



Landscape critique and utopias in young people's everyday lives: Reply to Katherine Burlingame

Frederik Aagaard Hagemann

To cite this article: Frederik Aagaard Hagemann (2025) Landscape critique and utopias in young people's everyday lives: Reply to Katherine Burlingame, *Landscape Research*, 50:5, 784-785, DOI: [10.1080/01426397.2024.2388716](https://doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2024.2388716)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01426397.2024.2388716>



© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 30 Sep 2024.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 182



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)

Landscape critique and utopias in young people's everyday lives: Reply to Katherine Burlingame

I, firstly, have to express my gratitude for the kind and constructive engagement of the peer-author who eloquently re-states the main points and chisels out the foundational challenges to conventional understandings of an urban landscape that the young people's analyses and my own interpretation and theoretical contribution entails. At the same time, I would like to take the chance to emphasise the radical implications of the young people's utopian vision, of a place in the urban fabric where everyone can perceive that they have an inherent right to be, and get to feel like, themselves. The young people's newfound experiences of creating places and practices that allowed them to be- and move- in the city, and feel seen and respected, did not lead them to a quest for empowerment. Rather, it led them to a critical and constructive engagement with pressing problems around segregation in urban landscapes, and to a radically different image of what a desirable future might be. Empowerment can only happen on the terms that a current social organisation provides. I would argue that this is not what the young people in the project were seeking. They did not press on in the workshops and experiments to learn about institutional organisation and get empowered to become more active citizens. This might have been a noteworthy by-product of the real-world engagement, but their motivation throughout was to point out how current the social organisation around landscapes and urban public spaces cuts their landscape experience short, and to explore what pathways to a different reality could be pursued that makes sense in their lived experience. This shifts the emphasis, from a focus on their potential empowerment, to the lessons that the rest of society must learn in order to begin democratic, transformative processes of urban landscapes that address deep-rooted patterns of segregation.

A just transformation must concern itself with the possibilities for all young people to pursue joy, with the need to feel seen and respected. This requires a heightened attention to how outlooks and possibilities in life might diverge from generalised notions of 'the public interest' that appear in the planning and governing of our urban landscapes. In a way, the young people provide a chance to empower a field that is often somewhat detached from subaltern experiences to better address the complexity of living in an urban landscape patterned by segregation. I deeply appreciate Katherine Burlingame's attention to how this requires a marked shift from perceiving the urban landscape as a succinct object of analysis, towards a democratic entity that requires substantive participation from diverse groups. In extension, Katherine's attention to the storytelling elements of the process and the paper serve to underline this as a ripe medium for everyday language and academic conceptualisations to meet in constructive tension. Finally, Katherine's own work (this volume) offers fruitful methods to extend the storied analyses presented here, into the materiality of location, and more-than-human presence that the young people's neighbourhoods also consist of. These elements, which seemed too distant to grapple with at first, have now started to filter into view in the young people's work, as the compaction of the surfaces, the inhospitable parking lots, and the fruitless search for shelter from othering

glances or traffic noise led to requests for more vegetation. Using landscape as an explorative method now seems more applicable in a negotiated social context with these urban landscape dwellers. Future research could thus move towards inscribing nature deeper into the urban fabric, now in dialogue with the problems and potentials in everyday life, also as seen from the margins.

Frederik Aagaard Hagemann
*Department of Landscape Architecture, Planning, and Management,
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), Alnarp, Sweden*
 frederik.aagaard.hagemann@slu.se

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.