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Abstract

Some communication is explicit: we speak, we write, we draw. Other communication is less obvious: how close is the next person to you? What makes that distance comfortable or uncomfortable? Benjamin Whorf, a linguist, and Edward Hall, an anthropologist, studied human communication under the assumption that the formulation of thought occurs only within the structure of language. What does this mean for designers? What does this mean for our ability to create fresh and new ideas?

These questions are bigger than landscape architecture and in order to explore them it was necessary to consult a related discipline: theater. Through an understanding of the relationship between landscape architecture and theater, as they relate to the creative process, this project attempts to understand how new spatial ideas can be formed in the landscape. By employing actors in exploratory physical-spatial activities known as “Viewpoints”, new creative possibilities can emerge in space that would not be imagined otherwise.
Introduction

Imagine yourself on a trip to a theater. As your subway car slows to a stop, you allow the pushier passengers to crowd the exit doors and lead the exodus up to the street. Exiting the train, you pass waiting passengers as they stand on the platform. Boarding the escalator, you clutch the railing with your right hand, maintaining your balance against that first pull of upward motion. Now on the street, you walk to the theater and arrive at the will call window, or more precisely, the line for the will call window, where you wait for your turn. Ticket in hand, the brass door is held open for you as you enter the lobby where small groups converse, taking advantage of the last few minutes in which standing is an acceptable social behavior. Passing through the inner lobby door, you enter the great volume of the theater. Moving toward the stage, you emerge from beneath the balcony as you walk along the sloped aisle searching for your row. When you arrive you excuse yourself as you cross over to your seat. Elbows tight at your side, you sit in a velvet chair and your knees touch the rear of the seat in front of you. Ten chairs on your right and twelve chairs on your left separate you from the aisles where you last moved with any sense of freedom. As the theater fills in, you have a moment to take in the great volume of space it encompasses. Elaborate moldings and the dim chandelier betray the passage of time as
you make sure to silence your cell phone. Looking ahead, you focus on the proscenium arch and beneath it the stage obscured in shadow, when Act I begins:

No curtain.

No scenery.

The audience, arriving, sees an empty stage in the half-light.

Presently the STAGE MANAGER, hat on and pipe in mouth, enters and begins placing a table and three chairs downstage left, and a table and three chairs downstage right.

He also places a low bench at the corner of what will be the Webb house, left.

"Left" and "right" are from the point of view of the actor facing the audience. "Up" is toward the back wall.

As the house lights go down he has finished setting the stage and leaning against the right proscenium pillar watches the late arrivals in the audience.

When the auditorium is in complete darkness he speaks:

STAGE MANAGER:

This play is called "Our Town." (Wilder 2003, 3)¹

¹ It bears mention that the STAGE MANAGER is a character in the play: an omniscient narrator. The STAGE MANAGER in the context of Our Town does not refer to the actual job of managing the stage. Our Town is a play by Thornton Wilder written in 1937 and first performed in 1938 (Wilder 2003) (Marguiles 2003). It is notable in the context of its era for an extremely sparse stage design, with very little scenery, which was a break with tradition (Marguiles 2003, xiv). The play is widely read and performed in American secondary schools, to the point where its message may have become watered down over the years. (Marguiles 2003). However, it remains an important work because, as Marguiles writes, Wilder, “did for the stage what Picasso and Braque’s experiments in cubism did for painting and Joyce’s stream of consciousness did for the novel. To mistake him for a traditionalist is to do Throton Wilder an injustice. He was, in fact, a modernist who translated European and Asian ideas about theater into the American idiom” (Marguiles 2003, xv).
Over the course of your journey from the subway car to “Grover’s Corners”, the fictional town in which the action of *Our Town* takes place, you have encountered an incredibly impressive series of human creative achievements: a railroad that runs through a tunnel bored through the bedrock beneath a city, an automatic staircase, a massive conglomeration of concrete, steel, asphalt, glass, and light manipulated into an urban form, a theater house with architectural roots in “a Periclean Greek design which evolved from an outdoor hillside with a little flat part for singing about sacrificing a goat” (Cartmill 2012), a device that fits in your pocket and connects you to an electronic network capable of holding the collective knowledge of humankind, and “a great American play. Possibly, the great American play” (Marguiles 2003, xi). You may even have passed a hot dog vendor, and the sheer ingenuity that over thousands of years took a first encounter with a wild ruminant and reinvented that experience as the liquefaction and reconstitution of said ruminant’s component parts into an industrially produced cylindrical mass of flesh boiled in a cart on the street and served on a bun with mustard is just as worthy of attention and of study as any other achievement (Steel 2009).

The focus of this study, however, is not to discuss the material existence of these many marvels, which would even include the play, so
commonly studied in its material form as a printed volume (Marguiles 2003). Instead, the focus of this study is to recognize a relationship between theater and landscape architectural design. By establishing and understanding a dialectic relationship between these two disciplines, new answers and new questions may come to light along with the invigoration of creative spirit (Halprin 1969).

Space is what landscape architects and theater professionals have in common. In fact, space is what all people have in common: “No matter what happens in the world of human beings, it happens in a spatial setting...” (Hall 1969, xi). Landscape architects manipulate materials in the design of space accounting for the logical activities that might occur in the designed space. Theater professionals create performance in space, manipulating the condition of space in subservience to the objective of a particular piece of theatrical art (Brook 1981, Cartmill 2012, Halprin 1969, Wiles 2003). For the landscape architect, manipulation takes place on a range of scales, from the planning of regional settlement and ecological functionality to the aesthetic appeal of the smallest private garden. Theater professionals, likewise, manipulate a great range of settings that include not only the archetypal proscenium theater, the theater in the round, the black box theater, the amphitheater, but furthermore break the boundaries of tradition and extend their art into the natural and built environments as well as the everyday public surroundings that compose the physical fabric of society (Cartmill 2012, Kershaw 2007, Wiles 2003). Similarly, a change in scale in either discipline will often correspond to a change in the number of people affected by a given intervention or performance, from zero to one to unknowable quantities. And let not go unmentioned
the response to context: the creative act that takes place against the backdrop of opportunity or constraint inherent to any environment, whether natural, architectural, or theatrical, in relation to purpose. For both disciplines, it is that creative act which, when addressed successfully provides the strongest argument for the overall success of a project.

In materiality, however, the objectives and practices of landscape architecture and theater begin to differ. The landscape architect often seeks a long-term material priority, whether that be in the creation of form or the encouragement of ecological function and its implication of planned or controlled change over spans on the geological scale of time. Building and development imply duration. Likewise, materially, the theater is built in a physical form that outwardly projects the relative permanence of any other large building (Brook 1981, Cartmill 2012, Wiles 2003). Inwardly, however, its purpose is to accommodate the mercurial changes of artistic theatrical expression and performance over time. The inside of a theater changes (a portion of) its material expression to serve the needs of a given performance (Brook 1981, Cartmill 2012, Wiles 2003).

Let us consider once again the trip to the theater which begins in the subway. When you arrive in the theater district, the subway car is quite full. All of the seats are taken and many people are standing, strap-hanging, as is said. You can hear the noise of the train, but it is not unbearably loud. How close are you to the nearest people? On a crowded subway, you are likely to be close enough to converse, but do you feel the need for conversation? Would you feel comfortable in conversation? How is your attitude toward the idea of conversation
expressed? When the car slows to a stop, you let the pushier passengers exit first, watching them move from their seats and straps into a tight clump just near the door. What would prevent you from wanting to be one of these first to exit? When you reach the platform, what are the waiting passengers doing? What direction are they facing? And when you reach the escalator, how many moving steps do you leave between yourself and the person in front of you? How many steps did the person behind you leave for you? Now that you have reached the street, is it easy to merge yourself into the pedestrian traffic of the busy sidewalk? Is the ease with which are able to merge yourself associated with your experience navigating the area? How do you avoid walking into people that are moving in the opposite direction? Now you have reached the will call window where a single worker conducts the business of ticket distribution and a line has formed. Just as you arrive at the end of the line, a couple simultaneously arrives and to avoid what could be an awkward encounter, you smile cordially and gesture that they take the place in front of you. As you stand in line, which direction do you face? What would happen if you—only you—face the opposite direction?
Having acquired your ticket, you walk into the lobby where a few groups of people are engaged in conversation. On your way to the inner door, you walk between two separate groups, four people on your left and four people on your right. Can you tell which group of four came to the show together and which group happened to run into each other? Entering the theater and finding your row, you must squeeze past a few people to arrive at your chair. Which direction do you face as you shuffle by? How helpful are people in allowing you to make your way? And now that you have arrived at your seat, an important question comes to mind: who will control the armrest?

The trip from the subway to the theater describes a series of interactions that the hypothetical you experiences with people in space. It is a fictional accounting designed to provide a non-exhaustive imagining of various scenarios with what can be described as proxemic implications. Proxemics is a word that was first introduced to me by Christopher Cartmill on October 4, 2012, during a class session in which Cartmill, about twenty theater students, and I explored the public space of Brower Commons on the College Avenue Campus of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. The exploration that day was about looking for ways that public space might be engaged through theatrical performance (Cartmill 2012, Wiles 2003). Cartmill’s use of the term proxemics originates with the work of anthropologist Edward T. Hall, who published numerous books and articles dealing with the study of proxemics and its implications for behavior, design, foreign diplomacy, and many diverse topics for human beings sharing a planet (Hall 1959, Hall 1968, Hall 1969, Hall 1972, Hall 1974, Sommer 1969). According to Hall 1974, “Proxemics is the study of man’s transactions as he perceives
and uses intimate, personal, social, and public space in various settings while following out-of-awareness dictates for cultural paradigms” (Hall 1974, 2). Hall cautions, however, that even those four distinct spaces he cites—intimate, personal, social, and public—are distinctions formed by Western cultural tendencies and are likely to have zero bearing on spatial behavior in non-Western cultures (Hall 1974, 5). The term transactions refers to behaviors exhibited by people, always in a spatial context, responding to their environment and to the other people in that environment, displayed through such outwardly observable traits as posture, body orientation, body distance, eye behavior, voice loudness, listening behavior, and seeking or avoiding touch (Hall 1974, 3). As these notions were introduced to me in the context of theatrical performance, their observation can be used to describe and understand the qualities of behaviors within a space and how those behaviors relate to a quantity of space (Cartmill 2012). Is there conversation? How many steps between yourself and the person in front of you? Which direction do you face? These observations seem to contribute to the experience of space and affect the way people perceive, behave in, and move through space in a way that extends beyond the material definition of spatial volume (Goldfinger 1941). Our acts of movement, of behavior, and our outwardly expressed acts of perception form the basis of communication, of language that can be visual alone, visual and verbal, or verbal alone (Hall 1959, Hall 1968, Hall 1969, Hall 1972, Hall 1974).

Imagine yourself back in your hypothetical velvet theater seat as the show begins. You have lost the battle for armrests on both fronts. The chandelier dims above you as the STAGE MANAGER sets up the tables. Wilder’s stage directions have told us “No curtain. No
scenery.” and this mandate is upheld by the production design. Without an overt visual representation of Grover’s Corners, with “scenery” as a representation of setting, how can you buy into the drama? How can you believe it? What will make you care about the interactions that take place on the stage (and in the case of Our Town, in the rows and aisles)? How will you, with your critical and analytical mind, suspend your sense of disbelief? Donald Margulies writes, “Stripping the stage of fancy artifice, Wilder set himself a formidable challenge. With two ladders, a few pieces of furniture, and a minimum of props, he attempted ‘to find a value above all price for the smallest events of daily life’” (my emphasis) (Marguiles 2003, xv). In order to be believable, these small events would have to realistically recreate Hall’s transactions. With the scenery stripped away, the actors are left with spoken word and proxemic action to tell the story. This is a move that implies confidence in both the audience and in the actors. It says that the actors can make the story believable, make it legible. It says that the audience can believe it, they can read it, they can understand the language as spoken and as seen. And with so much stripped away, it speaks volumes on the human capacity of perception. Like a science experiment, it strips away the variables of scenery and controls for proxemic legibility as a formative element of visual storytelling. It explores the nuance of action in everyday life and relies upon a believable spatial representation thereof for validation and the suspension of disbelief. Our Town shows us that we read interpersonal encounters in a powerful spatial way.

That is worth exploring, as it has profound implications for landscape architects who design spaces that people use, occupy, and experience. In design studio courses, we insert representations of
human form into representations of landscape space. We judge these representations based on what *feels* right: the designer’s intuition. How can we better inform that intuition? Is it reasonable to imagine that interpersonal encounter can form the basis of design in a material world? Can spatial behavior inform design? Can *what looks right* in the spatial communication of a theatrical perspective inform the design of a landscape space? This is what the study that follows will attempt to answer.
Landscape Architecture and Theater: Understanding the Creative Process

As discussed in the introduction, this project is interested in landscape architecture and theater. What can we learn from the relationship between the two fields? This is certainly not the first time such a question has been asked. Lawrence Halprin, for instance, bases his interest in scoring—"symbolizations of processes which extend over time" (Halprin 1969, 1)—in his personal experience: "This interest grew, quite clearly, from two different sources: first, because I am professionally an environmental designer and planner involved in the broad landscape where human beings and nature interface; and second, because of my close relationship to dance and theatre due largely to my wife, the dancer and choreographer Ann Halprin..." (Halprin 1969, 1). James Rose, too, sees a relationship between landscape architecture and theater in the process of understanding and changing a place: "No matter how I sift the ingredients of the landscape, instead of characters in search of a play I find a play in search of any character at all..." (Rose 1987, 66).

Both fields share deep roots within the history of humanity
(Cartmill 2012, Jellicoe and Jellicoe 1995, Wiles 2003) and both are capable of displaying massive depth of insight into the way people live and see the world. It can be said that landscape architecture and theater share a foundation in the historical interpretation of our primitive human ancestors. Geoffrey and Susan Jellicoe assert in the canonical volume, *The Landscape of Man*, that, “The first landscapes consciously conceived by man appear in the cave paintings of France and northern Spain between 30,000 and 10,000 B.C.” (Jellicoe and Jellicoe 1995, 14). However, these images painted on the walls of caves consciously conceive not only of landscape, but also of theater. They communicate action relevant to human experience: an idea which can serve as a definition of theater. I spoke about this idea with a group of acting students and they agreed with the assertion, adding that these paintings serve as an example of the communication that was happening among

*Figure 3: Cave painting from Lascaux, France (Source: Jellicoe and Jellicoe 1995, 14-15)*
these ancestral people, and that before they were painted on the wall, it is likely that these animals were described through word or sound and gesture or mimicry, and that in those actions lie the foundations of all theater.

Both fields, moreover, are deeply engaged in what we call the creative process: a series of interrelated actions taken in the advancement of some new concept produced in relation to an existing context of physical, social, emotional, and/or intellectual conditions. This definition clearly has roots in Halprin’s RSVP cycles: “...the multidimensional and moving interconnectedness between...” what Halprin has termed Resources, Scores, Valuaction, and Performace (Halprin 1969, 2). As Halprin explains, and as the terms multidimensional and interconnected imply, this process is not linear: “The cycle operates in any direction and by overlapping. The cycle can start at any point and move in any direction” (Halprin 1969, 2). Indeed, Halprin is highly critical of a linear process that would attempt to lead in some way to a perfect outcome:

One of the greatest dangers that we face is the danger of becoming goal-oriented. It is a tendency that crops up on every hand and in every field or endeavor. It is a trap which goes like this: things are going poorly (in the realm of politics or religion or building a city of the world community or a personal relationship or whatever). As thinking people we must try to solve this problem that faces us. Let us set ourselves a “goal” upon which we can all agree (most goals after all are quite clearly moralistically based

Figure 4: The RSVP Cycle
(Source: Halprin 1969, 2)
and incontrovertibly “good ideas”). Having set ourselves this goal we can then proceed posthaste to achieve it by the most direct method possible. Everyone can put his shoulder to the wheel, and systems, engineering, technology, and our leader (or whatever) will get us to the agreed goal.

It doesn’t work! The results of this oversimplified approach, now coming into general vogue, are all around us in the chaos of our cities and the confusion of our politics (or other politics—fascism and communism are clear statements of this approach). It generates tension in personal relationships by burying the real problems; it avoids the central issue of education, which is why today’s young people are dropping out; it is destroying the resources and physical beauty of our planet; and it avoids the basic issue.

There are evidences of this kind of thinking in the attempt to make a science out of community design, as if by assigning it the term “science” then the goal of perfection can be reached. Human community planning cannot ever be a science anymore than politics can rightly be called political science. Science implies codification of knowledge and a drive toward perfectibility none of which are possible or even desirable in human affairs. (Halprin 1969, 4).

Halprin finds some level of absurdity in the notion that community design should ever be treated as a science. Imagine the absurdity of theater as a science! I believe that Halprin’s statement on the futility of perfection applies equally to landscape architecture and theater: the possibilities for design and performance are infinitely divergent. Like a thumb print, no two designs or performances are identical. No two contexts are identical. If science relies upon replicability to build knowledge, then design and performance rely upon human response within context.

The relationship between theater and environmental study, a strong interest within landscape architecture or as Halprin terms it, environmental design, is discussed by Peter Brook, an influential director and theoretician who writes in The Empty Space in 1968:

Most people could live perfectly well without any art at all – and even if they regretted its absence it would not hamper their functioning in any way. But in the theatre there is no such separation: at every instant the practical question
is an artistic one: the most incoherent, uncouth player is as much involved in matters of pitch and pace, intonation and rhythm, position, distance, colour and shape as the most sophisticated. In rehearsal, the height of the chair, the texture of the costume, the brightness of the light, the quality of emotion, matter all the time: the aesthetics are practical. One would be wrong to say that this is because theatre is an art. The stage is a reflection of life, but this life cannot be re-lived for a moment without a working system based on observing certain values and making value-judgments. A chair is moved up or down stage, because it’s ‘better so’. Two columns are wrong – but adding a third makes them ‘right’ – the words ‘better’, ‘worse’, ‘not so good’, ‘bad’ are day after day, but these words which rule conditions carry no moral sense whatsoever.

Anyone interested in processes in the natural world would be very rewarded by a study of theatre conditions. His discoveries would be far more applicable to general society than the study of bees or ants. Under the magnifying glass he would see a group of people living all the time according to precise, shared, but un-named standards (Brook 1981, 98-99).

The passage shows how theater and landscape architecture can be similar in process: the iterative tweaking of objects in space until the setting looks or feels ‘right’ according to the subjective judgment of the designer or director. Moreover, Brook’s words translate easily into Halprin’s RSVP framework. The players, pitch, intonation, distance, color, shape, chair, costume, light, emotion, and stage constitute a non-exhaustive list of theatrical Resources. The script is a Score: it symbolizes a process, a performance, over time. The director observes and makes “value-judgments”, the equivalent of Halprin’s Valuaction. The performance is the resultant combination. Figure 5 compares the processes of landscape design and theater in the context of Halprin’s RSVP Cycle. And I appreciate and agree with Brook’s assertion that the student of the natural world could be fascinated and educated by the ecosystem of theatrical culture, for as much as both disciplines may have some inherited mission to encapsulate themselves in books for communication through generations and with outsiders, it is through direct exposure to people, process, and product (performance or space, depending) that the
distinct practices come into focus and their impacts become sensations.

An important question then becomes, how can the creative processes practiced in landscape architecture and theater be linked?

Landscape architecture is the sum of its theories and practices. Theater is the sum of its theories and practices. To this point, I have referred to landscape architecture and theater as “fields”: a vague term which implies some degree of boundary and encapsulation. A field is an individual entity with some characteristic or set of characteristics that it possesses and which in turn define it. A more appropriate term to describe landscape architecture and theater, however, may be “discipline.”
A discipline is a branch of study which implies both scholarly activity—the building of knowledge and theory—and professional application. Deming and Swaffield add that “...it is generally accepted that...disciplinary status depends on whether or not...[a proposed autonomous discipline] has the capacity to sustain and disseminate research and develop a specialized body of knowledge” (Deming and Swaffield 2011, 17). Disciplines, furthermore, evolve as knowledge and practice change through application. The origin of a discipline may be a convergence of several lineages of knowledge and practice, as is the case for landscape architecture, which “...can trace origins in fine art, architecture, surveying, engineering, agriculture, and horticulture” (Deming and Swaffield 2011, 18). Theater too, can trace a lineage of knowledge and practice with tradition dating back to Ancient Greece and ancient India and theory and practice evolving over all those years (Wiles 2003). Perhaps the best contemporary evidence for theater as a discipline is its need for theoretical resolution on the question of “theater” versus “performance” (Wiles 2003, 2-3). That it has such a question marks it as a discipline, in the same way that theoretical differentiation has yet to occur, according to Deming and Swaffield, between landscape architecture and landscape planning, though landscape planning may be classified as an emergent “subdiscipline” (Deming and Swaffield 2011, 18). Indeed, in both landscape architecture and theater, emerging knowledges constantly inform the questions that in each discipline may be the most difficult to answer: What is landscape architecture? And what is theater?

Within the discipline, there is a culture. Culture is a loaded word. As Hall quips, “Culture is a word that has so many meanings already that
one more can do it no harm” (Hall 1959, 43). A starting definition for might be: “The distinctive ideas, customs, social behaviour, products, or way of life of a particular nation, society, people, or period. Hence: a society or group characterized by such customs…” (Oxford English Dictionary s.v. Culture 2013). Hall, however, argues in *The Silent Language* to consider culture as a form of communication with biological origins in which we operate and are operated upon by “out-of-awareness” tendencies. (Hall 1959, 2). Consider, from a cultural perspective, the skills of the landscape architect in the modification of landform. The act of moving soil and rocks from one place to another can be imagined as purely random. But landscape architects move soil and rocks from one place to another with intention: to create a terrace, to divert the flow of water, to site a building, for example. The intention is culturally derived and communicates something of the values within the profession. These are values that directly influence ideas, behaviors, and priorities within the discipline. Theater, also a discipline, has a culture of its own. David Wiles, a historiographer of theater describes three non-exhaustive sub-cultures of theater:

“There is an official culture centered around productions of classic plays, commanding a high level of social prestige…. There is an alternative culture (no longer a youth culture as in the sixties)... minimally resourced and operating outside prestigious urban centres. There is also a commercially based popular culture, fostering many modes of performance other than theatre, including stand-up comedy, dance shows, circus and pantomime. To these three main performance cultures, one can add the non-western ritual theatre witnessed by western travelers, theatre-in-education, carnival practices, performance art and much more (Wiles 2003, 19).

Furthermore, my personal observations inform a perception of the culture of theater as a communication of collaborative creation. For instance, to envision a performance of *Our Town* would require the communicative
collaboration of actors with a director, stage managers, and set, costume, makeup, lighting, and sound designers. These professionals collaborate with a text that was written by a playwright, who may (but is not likely to) take part in the direction or production of the performance. The performance, therefore, is no more the intellectual property of the playwright than it is of the director, or the actor, or the set, costume, makeup, lighting, or sound designer. The performance is the intellectual property of the collaboration among these professionals. In this way, collaboration is a fundamental tenant of theatrical culture.

Hall’s association of culture with communication leads to questions about language, and indeed, Hall’s thinking on culture as communication builds upon concepts in the science of linguistics (Hall 1959, 145-147, Hall 1968, Hall 1969). Hall credits Benjamin Whorf with the notion that the, “Formulation of ideas is not an independent process, strictly rational..., but is part of a particular grammar, and differs, from slightly to greatly, between different grammars” (Whorf 1940). Formulation of thought, therefore, is not independent of language, but occurs within the structure of language, which is itself a formalized vehicle of culture (Hall 1959, Hall 1968, Hall 1969, Whorf 1940). The implications of this line of thought are serious and according to Hall they, “…strike at the root of the doctrine of ‘free will,’ because they indicate that all men [and women] are captives of the language they speak as long as they take their language for granted” (Hall 1969, 2).

How can we avoid taking language for granted? Landscape architects employ language in their professional work. Landscape architects speak and write, which are obvious forms of language,
and they also draw and model. Moreover, there is a certain amount of convention associated with their drawings, or what Whorf might call a grammar. The plan drawing is a transcription of a complex physical condition into a codified system, relying on graphic symbolism to communicate spatial condition: the contour line represents an incremental change in topography, the thick line may represent the wall of a building, the dashed line may represent the “property line”. It answers the question of where? Likewise, the sectional drawing is a graphic expression that is often less symbolic as it attempts to be more literally representative of the physical condition of a space. It is best suited to answer the question of how? Beyond drawing, the physical three-dimensional model, too, is a systematic codification of a spatial condition, and for what it lacks in precision, it compensates for in representation, versatility, and legibility. It is best suited to answer the question of what is it like?

Theater, too, employs language. The script is an obvious example of language. From the script, and through design and rehearsal, the performance is composed. Calling to mind once again the image of Our Town being performed, Hall’s proxemics take on the role of communication as a language. The characters speak to each other, but their proxemic relationships communicate something more about their relationships and characterization. This consideration of proxemics shows that the action on the stage is as much a language as the words from the actors’ mouths. That action is explored theatrically in a set of exercises known as Viewpoints, documented and explained in The Viewpoints Book in 2005 by Anne Bogart and Tina Landau. One definition of Viewpoints as a language states that, “Viewpoints is a set of names given to certain
principles of movement through time and space; these names constitute a language for talking about what happens onstage” (Bogart and Landau 2005, 8). As a structure for communication, Viewpoints organizes stage action in time and space, focusing on aspects of tempo, duration, and repetition, shape, gesture, architecture, spatial relationship, and topography (Bogart and Landau 2005, 8-11).

If we consider Hall’s definition of culture as communication, and recognize explicit forms of language (speaking, writing, drawing, stage action) as communication, it bears asking, where does communication fit in Halprin’s RSVP Cycle? If, as Whorf and Hall contend, formulation of thought only happens within the structure of language, then in consideration of the explicit languages we are aware that we use (e.g. English) along with the out-of-awareness languages that may have as much impact on our formulation of thought (e.g. proxemics), how does communication relate to the creative process, specifically the RSVP Cycle as outlined by Halprin?

Two possibilities come to mind. In the first, we might argue that communication is included within the RSVP Cycle. Communication may be a Resource that we work with in the process. Or communication may be a Score, describing the process. However, if these scenarios can be considered true, then it asserts that the creative process as represented by the RSVP Cycle is somehow greater than the capacity of communication. It says that communication is subservient to creativity; that communication happens within creativity. This is the opposite of what is contended by Whorf and Hall. In the second possibility, we might take the Whorf and Hall view of communication as the general framework
in which all creativity may occur. This view would assert that the RSVP Cycle can only occur within a structure of communication.

Both possibilities are worthy of investigation. However, in the context of this project, the focus will be placed on the latter. This project assumes that the creative process as represented by Halprin’s RSVP Cycle occurs within the structure of communication, which includes culture and language. By extension this means that new creative possibilities within landscape architecture take place within the structure of landscape architectural communication and that new creative possibilities within theater take place within the structure of theatrical communication. This idea is displayed in the top half of Figure 6.

Therefore the premise of this project is to expand communication of landscape architecture and communication of theater by synthesis, as shown in the bottom half of Figure 6. The resultant Performance, to borrow Halprin’s term, is the landscape architectural design of a space located on the Douglass Campus of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. The Resources for the design of the space are a landscape architectural analysis of the existing space and a theatrical investigation of the existing space. The Scores are the documentation of these processes. The Valuation is subjectively my own.
Figure 6: Synthesis of process through communication. Derived from Halprin’s diagram of the RSVP Cycle found in Halprin 1969.
As a matter of naming, I will refer to this space variously as “the exterior of Walters Hall” or “the study space” or “the design space” and even devolve into simply writing “the space”.

Let’s begin with a visual representation of the study space in the form of an aerial view (Figure 7). The red dot in Figure 7 represents the design space: the exterior of Walters Hall located on the Cook/Douglass Campus of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. It is on the northern side of George Street, which has historically been associated with Douglass College.

The study space is located centrally among a group of buildings which house the performing arts departments of the Mason Gross School of the Arts. A wooded ravine appears to sever the Mason Gross complex into two pieces; however, two existing bridges form a continuous connection across the geophysical divide.

Although Walters Hall is the centralized home of the Department
Photographic base map derived from New Jersey High Resolution Orthoimagery, images "h9b4" and "i9a1", captured between 03/18/2007 and 05/03/2007, NAD83, accessed through USGS EarthExplorer, downloaded 01/09/2013.
of Theater and the Mason Gross complex houses a number of theater facilities, there remain a number of theater facilities that are a distance from the general complex. As a result, enrollment in the Department of Theater implies enrollment in a program of pedestrianism among the various theater facilities and campus destinations, as shown in Figure 8. The exterior of Walters Hall, in this context, becomes a centralized destination for people in the Department of Theater: they move through the space often as they arrive at and depart from Walters Hall.

Zooming in to a smaller scale, Figure 9 shows the exterior of Walters Hall as an important junction point for members of the Department of Theater. It is their central station, but the space is not the exclusive property of the Department of Theater nor of the School of the Arts. Indeed, because of its proximity to the two bridges crossing the ravine, which at this point on the campus is nearly thirty feet deep, the design space becomes an important junction point for the entire campus: one must pass through the space to move between the eastern and western portions of the campus north of George Street. Therefore, this space is important not only to the Department of Theater, but to anyone who needs to cross the ravine.
Photographic base map derived from New Jersey High Resolution Orthoimagery, images "h9b4" and "i9a1", captured between 03/18/2007 and 05/03/2007, NAD83, accessed through USGS EarthExplorer, downloaded 01/09/2013.
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Photographic base map derived from New Jersey High Resolution Orthoimagery, images "h9b4" and "i9a1", captured between 03/18/2007 and 05/03/2007, NAD83, accessed through USGS EarthExplorer, downloaded 01/09/2013.
Having established a context for the exterior of Walters Hall within the greater expanse of Cook/Douglass Campus, the conditions of the site will now be analyzed in greater detail.

Figures 10-11 provide a general contextualization of the design space that will be relevant for the rest of this study and offer a transition from aerial photography to line drawing as representative of the space in the plan view. The design space is roughly defined by the northern edge of Douglass Library, eastern edge of Voorhees Chapel, southern edge of Walters Hall, and western edge of the Art History building. The space is entered in the southwestern corner by a sidewalk and roadway passing between Douglass Library and Voorhees Chapel, in the northwestern corner by a walking path which extends westward across the campus, in the northeastern corner by a covered bridge which passes into a covered architectural space beneath a mezzanine which connects Walters Hall to the Art History building on the second floor, and in the southeastern corner by a walking path between the Art History building and Douglass library which connects to a pedestrian suspension bridge.

Several existing conditions photographs are included as part of Figure 12 to illustrate these entrances and then general conditions of the site. Photo 1 shows the complex formed by Walters Hall and the Art History building from the entry point between Voorhees Chapel and Douglass Library. To the left is a parking area for ten cars, adjacent to Voorhees Chapel, separated from a patch of lawn by a raised structure with plantings. The walking path leads ahead into a lawn area in front of Walters Hall, where five sculptures are placed. Although the study space is considered to be defined by a relationship among Walters Hall,
In the Art History building, and Voorhees Chapel, the space has a feeling of division. This is because the parking lot and raised planting structure physically divide the space into two distinct parts: the parking lot and the grassy area. Photo 5 shows the space beneath the second-floor mezzanine connecting Walters Hall with the Art History building. In the background is visible the covered bridge which connects the study space to Bettenbender Plaza on the other side of the ravine. Although this covered space is sheltered from the element of rain, it is also deprived of light, feeling dark even during the light of day, a sensation which is captured in Photo 4. Photo 2 shows the grassy lawn area between the Art History building on the right, Walters Hall in the background, and the raised structure which defines the parking area on the left. Photo 6 shows Voorhees Chapel in the background and the raised structure which defines the parking area in front of it. Together, Photos 2 and 6 illustrate the extent to which the overall space is damaged by the raised structure which defines the parking area. It is marginalized and made to feel smaller than it should. Photo 3 shows the lane adjacent to Voorhees Chapel which leads to the parking area and to the rear of Walters Hall, providing access to the building’s fuel tank and dumpster area. Photo 7 shows the rather undefined northwestern entrance to the study space between Voorhees Chapel in the background on the left and Walters Hall in the foreground and middleground on the right. The ground plane in this area is poured concrete, the footprint of which marks the extent of the fuel tank that is below ground. Figure 8 looks directly south from the northwestern corner of the site. In the left middleground is the Art History building and in the right background is the Douglass Library. This photo begins to tell the story of sun and shadow as it relates to the study
Photographic base map derived from New Jersey High Resolution Orthoimagery, images "h9b4" and "i9a1", captured between 03/18/2007 and 05/03/2007, NAD83, accessed through USGS EarthExplorer, downloaded 01/09/2013.
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Linework base derived from CAD drawing provided by Rutgers University Facilities and Capital Planning. Date of composition unknown. Drawing provided 01/11/2013.
space, with the strong shadows of the buildings in stark contrast to the brightness and warmth where the sunlight is allowed to hit the ground.

In addition to these photographs, two sectional drawings have been prepared to communicate the existing conditions of the site, and their extents are keyed to Figure 12. Section A-A’, looking southwest, shows the relationship among the covered ravine bridge, Art History building, grassy space with sculpture, parking area, and Voorhees Chapel. Moving from A to A’, people are able to walk across the ravine within the covered bridge and arrive at the space beneath the mezzanine connecting Walters Hall with the Art History building (also shown in Photos 4 and 5). From there they can proceed into the A’ direction through the sculpture. The raised structure which defines the parking area prevents easy passage into the parking area, though there are ways around it, visible in Figure 6. Movement is also possible in the direction of the Douglass Library, which is visible in the background of this section. Section B-B’, looking northwest, shows the relationship between Douglass Library and Walters Hall. Between the two buildings are two spaces housing very different examples of sculpture, separated by a path. In the middleground, the raised structure which separates the parking area is once again clearly visible. Voorhees Chapel, in the background, defines the extent of the space.
Figure 12
Keyed Conditions Diagram

Photographs #1-8 on facing page
Section Drawings A-A’ and B-B’ on following two pages

Linework base derived from CAD drawing provided by Rutgers University Facilities and Capital Planning. Date of composition unknown. Drawing provided 01/11/2013.
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Figure 15 provides an inventory of the existing plant life in and around the study space. Species have been cataloged and identified spatially within the diagram. Figure 15 shows that the plant life in and around the study space is oriented more toward human use and aesthetics than toward ecological productivity. For instance, the spruce, cherry, Japanese Maple, cedar, zelkova, barberry, euonymus, Chinese Wisteria, shrub rose, and English Ivy are all examples of nursery plants sold for either aesthetic effects (e.g. weeping cherry blossoms) or functional effects (e.g. the “parking lot tough” barberry). It is important to distinguish these plants as either aesthetically-prioritized or human-functionally-prioritized, rather than ecologically-prioritized, because it is easier to justify taking and re-building a human-made arrangement than an ecologically important arrangement.

Figure 16 provides an analysis of the soil conditions of the site from a 1972 boring report conducted prior to the construction of Walters Hall. The soil is predominantly defined as a mixture of clay and shale with many possible occurrences of soil fill. It is also known that a gymnasium building occupied the site prior to the construction of Walters Hall. Therefore, it can be said that in addition to its clay and shale characteristics, it is highly likely that the soil is both disturbed and compacted. In other words, there is no ecologically sensitive soil on this site that would have to be treated in any special manner.

Figure 17 provides an inventory of the underground utilities in and around the study site. Indeed, the study site is quite densely packed with utility lines and access points. This diagram serves to inform the position that any redesign of the study space may provide an
**Figure 15**

**Existing Plant Inventory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Latin name</th>
<th>Common name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Picea</em> spp.</td>
<td>Spruce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Prunus</em> spp.</td>
<td>Weeping Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Acer</em> palmatum</td>
<td>Japanese Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Quercus</em> rubra</td>
<td>Red Oak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Acer</em> rubrum</td>
<td>Red Maple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Cedrus</em> atlantica</td>
<td>Blue Atlas Cedar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Zelkova</em> serrata</td>
<td>Japanese Zelkova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Berberis</em> thunbergii</td>
<td>Japanese Barberry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Euonymus</em> alatus</td>
<td>Winged Euonymus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Wisteria</em> sinensis</td>
<td>Chinese Wisteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Rosa</em> spp.</td>
<td>Shrub Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Hedera</em> Helix</td>
<td>English Ivy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 16
**Soil Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clay</th>
<th>Sandy Clay</th>
<th>Silty clay</th>
<th>Gravel</th>
<th>Shale</th>
<th>Cinders</th>
<th>Small Boulder</th>
<th>Possible Fill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17
Known Underground Utilities Diagram
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This diagram assembled from analysis of:
1. CAD drawing provided by Rutgers University Facilities and Capital planning. Date of composition unknown. Drawing provided 01/11/2013.
unparalleled opportunity for retrofit and repair of existing utility systems. Furthermore, in consideration of the amount of utility equipment and the need for periodic access and repair, it may be wise to recommend modular pavements be used for any paved surfaces in a new design. Modular systems, such as brick pavers, can be taken up to allow access to utilities and restored to their original position without damage.

Figure 18 provides an analysis of the various modes of travel that occur in the current design of the study space. In the current configuration, there are conflicts present among pedestrians, cyclists, cars, and service trucks. Luckily, the current movement of cars and trucks is both slow and sporadic, so while there are indeed conflicts between motor vehicles and people on foot or bike, the conflicts do not appear to be overly dangerous, assuming some level of care and conscientiousness from all parties. The dangerous conflicts, on the other hand, do not involve motor vehicles. The dangerous conflicts are between people on foot moving at walking speed and people on bikes or skateboards moving at higher speeds. There is confusion and the possibility for collision on the walkways, which are shared by cyclists and skateboarders, as they curve around the Art History building and emerge into the study space.

Figure 19 provides an analysis of the stormwater conditions as they occur in the current design of the study space. Beginning with Photo 9, which is keyed to the plan diagram, stormwater on the asphalt surface west of the library is channeled, unintentionally, into the study space. Photos 10 and 11 show an existing stormwater collection structure, which consists of a paved swale, passing beneath a steel plate, which
Figure 18
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sits at grade with the sidewalk surface. In order for water to enter this system, a portion of curb has been removed at the mouth of the steel plate. This system, unfortunately, is not working correctly: only a small portion of stormwater is entering beneath the steel plate into the paved swale. The majority of stormwater sheets past the opening and arrives at the pavement junction shown in Photo 12 within the study site. The water travels along the expansion joints of these paved surfaces, as shown in Photos 13 and 14, arriving at the north side of the paved path which runs between the library and the Art History building en route to the suspension bridge. Photos 15 and 16 show that this stormwater has begun to carve its own swale along the northern edge of the path, a condition which can lead to mud puddles, the degradation of the path, and ultimately may have consequences for the foundations of the suspension bridge, near which stormwater forms a pool. In all, Photos 9-16 show an occurrence of poor stormwater performance which should be addressed in any redesign. Meanwhile, Photos 17-20 show other instances of generally poor stormwater performance, which detract from the perception and use of the site.

Figures 20-22 provide an analysis of the sun and shade conditions of the study site, leading to an informed prediction of microclimatic conditions of the site. In Figure 21, it is evident that the buildings cast long winter shadows which pervade the site over the course of a day. In the northwest corner, however, a sun pocket forms in the afternoon, which may produce a tolerable condition for short periods of outdoor exposure on mild winter days. The brick buildings absorb and radiate heat into the space, which may further support this condition.
Figure 19
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It may, additionally, be necessary to block northwest winds in order to take full advantage of this tolerable winter microclimate. In Figure 22, the summer shade conditions show a long duration of sun exposure. With southwest winds blocked by the library, this space may become uncomfortably hot in the summer months. Therefore materials must be chosen for a cooling effect, to make the space tolerable during the summer.

The key takeaways from this analysis indicate the resultant design must accomplish the following: (1) maintain the busy flow of pedestrian traffic as people use the two bridges to connect the eastern and western portions of Douglass Campus, (2) maintain vehicle access to Walters Hall along the eastern face of Voorhees Chapel for fire and maintenance vehicles, (3) unify the space into a single whole, (4) improve the management of stormwater on the site, and (5) respond to microclimatic details to make site conditions tolerable in summer and winter months.
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Engagement with Theatrical Language

As was established earlier, this project explores the relationship between landscape architecture and theater as a means of diversifying communication. Communication, or more specifically language, it has been argued by Whorf and Hall is the general structure in which thought it formulated. Therefore by expanding communication between the two fields, new thought can be produced. In the context of this landscape architectural project, that new thought is conceived to be a new spatial design for the exterior of Walters Hall.

To join these two systems of communication together, a theatrical exploration of the existing site conditions was arranged and conducted on March 3, 2012. On that day, eight actors with the assistance of two stage managers and led by a director (all willing collaborators from the Mason Gross School of the Arts) engaged in Viewpoints exercises within the site boundary as delineated in Figure 10. The intention of the exercise was simply to experiment, observe, and see. No grand objectives were stated and there were no goals for the exploration. All participants were willing simply to explore and to see what could be found. The action was documented through photography on the ground and digital video from
the roof of Walters Hall.

There was, of course, some structure to the exploration. Over ninety minutes in the field, the actors participated in the following engagements, in chronological order:

1. Exploration: The actors were asked simply to explore the site and pursue any ideas which caught their attention in the space.

2. Sculpture Points Part I: The actors were asked to create a sculpture in the space. One actor would initiate by running into the space to establish an initial sculpture. Others would follow and build upon the initial sculpture, only as they felt compelled. The resultant sculpture was then photographed.

3. Sculpture Points Part 2: This was a second iteration of the prior engagement.

4. Untold Story: The actors were asked to move through the space, telling a story without the use of words.

5. Literal Parade: The actors were asked to first create a sculpture of a parade. Once in place, the sculpture would be animated in a parade moving throughout the space.

6. Emotional Bubble: The actors were asked to disperse to the four entry points of the space. Once there, they would choose any emotion they wanted to and display that emotion in movement through the space.

7. The Ticket: For the first time of the day, the actors were asked to engage their voices in dialogue during this exercise. In the
exercise, each actor was given a slip of paper and told not to read it. The actors then dispersed themselves throughout the space. Once dispersed, they were asked to read and enact the instruction on the slip of paper. Seven of the eight slips of paper instructed the actor that he or she needs to “buy a ticket, NOW!” One of the eight slips of paper instructed the actor that he or she is the seller of tickets, but that he or she is out of tickets for the next few hours.

8. A Day in the Life: Again using dialogue, the actors were distributed slips of paper with instructions and asked to disperse themselves within the space prior to reading the instructions. Each slip of paper instructed the actor to form a characterization based on several news stories that had occurred in the prior week.

The work of the actors is displayed in photography on pages 57 - 64.
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My intention with this design was to synthesize a landscape architectural analysis of the study space with a reaction to the spatial explorations performed by the actors, in order to produce a new design for the space. From the landscape architectural analysis, I prioritized (1) to maintain the busy flow of pedestrian traffic as people use the two bridges to connect the eastern and western portions of Douglass Campus, (2) to maintain vehicle access to Walters Hall along the eastern face of Voorhees Chapel for fire and maintenance vehicles, (3) to unify the space into a single whole, (4) to improve the management of stormwater on the site, and (5) to respond to microclimatic details to make site conditions tolerable in summer and winter months. These considerations have the potential to produce form for the space with no other intervention. However, in exploring the relationship between landscape architecture communication and theater communication in the production of new thought, or new space, the work of the actors can contribute form.

As the actors engaged the space, they were video recorded from the roof of Walters Hall. The video recording provides a bird’s eye view of the action taking place below, and allows for the translation of that action from the theatrical language of Viewpoints into the landscape
architectural language of the plan view diagram. The images displayed on pages 66-67 show the progression of movement as captured on video and translated into diagram.
From this series of diagrams, I extracted three forms to explore in combination in the redesign of the space in the exterior of Walters Hall. I translated the plan view of these three forms directly into a three-dimensional cardboard model. This process is shown in Figure 23. The red line would correspond to the manipulation of the ground plane. The blue line would correspond to the manipulation of a canopy plane. The green line was included in the diagram to provide form at some middle plane between the ground and the canopy. However, nothing seemed to inherently emerge from the green line, as it had from the red and the blue, and I decided to ignore it.
Figure 23: Synthesis of actor space with physical space
The space that emerged from these steps is illustrated in the plan drawing, concept diagram, sections, and perspective displayed as Figures 24 - 28. The design drawings are an iteration beyond the level reached by the model, and begin to address stormwater management. Circulation was kept largely the same, however, the parking lot was eliminated. The tree-lined walkway, which emerged from the spatial gesture made by the actors represented by the blue line, should slow the speed of bicycle travel, reducing the danger bicycle-pedestrian conflict in the space.

The space, however, fails to feel whole or unified. This is likely a direct result of the circulation, which cuts the space into arbitrary slices. In a revised design, this is the first issue which must be addressed. Moreover, the space seems to be incredibly static, a characteristic which contrasts greatly with movement of the actors which inspired it. The “theatrically-inspired” space lacks theater. So what went wrong?
Figure 24:
Design Proposal Plan View
Figure 25:
Design Proposal Concept Diagram
Figure 27: Design Proposal Section D-D’
Figure 28:
Design Proposal View 2
Appendix I: Landscape and Theater as Foils

There are times when a study of similarities and difference help to deepen our understanding of a concept. Often a device of literature or playwriting, two characters might be employed as foils: similar in origin, they possess different characteristics which become emphasized as they are put in contrast. Foils construct a lens through which to examine and consider different characteristics. The discipline of landscape architecture has a foil in the discipline of theater:

Consider the work of David Wiles, a theater historian who wrote *A Short History of Western Performance Space* in 2003. Wiles surveys the various ways that space has been used by theater performers from Ancient Greece to the modern day and constructs a history of performance space, relating the culture and theories of the time and place to the construction of space and performance therein. Wiles’ work is an example of spatial conceptualization in theater, and offers new insights for landscape architects.

First and foremost, the way that Wiles organizes the book reveals something about the conceptualization of space that may be employed by theater practitioners, which differs from that employed by landscape architects. In eight chapters, Wiles grounds his exploration in a discussion of theory—Descartes, Foucault, Lefebvre and others—
before devoting a chapter each to different entries within a typology of performance space. The typology, which is expressly non-exhaustive, includes: sacred space, processional space, public space, sympotic space, the cosmic circle, the cave, and the empty space (Wiles 2003). When landscape architects hear this list, archetypal images are sure to appear in their eidetic minds and they would look for a correspondingly neat graphic typology with which to rectify and solidify the mental image. But that slight discomfort of not seeing an image to associate with our thoughts is the reason that I cite Wiles’ typology: these spaces need not necessarily be seen in order to exist.

To clarify, let us consult Deming and Swaffield for a general expectation of what landscape architects might look for in a typology of space. They state:

In essence, typology is a taxonomic classification scheme applied comprehensively to entire categories of built form, relative to cultural values and practices. Studies of patterns and precedents (whether historic, organic, industrial, or otherwise) may make valuable contributions to typologies of form, shape, structure, arrangement, association, materials, construction technique—in short, if it can be named, it can be typed. Typology thus seeks to categorize and marshal a vast array of variant design forms and motifs, typically as a response to pragmatic cultural and environmental problems (Deming and Swaffield 2011, 133).

I value this definition; however, I believe that there is room for expansion. In its current state, the definition emphasizes built form and materiality. It promotes typological study that would express form and/or materiality as the strongest descriptive element to associate with the unit of study. For landscape architects concerned with form and the design of space, this emphasis seems fundamental; however, it may dangerously advocate an overstatement of the effect of form and/or material as agents acting upon the perception, usage, and value of space.
As a reductionist technique, the form-oriented typology simply isolates form and materiality as variables within the complex milieu of space: the volume defined by objects and experienced by people. Without a correlation of meaning, form and materiality alone offer little.

The Wiles typology, on the other hand, is not built on form or material. It does not associate the quality of sacredness with physical configuration or materiality. The spaces that Wiles identifies are charged with concept—thought, feeling, mood, idea, activity—and assume their quality of being sacred or processional or sympotic though intervention by human idea reflected in activity. The spaces are characterized, imbued, by people. Sacred space exists as the results of a “human impulse to demarcate certain spaces as sacred, separate from the profane spaces of everyday life” (Wiles 2003, 23). Processional space exists when “The route of the procession is bequeathed by tradition and understood as a ‘sacred way’. It defines a space either by marking a boundary, or by marking an axis, and processing along the sacred way lays claim to ownership of the space” (Wiles 2003, 64). Describing the idea of public space, Wiles conjures imagery of the medieval market and the idea of the grotesque: “This was an interactive theatre, with no hermetic boundary separating actors from spectators. The actor works his audience, turning the laugh from one area to another…. And it thrives on the language of insult” (Wiles 2003, 102). The sympotic space is characterized by commensality (Wiles 2003, 131) and a balanced and engaged performance (Wiles 2003, 132-133) which edifies affiliation. The cosmic circle is an idea that would seem impossible to wrestle away from form. However, Wiles never actually arrives at an analysis of anything truly circular in form. Circularity, for Wiles, is not about
form or perfect geometry, but the spatial quality that results from a human idea associated with circularity: “the historic devotion of western culture to circular playing spaces, which symbolically unify and centre the world” (Wiles 2003, 163). The cave is the space of illusion which exploits “…a distinction between soul and body, between intelligible and sensory realms of experience” (Wiles 2003, 211) It is the theoretical encapsulation of the proscenium theater. The empty space is the space of Modernism and “its attempt to start afresh, finding no roots in the historical past” (Wiles 2003, 241). The quality of empty space is defined for Wiles as the Modernist effort to strip away all historical and cultural meaning, all context, and try to invoke something all new and of its own (Wiles 2003, 261).

That distinction, the analytic (parts stripped from whole) versus the poetic (whole assembled from parts) is the notable difference between a form or material-derived typology and a typology inspired by performance. It is an important distinction that grows directly out of the dialectic relationship between landscape architecture and theater. In the assembly of performance, theater builds a poetic synthesis of characterization and narrative within a duality of simultaneous contexts: the setting of the narrative and the physical reality of the theater architecture. Likewise, in landscape architecture it is possible for the act of characterization to spark the construction of narrative: both devices are frequently employed in the creation of landscape designs. Furthermore, the duality of setting applies with equal strength in the landscape if we attempt to present a series of organized ideas within the context of some physical reality. Characterization endows some conceptual quality to a physical assemblage or space. It is the
assignment of an idea to something that exists, with or without that idea. Narrative is the interaction of characterized things—people, objects, space—within the context of some connecting idea. A change in the ideas created through characterization can change the perception of the narrative idea. Likewise, a change in the narrative idea can change the characterization idea. The changes that are made can deepen or cheapen, propagate or obliterate, sustain, supplant, nullify, strengthen or continue the originally applied ideas. The changes in characterization and narrative can occur for all, some, or none of the subjects involved. Indeed, a narrative of unchanging characterization in response to rapidly changing context can be as powerful and revealing as the most sweeping and dynamic change.

In theater, the concepts of characterization and narrative are straightforwardly apparent. They are the drivers of performance: the fuel in the engine of theatrical collaboration. But in landscape architecture, characterization and narrative, however often they are employed, are elective activities. They are not an inherent part of the soil, plants, structure, water, and light which landscape architects modify in the design of outdoor spaces. The acts of characterization and narrative in landscape architecture, when employed, are cultural decisions. They are acts of synthesis; they may be poetic; but they are synthetic. Whether or not they should be employed is not a question that I am prepared to answer: the goal of this investigation has been to reveal implications for landscape architecture through dialectic relationship with theater.

One set of real implications for landscape architecture to arise from this dialectic is a discussion of characterization and narrative and the role
they play in historiography. Indeed, quite often in landscape architecture a "site history" is constructed as a tool to be employed by the informed designer. But how do we interpret the construction of that history? As Wiles introduces his effort to construct a history of western performance spaces, he cautions:

The historian of today...cannot represent the truth about the past, the past as it really was, any more than a naturalistic play can represent 'true' human behavior, and a 'real' social milieu.... I have no personal doubt that the Globe was built in 1599, that on a winters day some chilly and desperate actors dragged timbers across the frozen Thames... The past did indeed happen. But as soon as I cast this information in narrative form, I begin to tell an ideologically laden story about the world’s greatest playwright, the romance of the acting profession, or the economic underpinning of art (Wiles 2003, 17).

Apparently, the recognition of historiography as an act of narrative construction is prevalent in theater to the point where “in most university departments of drama in Britain the once mandatory ‘survey of theatre history’ has dropped from the syllabus” (Wiles 2003, 17). I bring this up not to propose the dissolution of history courses in landscape architecture education, but to emphasize what theater practitioners already know: historiography is a creative, subjective act. Landscape architects are apt to engage in historiographical efforts as they design outdoor spaces, particularly as they approach the design of outdoor public spaces. The historiographical research for the project will often find some physical expression in the design: it is the low-hanging fruit of narrative development. Whether or not landscape architects are intrigued by historiographical reference in physical design elements is a matter of personal preference. However, the landscape architect must be extremely careful in the choice of language concerning the outcomes of site design that originate in historiographical research. Indeed, the outcomes must be presented as historiographically derived and not
historically derived, for the former expresses and accounts for the agency of the designer while the latter has the potential to usurp and impose a sense of authority to which the designer should not have access in a pluralistic society. History must be seen as subjective and the recorded events of the past need not be rectified with the events of the present and future. Historiographical narrative must be viewed as a cultural construct, an imposition of will, and not an inherent trait bubbling out of the physical environment.

It is not lost on me that I have justified investigating the dialectic relationship between landscape architecture and theater through a reference to a narrative of cave paintings that ties the two disciplines together in severely ancient human origins. That justification is an invention of narrative. It is a construction that provides me a point of view from which to investigate. It is convenient and I like the way it feels in my brain. When historiographical narrative elements take a role in landscape architectural design, that same sense of convenience and individual pleasure must be explicitly acknowledged.

It is possible that because of their close association with characterization and narrative, theater professionals became sensitive to the subjective agency of historiography. Maybe they saw a reflection of the narrative works with which they are so often engaged in the histories that attempt to tell them what was. In describing the matter, I can only offer conjecture: I can only invent a narrative. However, the conflict to which theater professionals may be sensitive has the potential to inform arguments in landscape architecture; hence, the utility of studying the two disciplines as foils.
Appendix II: Video Resources

Supplemental video resources are included on the attached DVD:

Chapter 1: “Processing the Process: A Self-Examination of this Project”

Chapter 2: “Space Bodyssey”

Chapter 3: “Space Bodyssey Redux”
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