

# Critical thinking on theory and criticism in landscape architecture

[Environment](#), [Nature](#)



Focusing on the article by MacHarg, the content is almost the same as that Kiley's article. The two articles can be compared to two roads from a single point traversing through different areas and terrains but having the same destination. This means that the two have almost the same theme and goal but slightly different structures. The only difference is that MacHarg's article is more elaborative on the topic sentence compared to Kiley's article which on the other hand is more descriptive on the relation between landscape and design. Evaluating these two articles, there is truth and reality in them. Design can be drawn from landscape as suggested by both articles but only by a creative mind. This comes into agreement with Corner's article that indirectly claims that creativity when employed to design can draw new designs from the landscape. The three roads join to form a highway leading to the idea that it is possible to draw a design from the landscape. Though the plots and themes of the three articles are different, the main content is the same. 'Landscape can be used as a masterpiece in design.'

Analyzing Corner's article further discloses that scientific and social approaches of landscape and design are different. The scientific approach takes creativity as the necessity for design to be drawn from landscape. This is in agreement with science since creativity must be employed for any invention or innovation to take place. This is in opposition to the social approach but by natural observation creativity is a vital tool for design.

Turning our focus on the fourth article by Smithson, his approach is similar to that of Corner but he does not provide much of history to the connection of ecology, landscape and design as it is narrated by Corner. Side by side with

Corner's work, both have a similar structure but Smithson is more elaborate on current example of how creativity and design have changed the landscape. He gives several examples of parks and land which has been misused and suggests of how to make the land useful again. In this point of view, I beg to differ since by focusing more on the topic sentence, design comes from landscape not landscape from design. In spite of this deviation from the mainstream of the other three articles, Smithson has still clearly explained the relation between landscape and design.

For clarity about the four articles, consider the three roads in the prior illustration. Kiley's and MacHarg's articles are the roads from the same point (similar approach) ending at the same point (theme of design from landscape). The different paths followed by the two roads to reach the destination are comparable to the different structures used by the authors to deliver the same theme. Corner's work is a parallel road to the two described roads but meets the two at the destination (theme). Corner uses a different approach and structure to deliver the same point as Kiley and MacHarg. Smithson connects landscape and design by drawing the land outlook from design. This can be compared to a fourth road having a similar structure as the third road but originating from the junction of the three roads.

In nutshell, the four articles shows that different works from different authors can have a common theme yet use different structures and plots to express the theme. Considering Corner's and Smithson's articles, it is true that nature and ecology influence design and the relationship can be either way. Kiley's and MacHarg's articles express the idea that design can be drawn

from the landscape but only would like to add that it is only possible for a creative brain. In reality, design is a product of creativity and only to some extent can it be drawn from nature.