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0.1 Abstract

This research examines how a landscape is articulated, elaborated, and made specific through the concept of the frame and of framing. The research takes as starting point a literature study on frame and framing, as understood by Deleuze and Guattari, and elaborated by Bernard Cache and Elizabeth Grosz, with the goal of unfolding the mechanisms of framing. To this aim, I detach the frame from any kind of preconfigured form (walls, etc.) or type of qualities (visual, for example). Once no longer bound, the frame is an ordering device that exists at and across different scales, that is not necessarily dependent on a subject to frame, and that always creates inclusion and exclusion. At the same time, there is never only one frame - this very inclusion and exclusion is simultaneous with other inclusions and exclusions, other ways of ordering or non-ordering. The research then uses the frame to understand landscape, territory, and landscape architecture, and to further understand the frame. The frame reveals landscape as made up of a series of frames and partial frames, refrains and rhythms. The role of the designer then becomes the choosing of what frames to operate in as much as the articulations and elaborations within a frame. The research involves two simultaneous parts, or frames: a research paper that assembles a thread unfolding the mechanisms of the frame and of framing, and a glossary, that explains, gathers, and elaborates related terms.

key words: frame, framing, landscape, landscape architecture, Deleuze

0.2 Summary

Framing is both an ordering and an elaborating process. It involves the selection of an inflection, or qualities, the choosing of a vector, or tendency, and the introduction of an interval - the giving of a relative, temporary stability - the frame.

The frame excludes
The frame is never total
The frame frames
The frame introduces an interval - a separation between causes and effects
The frame always involves not only space but also time
The materialization of this interval can be the boundary of it, or it can provide some other kind of limitation. The frame guarantees the interval through its materialization
The frame already contains the potential to unframe itself
The frame is always intentional - but not necessarily by a subject

Through my reading of the frame and framing, I detach the frame from any kind of pre-configured form (walls, etc.) or type of qualities (visual, for example). Once no longer bound, the frame is an ordering device that exists at and across different scales, and that always creates inclusion and exclusion. At the same time, there is never only one frame - this very inclusion and exclusion is simultaneous with other inclusions and exclusions, other ways of ordering or non-ordering. By using the frame to understand landscape - this process of exclusion is acknowledged, and can become instrumental in the process of design. A frame-based approach to landscape reverses the primacy...
of (human) built structures over territory articulation (human and non-human), and reverses the relationship between landscape and city. Cities are not to be understood as urban agglomerations but rather as landscape fragmentations. The frame reveals landscape as made up of a series of frames and partial frames, refrains and rhythms. To think in terms of framing is to think in and out of temporary totalities - is to bring in time, and to acknowledge process.

The task of landscape architecture is to intervene in the landscape as series frames in frames. There is no inherent choice of frame of a project - every site, as much as every project, is located at the intersection, inter-action, and entanglement of a number of frames. To intervene in a landscape choosing of when to frame, and when not to frame both in terms of site and project. The task of landscape architecture is to introduce frames - intervals - in both space and time to allow for certain processes to continue, and for the potential of new processes - and new frames to emerge. The risk carried by the frame is the crystallization of the framing conditions. By carefully reading the frames and framings of a site, as well as the processes involved in propagating and elaborating these territorial frames, landscape architecture can intervene in a way that allows for the possibility of emergent behavior - and the potential to re-frame itself.

0.3 Preamble/problem field

The aim of this preamble is to introduce the field of concerns that lead to the project, and to the starting point of the frame. Through my research, my understanding of both landscape and the frame have shifted, but some of the concerns have remained the same. I seek to develop an elaboration of the frame in landscape architecture that moves beyond visual framing, but also that accounts for the very process of framing that is constantly employed by the field. As soon as the frame is detached from solely the visual realm, the process of framing, the potential of the frame, and the importance of becomes much more clear. But first - a short description of some of the problems and concerns of the understanding of landscape:

The understanding of territory as landscape in the Western world is a process of distancing and subsequent objectification. The term’s often cited history has to do with the cultivation of the land. As societies have moved away from subsistence agriculture, the productive landscape’s productive status has abstracted the territory into a resource. The practice of the making of landscapes with the linked history of the representation of landscapes (from Renaissance woodcuts to Romantic painting) and the ‘creation’ of landscape gardens have brought on a different abstraction of territory based on the projected values of the cultural understanding of the natural. These attitudes and values that are associated with the term have left merely the realm of landscape or garden design, and the notion of landscape carries the connotation of these values. This process of estrangement of landscape from the human realm creates a certain relationship of power in the conception humans and their territory, which turns territory and its components into a natural resource, that can be used for economic growth. The fact that our primary means of understanding territory still involves looking from an objective,
predetermined point (whether that of the subjective eye, such as that in perspective, or the depersonalized eye of a satellite) makes it very easy to understand even the most unfamiliar territories, such as the bottom of the oceans or the surface of Mars, as ‘landscapes’. Even territories that are far from the typical images of Arcadia are turned into landscapes through the same process.

The process of understanding territory as landscape contributes to an understanding of the natural (which constitutes the territory) as an image. A classic example of this is the American National Parks. The understanding of the North American territory as sublime wilderness was a conception projected on the landscape with a strong colonial motive, then re-captured in the paintings of the Hudson River school. The fact that these painters painted the ‘wilderness’ in their studios, based on sketches done in the field, shows quite clearly the disconnection between the actual territory and the projected images of a wilderness. The parks were then created to preserve this sublime American wilderness, but the process of their creation created the very image they sought to preserve. A more recent European example is the creation of the Oostveldersplassen in Flevoland, a preserve with the aim of ‘re-wilding’ that re-creates the Paleolithic landscape by re-introducing the same mix of species that once would have existed there, regardless of the disappearance of many of the species. The artificial, designed process of creating and maintaining this preserve has less to do with the actual re-introduction of natural, wild processes into the territory and more with the creation (and maintenance) of an image of pure, past wilderness.

The idealized landscape and the image of the natural and their respective connotations, particularly of that which is ‘natural’ as being pure, harmonious, whole, inherently good, cross-pollinate and influence each other to create generalized images of the natural landscape as something pure, good, etc., but also that is subservient to human needs. What is particularly interesting of these images of the natural is they use the natural to manifest themselves. In other words, the natural, as well as the natural landscape, becomes an image of itself, and the projected image of ‘nature’ overtakes the presence of nature.

Landscape architecture is more than complicit to the use of the image of the natural to symbolize a certain set of ideal/idyll values, or to mask a certain less-than ideal (idyll) realities. The examples run many:

-(modernist example) of having forests/trees between otherwise very violent landscape of slab cities (Le Corbusier, etc.)
-vegetal buffer zones masking and decorating generic industrial/commercial areas
-Fresh Kills park- put a happy, ‘biodiverse’ landscape that literally covers up garbage dump
-parks in old industrial (Duisburg, Fresh Kills) sites that fetishize old industry by transforming it into biodynamic ‘paradises’, with the message that heavy industry is ok because we can always make a beautiful park that will clean the soil and have many ‘happy’ plants and animals
-mining sites that are subsequently transformed into ‘sublime’ parks
-landscape infrastructure etc.

2 Elizabeth Kolbert . “Recall of the wild.” (The New Yorker, December 4, 2012.)
Although many if not all these examples do actually provide ecological benefits, do involve actual plants growing, host a greater biodiversity, even more than that they rely on the _images_ of these phenomena. The actual biodiversity brought in is less important than the image of this biodiversity, serving as a bandage and the illusion that everything will be alright. The industrial process, the technological growth, the resources necessary to main this is masked with the image of a docile, contained nature. Meanwhile, ecological catastrophes fueled by the need for economic growth occur with increasing frequency: the bees are dying but you can always go to your local park paid for by the local industry and think “maybe it is not so bad”.

There is nothing inherently wrong with the images as of themselves, but taking a certain set of images as absolute reality can create dangerous illusions. The problem with the image of nature is not the fact that it is an image, but that this image is considered to be stable and fixed, while nature itself is always changing. What is needed is

- A need for understanding the process of image making, both in general and in the specific case of nature and landscape
- A need for a way of working with images as they are, regardless of shifting contexts or values projected on them
- A need for reading the contexts and values projected on these images
- A need for understanding nature and the relationship between humans and nature that does not resort to idyllic fantasies, nature as ultimate ‘other’ to humans, nature as resource for economic growth/nature as resource for human expansion,

One of the mechanisms of the process of image making has to do with the frame. The frame is the delimitation of something from its context. It is a separating and selecting act of making specific. What is framed becomes specific in a stabilized way, but the stabilization is neither inherently total, nor is its identity fixed. Landscape is always framed. It is for this reason that I take the frame as starting point in my research.
1. Introduction to research: frame and landscape

This project is about framing - how things become specific, and how these specificities structure how landscape is understood. Out of the territory of the earth, how do things emerge? In order to understand the mechanisms of this, I am looking at one particular type of making-specific - framing. Framing is the drawing out of elements from a milieu, and giving them a relative, (temporary) stability through the introduction of the frame, or interval in order to allow for something new. It is a process both of ordering but also of elaborating. The frame implies a limit of separation, an ordering of exclusion/inclusion, a pattern of difference, an interval of time, a separation between causes and effects. Framing is often cited as the basis of art, and architecture is seen as the first art that elaborates the territory and allows for further elaboration. Between territory and architecture are landscapes of articulation and elaboration of territory - framings, frames, and quasi-frames - a landscape of landscape - the work of landscape architecture.

In this project, territory and landscape are understood as including both human and non-human, both natural and artificial. Landscape, understood here as the human milieu, is never neutral, natural or artificial. Landscape is always the outcome of forces, processes, agencies, inter and intra - actions that occur not only within the human milieu but always also outside of it. These processes include not only geological, hydrological, vegetal, etc., processes, but also political processes, (human) aesthetic processes, juridical processes, etc.. Places in landscape become specific or gain identity through contesting forces operating on the territory of the earth.

There are, of course, other ways to understand how things individuate out of the chaos of the earth, out of territory, but I have picked framing and the frame as my starting point, starting with a fascination with the frame that is both part of, and separate of what it frames. At the start of my research, I considered the frame as a mechanism of individuation that gives parts of chaos identity or specificity through separation. While the frame already contains the seeds and tensions that lead to its own unframing and potentials for new framing, there is a strong tendency to crystallize the frame, to minimize its potential for instability, to fix it as much as possible. Then, there is no longer merely a frame but the framed becomes objectified - a separation emerges - the qualities become separate from their milieu - they have an identity and a whole other slew of operations become possible. The operations that specifying and identifying make possible are varied - it is difficult to think of any inherent value these operations could have without putting them in a specific context. However, there is a difference between things specified and things identified - specificities tend to allow for movement and transformation to other specificities, while identities tend to resist it.

The mechanisms of framing describe process of elaborating territory that involves both space and time, is not bound by scales but topologies of ordering, and allows becomings and processes to unfold - the frame itself supplies the interval, and allows for an excess. It is, of course, neither a simple matter of framing = open = good and frame = closed = bad. The elaboration of territory is an intermingling of framings and frames, refrains and quasi-frames, frames which allow for unframing, and conditions of unframing which create new frames. Through my research, a
dichotomy between identity and specificity became less important than the processes of individuation and elaboration resulting from framing processes, and their potential for further elaborations - for openness.

1.1 Research questions

INITIAL RESEARCH QUESTIONS
How can the concept of failure release the inherent potential for destabilization of the frame present in the mechanisms of framing?
- what is the frame?
- what are the mechanisms of framing?
- why failure?
How can the concept of the failed frame be used within the elaboration of territory in order to destabilize fixed structures of understanding space/landscape/territory/nature?

The initial research questions gave a starting point with which to begin the research and study of the frame and framing. However, through this research it became clear that the role of failure was clearer than initially anticipated. The frame, and framing are tools in both the articulation and elaboration of landscape, and as tools it is impossible to judge their possibilities and potentials a priori. The mechanisms of framing already contains the potentials to unframe. In understanding this, one can begin to identify ways that the frame and framing already operate on a site, and can be then utilized to intervene in the site. During the research, a new set of research questions emerged:

CURRENT RESEARCH QUESTIONS
How can the expansion of the concept of the frame beyond the visual realm contribute to the understanding of the frame and framing as ties to the elaboration of the earth?
How can this expanded understanding of the frame and framing be used by landscape architecture to
  a) understand landscape and territory immanently
  b) contribute to the destabilizing of fixed structures of understanding space/landscape/territory/nature?
  c) provide a framework in which to elaborate territory (design)

The goals of this research document are to
- understand the process of framing
- understand and reveal the mechanisms of framing within the context of the understanding of landscape and through the frame of landscape architecture
- explore the possibilities of failure, instability, unframing, and re-framing present within the process of framing and their potential to present alternatives to the understanding and elaboration of a landscape (landscape architecture)
- provide a the beginnings of a conceptual framework for design (understood as the deliberate elaboration of territory)
2. Frame and framing

The purpose of this section is to outline the mechanisms of the frame and of framing. Deleuze's notions of the frame, of chaos, of territorialization, and their elaborations by Cache and Grosz provide a framework for understanding the frame and framing as both elaboration and organization of matter that is continuously becoming. This section also describes what comes before framing - or 'in-between images', as Cache refers to them - and what is the agency of the frame.

2.1 Images

In his book *Earth Moves*, Bernard Cache seeks an understanding of what Cache calls images that focuses on specificity rather than identity. In distinguishing between specificity and identity, Cache answers how can something be identified and defined without being fixed to an identity? How can something that is constantly changing be defined without eliminating its becoming? How can something be defined without relying on fixed projections of values or meaning? This question is particularly important when it comes to the understanding of place. The danger, Cache warns, is that with fixed identity tied to a place, the only possible modes of intervention become imitation, dissimulation or minimalism. However, it is possible to understand a place in a very specific way without resorting to a fixed identity.

Cache begins his analysis by examining a city, Lausanne, and trying to find a way of understanding the 'nature' of the city - the image of the city - that is constantly changing, and means various things at different times. In any site, the identity must be constructed, and it never pre-exists its site. Rather than trying to find an overarching and fixed identity, Cache seeks the specificities of the city, and pulls a number of abstract vectors that emphasize a different moment in the past of the city, that at different times has had different identities and values projected to it. Cache explains:

"Each abstract vector nails down a multiplicity of concrete values, such that the historical succession of vectors appears as a sort of repetition. It is not because of any genius loci that the cathedral's spire still preserves its meaning, it is rather that the abstract vector of the site still designates the Cité as a place of predilection".

Rather than taking these historical specificities in a hierarchical understanding, which would confer a fixed relation between them, Cache tries to understand how these abstract vectors work, and how do they make up images.

The above is a useful introduction in his way of understanding images, which focuses on three types of images Cache calls ‘primary’: inflection, vector, and frame. These images combine to make all other images. The primary images are:

---

4 Cache begins with an expanded understanding of the term ‘image’: ‘...we can give the image its widest meaning, designating thereby anything that presents itself to the mind, ‘whether it be real or not.’ In this way, we pass from visible objects to visibility itself. The word ‘image’ then places us in a purely optical register where effects are produced without reference to any given object. But these effects are not deceptive illusions, for perception is not an interior image of exterior objects but stands for things themselves. Our brain is not the seat of a neuronal cinema that reproduces the world; rather our perceptions are inscribed on the surface of things, as images amongst images.’ Cache and Speaks *Earth moves*: 3
5 Ibid., 14
inflection
Cache borrows the term of inflection from mathematics, where the inflection of a curve, or point where the curvature changes (from concave to convex), is the most basic intrinsic singularity. Unlike any other singular points, such as that of maxima, or minima which require an axis in order to be identified, the inflection is identifiable from itself. At the same time, it is an ungraspable point, existing only in the instant of a change. This intrinsic specificity is very interesting because although it gains an additional meaning once a vector orients it or gives it a tendency, it still remains specific and defined, although ungraspable.

vector
The vector is a tendency that is directed. The vector selects an orientation on a territory: it endlessly builds action-reaction relations. However, as Cache warns: “As long as no frame is established in which the diagonals neutralize possibilities of deviation, the relationship between one vector and another will remain a confrontation for its own sake with no external purpose”

frame
The frame presupposes a form that is independent from its contents, and an interval that separates the order of causes from its effects. It has the role of separation, selection, and smoothening. It is the territorializing act that includes and excludes, delimits, selects a vector and eliminates the tendency for evasion. The frame establishes an interval, in which its selection of vectors is deliberately made to produce “ever more singular effects.” Perhaps the most important function of the frame is the smoothening, or “arranging the interval in such a way as to allow the frame of probability to produce its effects.”

In describing the frame, Cache calls upon Dupréel’s notion of the frame of probability which introduces an interval between cause and effect:

“For a cause to produce an effect, this interval must be filled, for in and of themselves the set of causes that produce an effect are only frames of probability. One never knows how the interval will be filled; otherwise everything known about the interval would cross over to the side of the cause, and all one would have done is to define a more restricted frame of probability. And if by chance no indeterminacy remained in the interval, the cause would become identical to the effect and nothing new would happen at all.”

By including the interval in causality, Dupréel allows for the unexpected, for imprecision, for the unknown to occur between the cause and effect or in other words, for failure. And by containing this necessary interval - this frame of probability - the act of framing contains potential for failure - for something new to emerge. Considering architecture Cache proposes a rethinking: “architecture would be the art of introducing intervals in a territory in order to construct frames of probability.” In other words, the potential for failure, for the possibility of

---

6 Cache and Speaks, Earth moves, 103
7 Ibid., 56
8 Ibid., 25
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid., 22
11 Ibid., 23
something new, something different, for destabilization is inherently present in the making of architecture.

Cache emphasizes and elaborates Deleuze’s point that architecture is not only the art of framing, but the first act of framing, that comes before all other arts. The act of picking a site, of framing chaos into a territory is an architectural act. Both Deleuze and Cache explain this act through an examination of architecture as an act of making buildings. The wall being the element of separation that delimits, the window selects a vector, the enclosure (floor and roof) smoothen the identifiability of the building by minimizing and eliminating disturbances to it. More importantly, the materialization of the frame provides the possibility of the interval to unfold. This materialization is not only present in the frame as boundary, but also in the unfolding of the enframed permitted by this interval - by the frame.

2.2 Frame

Cache’s description of the traditional frame, exemplified by the painting frame, requires two main principles, the first being that of geometric legality, that is to say it must be complete, or, simply, that it must be, in fact, a frame. This can refer to the equal geometrical forms (circle, triangle, square, etc.), which through the equality of segments and of angles in-between make complete shapes that have at least one symmetry. From this, variations in form are always additive or subtractive, or dislocations, but in these cases, the second principle of stability holds prime importance. In the classic frame, the stability is ensured by either being built into the frame itself, such as in the figure of the trapezoid, or it happens within the frame, such as cross bracing in a parallelepiped frame.

Cache also introduces the idea of the modern frame. Despite having the same functionality, the modern frame also allows room for play within the frame. The modern frame does not need to be a autonomous and predetermined frame, rather “the tensions of the surface now lend a relative stability to the articulation of the frame.” The frame still has a material and geometrical reality as rigid parts, but, as Cache explains, “their articulation is mobile and their equilibrium results from the play of tensions that run through the system as a whole.”

This play of tension can be stabilized, should the play be harmonious or balanced, but this is not necessary: there is still the possibility for reverse movement, for the picking up of new, different vectors. The possibility of destabilization that the modern frame has makes it not quite a total frame, but rather as Cache puts it, a quasi-frame.

---

12 Elizabeth Grosz further elaborates this. This first framing is not only an architectural act, but also an artistic one, that generates an excess that allows life to elaborate itself.
13 I would define buildings as a radical specificity of space, that is to say space that has an identity. I contrast this to landscape, which has gradients of specificity, but because there is no rupture, no total framing from the territory to an instance of (designed) landscape, there is no total identity. However, the conflation of landscape with its own image makes it possible to tend towards a total identity. But something always escapes... this is not always enough. This is one of the main problems this research project attempts to grasp.
14 Cache and Speaks, Earth moves.
15 Ibid., 109
While the classic frame eliminates disturbances, the quasi frame absorbs, embraces and reacts to these disturbances. Cache identifies the quasi-frame as between images, to which it also adds the vector of concavity, where “each point of curvature is vectorized and manifests a tendency”\(^\text{16}\), between inflection and vector, and fluctuation, before an inflection is identified. These in-between images are important because they contain the possibilities both of the images they position themselves in, and allow movement towards other image configuration. Cache describes life as a fluctuation between these images that must both avoid falling into complete chaos on one side, and on the other side into death through the absolute stability of the perfectly smoothening frame, the frame that has eliminated all possibilities of failure from within it.

The frame *frames* by allowing for the interval, and excluding disturbances. In both the classic frame and the quasi-frame, this act has to do with a limitation, a separation that excludes some disturbances to allow for other disturbances to take place. In this way, the frame orders and separates. The frame provides a boundary condition. The boundary of the frame is not a boundary of delimitation, but a boundary of negotiating and responding to disturbances. It is a boundary enforced through the limitation of consistency rather than spatial limitations.

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{action onto a territory} \\
\text{image} \\
\text{in-between} \\
\text{fluctuation} \\
\text{vectors of concavity} \\
\text{quasi frame}
\end{array}\]

\(^\text{16}\) Based in part on sketches and description by Bernard Cache in his book 'Earth moves', the kinds of images (inflection, vector, frame), in-between images (fluctuation, vectors of concavity, quasi frame), and an illustration of their action onto a territory

To these in-between images I refer to as framings - moments in the mechanism of framing. Framings do not present linear tendency or an additive mechanism where partial ordering processes and partial framings build up into a ‘final’ frame. Framings are partial frames in their own right that allow for the weave in intervals in their becoming, that do not completely smooth out disturbances but are relative unstable. At the same time, these in-between images elaborate the earth.

\[16\text{ Ibid., 51}\]
2.3 Framing

“The frame is what establishes territory out of the chaos of the earth.”

Grosz elaborates on Deleuze and Guattari’s understanding of art to tie it to the becomings and elaboration of life. Her discussion of framing is important because it ties the act of framing to the very becomings of life, highlighting the primacy of the act of framing in world-making even before the notions of landscape or architecture appear. In her book *Chaos, territory, art: Deleuze and the framing of the earth*, Grosz explains how framing is instrumental in the elaboration of life, and the production of something new.

Life, Grosz explains, by way of Bergson, exists by its ability to extract what it needs (differentiate, order, organize) from chaos and bracket out the excess so to incorporate what it needs into itself. The elaboration of life is not limited merely to survival and re-production of itself: the very survival requires an excess - something extra - in order to produce something new. Grosz ties this to the process of sexual selection as a consequence of an (irreducible) sexual difference that guarantees endless generation of morphological and genetic variation. It is important to note, as Grosz does herself, that this irreducible sexual difference is neither a clear cut one nor an essentialist one. Rather, it is a difference that “attracts, allures, and appeals but not in predictable or clear cut ways,” and “that generates desire and drive towards something different, rather than the fulfillment of a preset or given biological need.”

This process through which life comes to elaborate itself is a becoming-artistic: “life comes to elaborate itself through making its bodily forms and its archaic territories pleasing (or annoying), performative, which is to say, intensified through their integration into form and their impact on bodies.” For Grosz, this artistic framing is part of the becomings of life, human and non-human. Chaos is continually framed and unframed.

This understanding of the need for framing in the elaboration of life reveals the two very important aspects related to the framing: 1) the pulling out of an excess that is extracted from the chaos and elaborated through the framing, and 2) the importance of the indeterminacy. In other words, this (artistic) framing that elaborates life relies on its own failure - its ability to reintroduce indeterminacy within. This is not a triumphant failure, that settles things down in to a form better for its own framing, and provides the possibility for the improving of that frame. It is also an unframing, changing the very conditions that produced that framing, and allowing for new potentials to unfold.

2.4 In-between images and the refrain

“Chaos is not without its own directional components, which are its own
Among the fluctuations of chaos are blocks of content that make up patterns of difference. Before the frame, the in-between images differentiate themselves. These in-between images are the fluctuations of chaos, the assembling and reassembling constantly taking place and transforming, forming intensive relationships, or assemblages together. For Deleuze and Guattari, an assemblage is any intensive coming together of heterogeneous components. To account for the differentiation of chaos and the becomings of the world, Deleuze and Guattari describe a series of emergent, organizing, and intra-acting operations and resulting territorial assemblages: milieus, rhythms, and refrains.

Refrain The refrain is a territorial assemblage where the intensive forces - the rhythms of chaos converge. It is an territorial assemblage that links assemblages to the chaos and the milieu. It is made up of rhythm and melody, a territorial series of inflections. The refrain is “any aggregate of matters of expression that draw a territory and develops into territorial motifs and landscapes (there are optical, gestural, motor, etc., refrains”). In their description of the refrain, Deleuze and Guattari make list of refrain classifications:

- territorial refrains that seek, mark, assemble a territory
- (territorialized) functions
- intra-assemblage functions
- gather or collect forces (either inside or outside territory)

This classification make it clear that the refrain is tied to functions - rites or patterns of doing which make for its repetition. The refrain gets its consistency not from its distribution of inequalities but from its repetitions that builds into resonance. The refrain is an assemblage that gathers its consistency through movement - which allows it to remain open. Grosz elaborates: “A refrain is the movement by which the qualities of a specific territory or habitat resonate and return to form it as a delimited space, a space contained or bounded but nonetheless always open to the chaos from which it draws its force.”

A refrain can be summarized as a consistency within, a consistency without, and a movement towards the outside - a line of flight. The refrain is an in-between image, following Cache’s classification, it is a quasi-frame not bound to territory.

---

24 Ibid., 323
25 Ibid., 327
26 Elizabeth Grosz, *Chaos, territory, art*. 19
27 “To repeat, every refrain, for Deleuze and Guattari, has three basic components: first, a point of order or inside—a home, nest, or space of safety that filters out or keeps the forces of chaos temporarily at bay (“A child hums to summon the strength for the schoolwork she has to hand in” [Deleuze and Guattari 1987, 311]); second, a circle of control that defines not only a safe inside but also a malleable or containable outside, a terrain to be marked, a field to be guarded (a cat sprays strategic objects at the boundary of its territory, a bird marks the field below its nest as the space of its sonorous and rhythmic performance); and, third, a line of flight to the outside, a movement of migration, transformation, or deformation – Elizabeth Grosz, *Chaos, territory, art*. 52
2.5 Frames

What keeps the frame together? The philosopher Eugene Dupréel proposes a theory of consolidation that occurs from within and is not imposed from above. Rather than a linear sequence of consolidating, Dupréel proposes a consistency emergent from densifications and intensifications. In other words, the consistency of the frame is generated from the very milieus and refrains a framing entails. Furthermore, there must be a distribution of inequalities - an arrangement of intervals or in other words, a framing. Withing this framed consolidation, the rhythms of the milieus from which the qualities have been extracted are super imposed - “an articulation from within of an inter rhythmicity, with no imposition of meter or cadence.” Perhaps then it can be said that there are two kinds of framing - one from above, a consolidation of process that brings internal consistency through the choosing of one vector and the minimizing of deterritorializing components, but also that stratifies the inflections within its limits - and one from within that works with densifications and intensification, that allows the space to remain smooth and continue the process of becoming.

These two kinds of framing do not become separate entities, but just as the milieus they intra-assemble, pass through each other, frame and re-frame each other. Framing is a stratifying operation - but these strata can in turn smoothen out. Deleuze and Guattari remind us:

“What this constant doubled tendencies - of stratification and deterritorialization puts into attention is the nature of the frame of never being singular, or existing in only as itself. Instead, a series of framings inside other framing becomes evident. The earth is not elaborated merely through the frame and framing, but through frames in framings, framings in frame - a continuous and infinite series of frames of frames. At any given moment - at any given frame - there are simultaneously other frames, at other scales, interwoven and intra-acting. There is not only never a singular, single frame, but there is always a multiplicity of frames, framings, partial framings, quasi frames at play.”

2.6 What can the frame do?

The in-between images Cache refers combine into assemblages - coming together of components into consistency that produce and are intensities - with more ability to act than any separate inflection, vector, or even frame. The frame, and the process of framing is not enough to produce intensities and excesses. The frame as
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ordering device, a generator of inclusion/exclusion is, on its own, static. What the frame can do is to allow for assemblages to combine and recombine, for rhythms to find resonance, for refrains to be bound to territories. The frame's interval presents a spatiotemporal structure that allows for both the possibility and the potentials of that which is framed - the territorial and non-territorial assemblages of inflections and vectors - to unfold. More than that, the frame can be in itself an assemblage that bears the intensities that make the conditions for the emergence of something new. In such cases, both the frame and the framing are open to change - to becoming different. Already it is inadequate to speak of one frame, or even one framing. Can it be said then, that the frame has an agency of its own?

Assemblages frame themselves when they self-organize. The consistency required by self organization can be thought of as a quasi-framing mechanism - in this sense, assemblages are always, to some extent, self (quasi)-framing. If matter is vibrant, then assemblages can also frame other assemblages, other refrains, other qualities, other inflections. In other words, assemblages can act as catalysts in both the creation of other assemblages, but also of framings. What the frame, and what framing can do? Does the frame operate independently, or if there is someone - or something that frames? Who or what does the selecting, the ordering, and the elaborating? In her description of the frame, Grosz ties the frame explicitly to life and to sexual difference. It is living beings who frame - whether it is birds, ticks, or humans - to attract, allure, and otherwise elaborate. But Grosz's understanding of life perhaps can be extended past the living to include all matter.

In her book Vibrant matter, Bennett argues for a vitalism in all matter. Building up on Spinoza, Deleuze and Guattari, and De Landa among others, Bennett argues for an understanding of matter as fundamentally creative, and an expansion of our understanding of the world that does not privilege humans above any other material being. Bennett argues for the notion of 'vibrant matter' as a move away from human-centric view of the world and calls for the need of careful awareness of non-human material becomings and needs. Bennett states: “the ethical task at hand here is to cultivate the ability to discern nonhuman vitality, to become perceptually open to it”. This non-human vitality of matter must then be present at all scales, so to speak (coming from a still human-centric measure): this means both to take the vitality of matter seriously (dust, rocks, topography), but also the materiality of things that seem to have vitality (politics, culture, economic structures) In allowing matter its vitality, Bennett also allows it to have an agency - an ability to act, and be affected by others. The agency of an assemblage is reliant on “vitality of the materialities that constitute it”.

To return to framing, by being a structuring measure, does not inherently have agency, but can allow for agencies to unfold. Only if the frame itself is part of an assemblage that has the potential for emergent behaviors - for unframing - can it be said that it has agency. Framing is always intentional - the qualities are pulled out, emphasized, “chosen” & then elaborated & articulated through a variety of

---

33 Jane Benett, Vibrant Matter: a political ecology of things., 14
34 Ibid., 34
ITERATIVE DRAWING EXERCISE: FRAME & EXCESS The necessarily (at least for me) of this kind of thinking through doing can be through through the mechanisms of framing. This kind of exercise - iterative drawing - separates causes from effects, and introduces an interval in which new articulations and elaborations can emerge. This drawing and subsequent animation exercise introduces an interval between the reading of text and its reconfiguration into writing of text. This instance of deterritorialization of thoughts (through drawing) reterritorialized (into an animation) framing an interval to allow for other thoughts to appear.
Ultimately, this exercise usefulness has less to do with its potential to illustrate, analogize, symbolize ideas about continuous landscapes, articulation of territory, mechanisms of framings etc. (which were the initial intentions), but providing new input for other ideas to further the research. The drawings presented here were used to make an animated gif that enacts a certain illustration of both the process of frame - the elaboration of a territory through intensification of certain processes (the illustrative process itself, as well as that which the illustration refers to - an imagined territory and its transformation).
techniques - but this intentionality need not be tied to a singular, or even human subject. This means that, even if the frame - with its potential for crystallization - is always intentional - *something* always is doing the framing, this something needs not be a subject - or even something external to the frame.

3. Framing landscape and landscape in frame

In this section I describe how the frame and framing relate to landscape processes and the understanding of space. In many ways, the frame is inherently linked with landscape since it is the territory of the earth that is being framed, that provides the inflections, vectors, and matter of framing. The understanding of the mechanisms of framing is applied to landscape, territory, and landscape architecture. At the same time, applying the mechanisms of framing to landscape further elaborates the notion of the frame and of framing.

3.1 Landscape, frame, framing

The difference between frame and framing is decisive in the understanding of landscape, but not always clear cut. Framing is the process of selecting certain qualities out of the chaos, the undifferentiated milieu, the world, gathering deterritorialized components, and selecting certain tendencies and processes over other ones, and combining them into assemblages. The frame introduces an interval. Framing is a material process, but frames need not always be materialized as such (for example, property lines are legal spatialized frames, and allow and disallow certain processes, but are not always materialized onto the territory). However, framing always has material implications at the level of territory because of the processes it intensifies. The frame is the materiality that guarantees the interval of the framing - it does so not only by selecting certain processes and tendencies, and preventing others, selecting certain qualities and keeping others out, but also by giving these conditions a duration. This frame as materialization supports and sustains this interval. How then to understanding the landscape starting with the frame?

In the introduction to the book *Méandres: penser le paysage urbain*, Pieter Versteegh\(^{35}\) puts into question the continuity of urban tissue and the perception of its linearity traditionally understood by urbanism. This way of understanding urbanity sees it as a one-way process, with the tendency always being from less urban to more urban. Although the limitations of this view are clear, especially in a time where the urban landscape gains more prominence, this cultural notion carries an inertia that continues to influence landscape architecture. Versteegh puts in question the value of the “natural” within this understanding, which suggests that the natural only ‘truly’ exists as an untouched state. He proposes instead to “consider the re-naturalisation not so much a call to an ancient state or pure, transcendental preexisting state but rather the production of a new state of nature through human intervention”\(^{36}\)


\(^{36}\) Ibid., 29. Trans. by author. Original. “... penser la re-naturalisation non comme appel à un ancient état ou fond pure et pré-existant mais plutôt la production d’un nouvel état de nature grace à l’intervention humaine”
Building up on Versteegh, a frame-based approach to landscape reverses the primacy of (human) built structures over territory articulation (human and non-human), and reverses the relationship between landscape and city. Cities are not to be understood as urban agglomerations but rather as landscape fragmentations. At the most basic level, what makes territory into landscape is its framing through topography. Topography frames its inflections in order to give territory specificity and present to us an understanding of it as landscape. This topography is the result of non-human/geological (erosion, plate tectonics, etc.) and human processes (buildings, built infrastructure etc.). In other words, both a building and a ridge carved out a river are considered topography in relation to their ability to frame space.

3.2 Landscape refrains

The refrains of a landscape are not the same as the processes of a landscape. Rather, they make up the functions - the doings of a landscape. In terms of urban environments, these can be thought of as practices, or patterns of doing. As previously outlined in section 2.4 Chaos, milieu, rhythm, refrain, Deleuze and Guattari make list of refrain classifications:

- territorial refrains that seek, mark, assemble a territory
- (territorialized) functions
- intra-assemblage functions
- gather or collect forces (either inside or outside territory)

This list can be used to inform our reading of the refrains in a landscape by searching for the human, non-human, and human-non-human assemblages and practices on a site. The landscape refrain is tied with the landscape vector (following Cache’s categories, described in 2.1 Images) in that it has a tendency. A refrain is a vector but not all vectors are refrains.

The refrains of a landscape can be through of as the activities and traces of these activities that are present on a site. It is important to highlight that these activities are always material and have material consequences onto a site, even if they are (more) temporary. For example, ‘desire paths’ - the lines made by walking in the most convenient route in a field - modify the growth of vegetation onto a site. These modifications (prevention of growth) provide a temporary quasi-frame (destruction of any vegetal growth through repeated walking) that is contingent on the activity (walking). Should this quasi-frame be removed (for example, through the introduction of another framing such a fence around the site), in time the initial material traces (the desire paths) will fade away. Other activities can have traces that last longer - the territory marking behaviour of a dog urinating, for example, can prevent certain kinds of vegetal growth. Taken together, the human-dog-leash assemblages a park frequented by people walking their dogs creates a particular condition hostile to certain vegetation and encouraging of other.

The refrains of a landscape are also the larger patterns and processes not so easily attributable to a single subject or even a simple assemble. The processes that shape the landscape, such as erosion and sedimentation but also traffic and
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urbanization, also make up the refrains of a landscape.

3.3 Landscape frames

It is difficult to think of any inherent value these the mechanisms of framing could have without putting them in a specific context. A framing is always materialized. It is a pattern of difference whose materialization is either diffused frame, that is to say the pattern of difference is present across that which is enframed, or concentrated, as a separate, recognizable entity: the frame. However, there is a difference between things specified and things identified - specificities tend allow for movement and transformation to other specificities, while identities tend to resist this kind of movement.

The understanding of space has to do with the analysis of the composition of this space. This compositional understanding seeks to reveal what structures the space, but largely focuses on the primacy of the architectural object. In landscape architecture this compositional method of understanding the landscape is most clearly developed by Clement Steenberg in “Architecture and Landscape”\(^ {38} \). Building up on Paul Frankl’s four aspects of understanding architectural form: purpose, spatial form, plasticity and external appearance. Steenberg develops four aspects of understanding landscape form that breaks up a landscape in elements that appear in four layers: basic form (related to geometry and topography), spatial form (related to spatial composition), image form (related to semiotic understandings), and programme form (related to use). The landscape defined by these aspects can be through of as the landscape that is framed. However, this approach is very static, and does not account for landscape processes. Furthermore, this method of plan analysis focuses on generalities, leaving out particularities\(^ {39} \). Nevertheless, this approach is very strong in highlighting the power of form in structuring space.

A way to understand this form that structures space beyond the notion of the object is through the concept of framing and its materialization. This understanding on framing takes as starting point the elaborations of the frame of Bernard Cache and Elizabeth Grosz on the writings of Gilles Deleuze. As Cache explains, an frame involves: a) an inflection b) a vector to select it c) a frame to stabilize it. This finds an equivalent in the landscape with a) particular set of characteristics or qualities, or specificities. b) tendency towards a refrain or pattern of difference c) stabilizing element that picks out a certain refrain out of all the other ones and minimizes the possibility of change.

None of these components are necessarily fixed: qualities emerge and change over time, there is more than one possible refrain at once, even the most concretely materialized stabilized elements, such as a material boundary, can allow for multiple refrains to coexist or for qualities to changer. It is important to highlight that the qualities aforementioned need not be fixed materialized objects in turn, but rather they are materials in becoming, part of a processes. In a landscape, what is framed isn’t a


static pre-existing entity but rather a material process over time.

The frame itself involves the making specific of a pattern of difference. It has a material presence that is either diffuse - that is to say the pattern of difference is distributed over that which is differentiated, or concentrated - into what is usually recognized as a frame. This can be explained in the following simplified diagram:

![Diagram showing the difference between diffuse frame and concentrated framing]

^ Simplified illustration of the difference between diffuse frame and concentrated framing

3.4 Frame of frames

From territory to any instance of greenery in the city, there are a number of elaborations and articulations that occur to make this specific instant. However, these articulations and elaborations, or sequences of framing, at some point cease to be variations of one another and become specific to a larger specificity in an irreducible way. In other words, certain framings resonate across other framings, in such that such framings are nested in one another.

Within these scales, there are also articulations such as making more specific without being a frame (for example the interstitial space between buildings, the garden of a house, the yard of a block). These articulations, although they can partake in processes of framing, are specific within their scales, rather than specificities to their scale. For example all the gardens in a neighbourhood of houses with gardens are of course specific to the house that houses them, but a park is specific to the entire neighborhood, and to all the gardens. Each of these specified areas of these scales has ways of framing particular to them. These framings-with-frames are not to be understood hierarchically, nor absolutely. They are meant to be a starting point, a tool for schematic analysis of the city, deriving a set of scales not based on empirical dimensions but rather on frames.

These infinite series of frames describe a topological space. Rather than thinking the landscape as fixed in a set of predetermined, metric scales, the idea of frame in frames allows to connect disparate elements of a landscape based on their framings - their shared intervals and shared consistency. The landscape as frame-of-frames allows for a bypassing of both (metrically) measured space and (human)
perceptive space. Any given ‘frame’ that the landscape is viewed in is but one among many others - the landscape is no longer a finite entity waiting to be divided into appropriately (metrical) intervals, but rather the continual series of frames is what makes the landscape, which is no longer one universal landscape but many landscapes entangled in one another. A landscape as frame-of-frames is a landscape that is continuously articulating and elaborating not only the territory and territories it frames, but also the very conditions that the frames and framings operate on.

3.5 Landscape processes

Landscape always in becoming. Not only is landscape always changing, shifting, reassembling, but it is always producing difference. This is the very same production of excess that Grosz describes in her account of the elaboration of the earth. A given landscape can be understood as the traces of a series of processes of and in the landscape. These traces are not only the static remnants of past processes, but also part of other processes in turn. To recall the first explanation of framing mentioned in this text, these traces can be considered inflections, while the force of the unfolding of processes can be thought of as the vectors. The frame allows for the understanding of these processes without subscribing to a chronology of causes and effects or linear way by giving us the time of the interval. It is possible, then, to think of a landscape as a series of frames and intervals, in which certain processes are allowed to unfold while others are prevented.

The processes that shape a landscape are varied. There are not only geological processes (plate tectonics, sedimentation, erosion, etc. but also construction, resource extraction), biological processes (plant growth and decay, animal populations, bacterial colonization, etc.), and social processes (cultural, political, economic, etc.) but these processes intra-act, and from assemblages that produce new configurations and becomings beyond the initial components - emergence. An ecosystem, for example, is such an emergent assemblage. It is important to emphasize that neither the interaction between such processes or the components of an assemblage are ever exclusively all human or non-human, or of a particular domain in particular (for example, geological). Understanding a situation as such is a matter of framing - but a rather unimaginative one.

3.6 Emergence and the frame

In the field of landscape architecture, the idea of designing to allow for emergence is an appealing notion. In his book “Emergence in landscape architecture” and in is “Ten point guides to Emergence”, Rod Barnett advocates for the thinking of design as an open system that links humans to landscape. He explicitly links ideas of auto-catalytic systems - systems in which energy and matter self-organize producing an output that affects the input of the system, giving it the ability to self-organize - with the scope and matter of landscape architecture. Barnett explicitly argues for an emergent approach to landscape architecture that considers landscape an open system,
and a landscape architect’s role to make “sources not sinks [of matter/energy flows]”. He contrasts this to the nineteenth century park, which “requires maintenance in the form of physical and economic input” and therefor is a sink. This is, of course, a very exciting and compelling proposition and position for landscape architecture.

To think of this in terms of the frame and framing is to also think of exclusion and inclusion - what is encouraged to emerge, and what is suppressed. Emergence always implies a framing process - the selection of certain qualities (inflections), certain tendencies (vectors), and often involves certain external (or at least, at the same level as the entire system) parameters as frame. There are many landscape design projects that succeed in setting the conditions necessary for emergence within the system they frame - wildlife flourishes, plant communities grow, nutrients cycle through the system - ecosystems are (re)established. All these kind of projects do so within certain conditions. Every time the conditions are unpacked, the limits of the conception we are willing to conjure landscape as open-ended, emergent, even wild roll back onto themselves to reinforce the very same things such approach strayed away. The movement from pastoral parks as energy sinks gets expanded to the production of the correct type of wildness. We want the coyote because it is wild, and might even tolerate the tick, but not the disease. A category providing certain kind of favorable human-non-human assemblages becomes clear - and such landscapes become co-opted in the production of particular projections of explicitly human desires and wills. This becomes a matter of framing - of exclusion/inclusion, in order to allow certain things - processes, becomings - to unfold and to prevent others from doing so.

The call for emergence in landscape architecture is often presented as a utopian situation of cohabitation. Barnett, for example, calls for “a truly sustainable public realm will be one in which difference is not only tolerate but is productive of difference; where the pressures of control and appropriation, consumption and politics are negotiated, enabled and carried out in a democratic manner by those who constitute the democracy; where safe, transgressive practices are not repressed or discouraged; where flexible and non-exclusionary cultural and social life is enabled”. The call for a “sustainable public realm” supportive of difference is admirable, but the reliance of democracy and the specification of “safe, transgressive practices” is clashes with the “non-exclusionary” life it hopes for. Much has been said already of systems of liberal democracy, where everything is included ‘safely’ and the tyranny of the majority rules. In order to have “collective [as] an assemblage of interacting species, objects and processes” as Barnett calls for, this assemblage must preserve its internal differences, its clashes. Perhaps this is a case where the temptation to frame the entirety of human and nonhuman actants should be avoided- rather than smoothen a total human-non-human assemblage and eliminating disturbances within it by framing it in the first place. Perhaps, sometimes, it is best to not frame.

An emergent approach to landscape architecture also attempts to shift
the role of the landscape architect from the imposer of frame to the facilitator of processes. Barnett quotes Waldheim to support his call for “open works or infrastructural systems that are meant to distance questions of authorship in favor of an explicit open-endedness and indeterminacy in the face of future cultural contingencies or larger urban forces.” This ‘distancing’ of authorship risks also being a distancing of accountability and responsibility. In doing so, Barnett advocates for use of “chance as a form finding device” based on processes that are set in motion. But the designer, in choosing the field in which becoming. The designer has made a deliberate choice of frame in the project (or has chosen not to choose and follow given notions concerning the appropriate frame of landscape intervention). Even a meticulously controlled, close ended project is subject to external, larger, and unpredictable processes – especially when shifting time-scales outside the direct time of the project. The world is inherently open-ended and constantly becoming, and the concerns over open-endedness have to work with the scale at hand - with the framing of the task at hand.

An emergent approach to landscape architecture should hold itself accountable. Concepts of emergence in landscape architecture, and the shift behind human-centric world views should make even more clear the responsibility involved. This is not to say that the structuring of everyday affects - of landscape should fall only into the hands of professional practitioners. But by shifting the focus of landscape architecture from form to frame - from answering questions to asking which questions can be asked. As Bennett suggests at the end of her account of vibrant matter, “sometimes ecohealth will require individuals and collectives to back off or ramp down their activeness, and sometimes it will call from grander, more dramatic and violent expenditures of human energy.” This choice is a matter of framing.

3.7 Frame semiotics

The definition of space has to do not only with specificity of a place - the ability to distinguish it from other spaces as well as from its surroundings - but it also has to do with the perceiver. Humans understand the world as 3d, and also understand it through human scale. Our understanding of space has to do with our abilities to perceive it. These abilities have to do with not only with a range of ‘typical’ human physiologic variations of abilities, but also cultural ideas about the extent of the self, and apparatuses that humans consider more or less natural (such as eye glasses). Most often, understandings of ‘space’ has to do with that which can be visually perceived in relation to (our) horizon in a given moment (us as the sum-total of our physical self, cultural self, apparatuses, etc.), blocking the horizon has a stronger impact on enclosing a space than blocking the azimuth or the ground, although space necessarily extends in all directions. Haptic enclosure, however, would take on a different form, and follow

45 Rod Barnett 2015. ‘The Ten Point Guides to Emergence’. Point 6
46 Ibid., Point 6
47 Jane Benett, Vibrant Matter: a political ecology of things, 122
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different patterns. Other types of enclosure would take on forms of delimitation. Any given spatial specificity is made specific through a number of ways - sometimes acting in similar way, and sometimes contradicting each other. Some speculative examples of non-visual spaces framed space:

the 'space' of a familiar scent - its edge the dissolution of intensity; the 'space' of one’s clothes, which follows us wherever one goes, but varies within different clothes, its edge the contact between flesh and skin; the 'space' of a sound - for example the sound of a city - its edge being its lack; the 'space' of focus - for someone with myopia, everything behind the focal point becomes flat; the 'space' of memory - where the limits of a space are defined by the projected memories and associations, the 'space' of the internet, limited by the range of wi-fi, and so on.

These making specific is not merely an phenomenological arrangement of perceptions. While human access to such framings has to do with a very (subjective) perception, to detach the frame from its visual understanding (frame as in picture-frame → frame as in framework) allows us to liberate our understanding of landscape and territory beyond our human perception and limits. At the same time as territorial assemblages or frames involve a territorialization and deterritorialization, Deleuze and Guattari suggest another axis - that of content and expression. Bonta and Protevi clarify this distinction by explaining that content is “that which is put to work”, while expression is “the takeover of content, putting it to work in a ‘functional structure’”. These are the incorporeal but nevertheless acting elements in an assemblage, or signs.

It can be said then that there is some kind of ‘semiotics of framing’ that give it legibility. Recall Pierce’s semiotics of icon, symbol, index, which Deleuze and Guattari shift from concerning relations of signifier-signified to territorialization-deterritorialization-reterritorialization. Such a semiotics might be defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Icon</th>
<th>Reterritorialization</th>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Relation to Outside/Milieu</th>
<th>Consistency Through Separation/Threshold</th>
<th>Defined by Border/Threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Territorialization</td>
<td>Inflection</td>
<td>Traces/Effects of Processes</td>
<td>Consistency Through Difference/Pattern</td>
<td>Defined by [pure] Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Deteritorialization</td>
<td>Vector</td>
<td>Relation to External Codes</td>
<td>Consistency Through Order/Composition</td>
<td>Defined by Movement/Line of Flight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49 Arguments for why this is necessary are many - see Jane Bennett, Rod Barnett, Gilles Clement, and particularly the latter two for explicitly landscape architecture perspective on this. These arguments call for an increased awareness of our impact of the environment, and also the failures of our object-subject relationship in instrumentality (an exploiting) what is ‘other’ to a subject.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pierce</th>
<th>Deleuze + Guattari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Icon: shared characteristic to object</td>
<td>Reterritorialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index: affected by object</td>
<td>Territorialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol: external reference to object</td>
<td>Deteritorialization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Framing then gives meaning to the *specificity* of a landscape through the above-described signs. These make a starting point for the staging of encounters.
4.0 Towards design

Framing is a form of stratification (stratification being an 'extreme' form of assemblage that is all ordered and distinct) that orders through exclusion and inclusion. However, this very exclusion can allow for other kinds of assemblages - and intensities to unfold. The notion frame allows for a particular relation between the stratified and the smooth - and holds tight the intentionality (whether subjective or a-subjective) of such an operation.

Design process constantly involves two operations:

a) framing

b) elaborating

These two mechanisms of action in a design: one which is the elaborating the increasing rich and consistent material, and the second, the introducing of the interval. Both of these ways of elaborating and articulating can be thought through the mechanisms of framing. The usefulness of this is that it provides consistency to the process of design itself and consolidates the project not through an organization of the design process or the design itself, but by identifying the kinds of operations undertaken. This is described by Deleuze and Guattari as the ‘double articulation’:

Double articulation is so extremely variable that we cannot begin with a general model, only a relatively simple case. The first articulation chooses or deducts, from unstable particle flows, metastable molecular or quasi-molecular units [sub stances] upon which it imposes a statistical order of connections and successions [forms]. The second articulation establishes functional, compact, stable structures [forms], and constructs the molar compounds in which these structures are simultaneously actualized [sub stances].

The first articulation is that which selects and orders (framing) - and the second is that which gives it form (frame).

To intervene in a landscape is not only to intervene in human processes, but also in non-human processes - animal and vegetal becomings (‘nature’), mineral and cosmic becomings (‘geology’). Should there not be some kind of participation - some agency given to these processes? Many streams of design advocate for designing with nature, and leaving room for non-human becomings to unfold within the design. But in order to be successful, such instances end up being coded into human understanding - urban wild still carries the fantasies of wilderness along within it, and is mostly tolerated as long as the wild remains withing bounds. Is not much of a participation if one party - here humans - sets up the terms - and limits of the participation and coexistence of human and non-human. While such projects and considerations are very important in preparing the ground for humans (and non-humans) yet to come, imagining new possible ways of coexistence and co-becoming, they cannot ignore the very human role - and therefore responsibility, in this process. Maybe then openness, flexibility, and awareness in, within, and after the design process should be key in design.

There is also a matter of legibility - explicitly related to human understanding.
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This is important to consider not because human understanding is valued more than other understandings, but because any framing human-generated (or assisted, in ) framing process (which is to say, all landscape architecture) also interferes, participates in, and elaborates human processes, assemblages, and constructions. To make a park in the city is to not only interfere in the materials becoming of the city - from concrete, impermeable ground to add permeability, etc. - but also into the city as a human-social construction - where people go, what people do, what people can do - a series of rites and practices - that are as material and as constituent of a city as its forms and infrastructures.

4.1 Next steps

The next step in the understanding of the frame and framing involves testing the possibilities of the frame:
   a) frame as tool - what can framing, reframing, and unframing do
   b) the mechanisms of framing, or how can framing liberate or capture qualities/processes, etc.
   c) what can a series of frames - the frame of frames - do
   d) to what extent can a series of frames in frames allow for openness

   These questions are not to be resolved in finality, but explored through doing. Towards the doing; these translate into design imperatives as follows:
   - identify site refrains/assemblages
   - identify site frames
   - reframe site through combination of frames + practices
   - maintain new frames to allow for possible new reframings
   - open possibilities and potentials for further reframing of site and designed frames

   To think in terms of framing is to think in and out of temporary totalities - is to bring in time. Thinking (of landscape, of territory, of ...) through the frame is to introduce an interval in thinking - a time of thinking that belongs to that very thinking in itself. Landscape architecture (and architecture, and design) is concerned with both the ordering through articulation of territory. It does this however through framing - by deliberate creation of strata - of boundaries, of order - but it can also allow for a certain openness that allows for emergent qualities to unfold. Design is not totally emergent or neutral - it is a deliberate elaboration on the earth. so in this question how articulation, there is both the setting up of this “increasingly rich and consistent material”, but also the choosing of which territorial assemblages to preserve, identify, to privilege - or in other words what to frame. But perhaps even more importantly is to know when to frame. This is the framework towards design.
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