

Task

Write an essay that positions your Phase Two drawing within and without the discipline of architecture. Make an argument for its relevancy as an autonomous object and as a motivator, map, guide or source material for your future work. Expend very few words on an overall description of the drawing. Also, avoid going into excruciating detail about how it was made. Process and method may be involved with the argument you make, but even then, edit down the description of your process to the essential elements. Much more important than what you did is why you did it. Make sure your essay addresses the “so what?” and “what’s next?” questions in sufficient enough detail that the essay can serve as a rubric in evaluating your future work.

Reference and explore concepts, ideas, and theories from at least two of the following essays in your writing. You may use these essays to support your argument. You may also refute the arguments in the essays in the formation of your position.

Reference and explore at least one additional work in your writing. This resource may be something that you were directed to address in class, or something that was cited in one of the given essays. Works of fiction are welcome, although your writing will analyze and assimilate, rather than propagate or extend, that fiction. Aim to find something that is surprising and obscure, but still directly relevant to your work.

For formatting, use Chicago Style and with respect to tone, audience and principles write in “Classic Style” as defined by Steven Pinker. Poetry is forbidden. Your essay should be no more than 1200 words. There is no minimum length.

Agenda and Considerations

This sub-phase of the course is called an “intermission” not because we’re on a break, but because we’re taking a moment to step out of our drawing projects to reflect back on our work and suggest how it might be projected forward. This is an important and necessary task in our pursuit of architectural content, conditions, ideas, arguments and issues. Currently, our motivations may be heavily technical in nature. Writing is an opportunity to congeal and articulate what can be read in the drawn object when it is considered independent from the act of drawing. The drawing process, however, can’t be shelved—that’s the nature of drawing—although this assignment calls for its re-framing as a matter of theory.

References

Stan Allen, *Stan Allen Essays, practice, architecture, technique and representation with commentary by Diana Agrest*, “mapping the unmappable, on notation”

Cammy Brothers, “Michelangelo, Drawing, and the Invention of Architecture.”

William Empson, *7 Types of Ambiguity* (excerpts)

Tim Ingold, *Lines: A Brief History*, Chapter 2, “Traces, threads and surfaces”

Paul Klee: *the thinking eye* (excerpts) edited by Jurg Spiller

Donald Kunze, “Concealment, delay and topology in the creation of a wondrous drawing” from *From Models to Drawings, Imagination and representation in architecture*. Edited by Marco Frascari, Jonathan Hale and Bradley Starkey

Bruno Latour and Alben Yaneva, “‘Give me a gun and I will make all buildings move’: An

Ant's View of Architecture”

Deanna Petherbridge, *The Primacy of Drawing, Histories and Theories of Practice*. Chapter Four, Line, Mark, Linear Codes and Touch.

Andrew J. Witt, “A Machine Epistemology in Architecture. Encapsulated Knowledge and the Instrumentation of Design”