right.

LJ: I don't know. He preached that, but at times I'm not completely sure he completely believed it. But it had permeated certainly landscape architecture education to the point that design education was very limited.

It was very limited at Penn. I was quite frustrated at times, and McHarg was certainly aware of that, in that I wanted to transfer my very excellent design training as an architect into designing landscapes. Fortunately in my final semester, Laurie Olin came in as a lecturer and he sort of pulled me out of my depression, [Laughs] and helped me on a project that McHarg had been advising me on. I had pulled out of the normal studio sequence to work on this project. It was a competition.

So, you know, I got a great education, but I kind of had to pull some things together for myself because—and Penn wasn't the only place. Every place in the country really was teaching primarily ecological analysis and very little design. So, I had to rely on my architectural education for that.

YO: Right. Well, from 1987 to 1991—Can you hear me Linda? I'm getting a little feedback here.

LJ: Yeah.

YO: Okay. From 1987 to 1991, you were chair and adjunct professor at Harvard's Graduate School of Design. Were you the first female chair at GSD?

LJ: I was.

YO: And what were some of the challenges in that position?

**29:58**

LJ: Well, it wasn't just that I was the first woman chair, I was also quite young—I was still in my thirties—to be doing that position. Oh. Well, the GSD certainly was, and until recently it may still be, a male world, but I was used to that. I think mostly I was just so concerned and delighted with the opportunity to in some way contribute to once again having landscape architecture move into the realm of design and beyond just deterministic planning.

At the same time—and I make it sound like I was anti-ecological analysis. I wasn't. I think that my education of understanding natural systems at Penn was terrific and a real gift, but that integration of that understanding into making design proposals is what I was interested in, and it gave me the best platform in the world to contribute to that.

So, that was what I was really focused on. In a way I was just so much sort of fighting for the department and for the discipline I think more than as a woman. [Laughs] Although there were any number of things that happened, and that I'd rather not go into, that were not right in terms of having been the first woman, what that meant in certain kinds of expectations, and the failure to be mentored in the way that my male colleagues were. It was very typical in education and it's still a struggle, I think, for women in design education.

YO: Well, that kind of leads to my next question. What advice do you give to women who complain about not being taken seriously as architects and landscape architects?

LJ: Promote yourself. In the world of design, particularly today—and I'm not good at this so I can recommend it while not doing it very well myself—it has become much more a world of promotion. You can't sit back and wait for somebody to notice that you're doing good work. You have to promote it. You have to actively seek it out. You have to have a strategy and an agenda to get your name out there.

And then when you have all that ammunition, it sets you up in a better situation not to be ignored. And you have to speak up also when you think that something is not okay in terms of a decision that is made, a judgment that is made, a comment that is made. I had to learn—and I'd say definitely this at the GSD—I had to learn to speak up in an assertive, but not confrontational way, and it can pay off because there are—the other thing is to look out for the colleagues that are helpful and to really ask for their advocacy.

YO: Right. I like to recommend your *Women in Landscape Architecture: Essays on History and Practice* that you edited with Louise Mozingo.

LJ: Uh huh.

YO: I think that's a really good collection of advice and history.

LJ: It's a great collection, it really is, and I wish—[Laughs] this is kind of classic of me. I was so busy trying to do other things in the department, I wasn't able to get my own essay in there, which I wish I had.

YO: Well, we'll look for that in the future.

LJ: Yeah, in the future. Sally's is quite delightful.

YO: Oh, Sally Schauman's, right?

LJ: Yeah. Sally's was a real key in the collection.

YO: That's wonderful. Well, let's move on to something else you've written. You've written that, "The relationship between landscapes and structures fascinates me," so is there ever a point where a design is equally favorable for the landscape and the structure, and if so what is it?

**34:54**

LJ: Well, it happens to be—I don't think there are many examples out there, but the examples that I have chosen to look at is American outdoor theaters, and I've been working on a research project, had an exhibition that has been in a number of places, including the School of Design some years ago, and I've been very slow to get the book out, but I'm still working on it.

These theaters—and I think Red Rocks in Colorado is a great example, the Swarthmore Theater up in Pennsylvania, there's the Marin Theater out here, I think actually Dick Bell's theater at Meredith, the theater at Chapel Hill. There are a lot of these theater structures where it's clear there was this conversation between the structural intervention and the landscape itself. It's almost like well the structure, because it has certain kinds of programmatic needs, says I want to be like this. [Laughs] And the landscape says oh, but I've got a root system over here, or, I've got an existing slope that is this, or a little bedrock that is this. And it pushes back and sort of helps reshape what that idealized typology of a theater is and then the typology pushes back and it's this back and forth, literally a conversation between the structure and the landscape that is orchestrated by the designer, and sometimes those designers were architects and sometimes they were landscape architects.

By looking at these theaters I begin to try to understand why they worked in the way that they do in the way that they are workable, dynamic structures at the same time they interpret and highlight the landscape. A key to that was that the designers, whether they were architect or landscape architect, spent a lot of time being on the landscape and seeing the landscape. And that made a difference.

And I think that that can happen in structures as well. I think one of the reasons I'm interested in landscape architecture has as much to do with Harwell Hamilton Harris as it does any of the other faculty because Harwell, every building he did he really looked carefully at the landscape. I can't say every one because I haven't checked out every one, but certainly the one I know the best, the Havens House here in Berkeley. It's an extraordinary sort of push and pull between this dynamic structural intervention and accommodating a very complex and difficult landscape setting.

So, there was this push and pull where it sort of adds up to a zero [Laughs] or maybe you say to a hundred, depending on the way you look at it. Each one complements the other and neither one dominates. So that interests me, and not every setting needs to be like that, but I think when you have that you have very special places that are important in our lives.

YO: Well, we really like the Koka Booth Amphitheatre here in Cary.

LJ: Oh, well, we spent a lot of time on the site, and I think my big contribution to that was to really force everybody—we did a several-day charrette right there at the site and there were people from Cary Recreation, there were people from the symphony, there were a whole

collection of—and the consultants, and Bill was down from Boston, and we were just all there for—

YO: That was Bill who?

LJ: Bill Rawn, who was the architect that did the structure, and then Alan—I just went blank on his last name—who was working in his office and then went out on his own and he was really in many ways the very involved designer on the project, along with Sam Reynolds.

We worked on a model. We had built a base model inside the conference room and everybody would do little diagrams. I showed everyone my collection at that point from the exhibition of outdoor theaters across the country, and people kept talking about and doing little diagrams with this little sort of tiny pea in this huge forest. And I said, you know, I'm not sure that's what we've got here. [Laughs]

**40:31**

YO: What was different—

LJ: After the first day I said to Sam can we get somebody to go over to the hardware store and get us some orange construction tape and some stakes? I think we need to stake out the size of the stage and what they're talking about.

There was pressure to put VIP seating and reshape the entire place in order to have very structured seating right next to the stage and then as a result of that, you'd have to really reshape all the area behind it so that people could see anything.

So, we went out and started putting the stage in different locations, actually staking it on the ground, and in that process made the suggestion that perhaps we could have a privileged area there in the very back on a raised platform and therefore avoid a major reshaping of the topography so that we could save a lot of the pine trees.

Originally, we even had pine trees right in the middle, but I guess [Laughs] the administrators finally decided that was not a good thing and they took out some of those pine trees, which I personally think is unfortunate even though I appreciate why they did it. So, with some very careful grading—you know after we had done that conceptually, I mean that was the big step in my mind because if you had to re-grade that auditorium space you would have destroyed the entire site.

YO: That's true.

LJ: So, with Sam's great skill at grading and this sort of concept, and Bill Rawn's firm's great skill as an architect—and in those charrettes when we were on the site we kept talking about that the structure itself should reflect something about the pine trees.

We had some sandwiches with some really long toothpicks in it—I have a great slide of this—and we started making the structure for the stage out of these long toothpicks and sticking it into our model, which began to give form to what the stage structure eventually was, and that's really where that sort of soaring—that whole basic scheme that of course was carried out, I feel, really well by Sam and Bill. We essentially designed the overall layout in those three days by going back and forth between looking at the site, really understanding that landscape, which was very flat to build a theater on.

YO: Right. The point is that you didn't sit in front of your CADD-loaded computer and design that amphitheater.

LJ: Absolutely, absolutely, and I'm sure Lewis never just sat in front of a drawing board. When you look at the real masters in our field that are in their late seventies, and I know Pete Walker's about to turn eighty—but Rich Haag, Lewis, the ones that are now in their eighties or the ones that are recently deceased, whether it was Royston, Halprin, who I was lucky enough to get to know fairly well, they really knew how to look at and understand site, and they spent time. They spent time going out, sketching it, looking at it carefully, and there's not enough of that, I think, ongoing in the field today. We really fight to try to keep that kind of learning a part of our education here at Berkeley, and I think some other schools do, too.

YO: I think it's turning around. I think there's been a period where we didn't—maybe we were too enamored with CADD's abilities and now we're starting to go, wait a minute. This is not what we're supposed to be doing. We're supposed to be out there actually doing some walking around and seeing.

LJ: Yeah, because going out and drawing the landscape, it's not so much about the drawings you produce, it's what you learn and what you observe in the process of doing the drawings.

**45:05**

YO: Right. Well, a number of individuals who've been interviewed for this oral histories project have degrees or special training beyond landscape architecture, or did it the reverse way that you did, architecture back to landscape architecture. Should today's landscape architects have more than one area of expertise?

LJ: Oh, I think some of them need to and others need to just spend their lives focusing on landscape architecture. I mean I think we need both. I think there are a lot of people—I know there are people that have backgrounds in landscape architecture, and I think of one person in particular in the Boston area, that has focused on soils, and he also had a degree in I don't remember what, ag engineering or something, soil science. He has worked as a consultant on all of the major sort of landmark constructed landscape projects in the country, as a consultant to other high profile firms.

We need people like that because he understands what it means to be a landscape architect. Same with people maybe that deal with water and hydrology, forest or stream restoration, marsh restoration—we need those people that have that expertise, and I think if they also have a background in landscape architecture they're really golden in terms of providing expertise to other designers, but we also need the people that are just grounded and passionate about making landscapes.

YO: Well, it kind of is a pointless question maybe after such a good explanation of what kinds of things landscape architects can contribute to, but by today's definition what does a landscape architect do?

LJ: [Laughs] Well, I think we're still about—I think the primary thing that we should do is interpret the landscape. So, whether we're building playing fields or building a garden on top of

a roof deck or collecting water for sustainable goals, which I think is certainly—it's almost like why talk about it because everybody talks about it. I think the world has gotten on to what we have been advocating for, for a hundred and fifty years, and that is more concern for long term, sustainable development.

But on top of that I think we're the ones, because we look and understand how a landscape functions and the tie between what experiencing it is like and how it functions, that we are the ones that can provide that layer of interpretation of a particular landscape, and let that inform a design proposal, the physical changes of that. So, we're still about physical changes in the landscape and how to accommodate them in the best possible way for long term health and spiritual interpretation of that landscape.

YO: So, you don't see the landscape architecture profession going out of existence at this point.

LJ: No. I think we're in the best shape we've been in, in a long time.

YO: That is really encouraging.

LJ: I mean since the Olmsted days, really.

YO: Really?

LJ: Yeah, absolutely. I mean I think there have been three sort of peak times, and certainly one was the time of the Olmsted firm in the early days, and then I think under McHarg we certainly peaked in terms of international visibility with the population in general, but it was primarily focused on ecological analysis.

And I think now, because of the rise of the concern for sustainability—I mean even through the downturn our students have been finding jobs—it's not been that way in architecture—and just before the downturn there was such a shortage of landscape architects across the country. I felt like I could open a brokerage [Laughs] firm and made a lot of money trying to [Laughs] as some kind of headhunter for former students to firms out there because all firms in the country were looking for good people and there was a shortage.

As people begin to build again, I think it's going to happen again, although certainly the number of programs has grown and the number that the schools are producing has begun to increase, finally, because it had been at a kind of steady pace of very modest increase for quite awhile.

**50:18**

YO: Right. What is the one important thing to know about Linda Jewell?

LJ: Oh, wow. I guess that I'm—you know, I feel strongly about, from a professional design educator standpoint, that the design fields have to be about the human being, and the creative impulse, and long term ecological health all rolled up into one, and that it's tough, it's hard. And I hope I don't get overly taken with one aspect of that three-legged stool—creative expression, ecological health, and human experience. I mean those are the three legs of the stool that you want to keep juggling, and you want to give proper accommodation to all three.

So, that's what I'm about, certainly as a professional and a teacher. I think there are other things about me as an individual. [Laughs]

YO: Would you like to share any of those?

LJ: I like to think I was a good mom. [Laughs]

YO: I'm sure you have been. [Laughs] Well, Linda, those are all of my questions for today. Do you have anything you'd like to add?

LJ: Just that I think Lewis' contribution to the field has probably not been fully appreciated, and I think this whole thing of—I mean he's so representative—he's both representative of a very important era, and that is the modern sensibility of 1950 to 2000 plus, but in addition to that he was at the forefront of very many things within that period. He's not as well known as he might be. So, I hope this collection will help remedy that.

YO: Well, that's kind of our goal.

LJ: [Laughs]

YO: So, with humility and perseverance we seem to be doing okay at this point.

LJ: Yeah. It's great that you're doing this.

YO: Well, thank you. I've enjoyed our conversation, so thanks again for agreeing to be interviewed.

LJ: Okay.

YO: And we'll see you.

LJ: Okay. Bye, bye.

YO: Thank you. Bye, bye.

Transcriber: Deborah Mitchum

Date: May 13, 2012

