

[ij]

idea journal

co-constructing body-environments

vol. 17, no. 02

2020

the journal of IDEA: the Interior design +
interior architecture educators' association



vol.17, no.02
2020

co-constructing
body-environments



idea journal

co-constructing body-environments

vol.17, no.02

2020

**the journal of IDEA: the interior design +
interior architecture educators' association**

about

IDEA (Interior Design/Interior Architecture Educators' Association) was formed in 1996 for the advancement and advocacy of education by encouraging and supporting excellence in interior design/interior architecture education and research within Australasia.

www.idea-edu.com

The objectives of IDEA are:

1. Objects

3.1 The general object of IDEA is the advancement of education by:

- (a) encouraging and supporting excellence in interior design/interior architecture/spatial design education and research globally and with specific focus on Oceania; and
- (b) being an authority on, and advocate for, interior design/interior architecture/spatial design education and research.

3.2 The specific objects of IDEA are:

- (a) to be an advocate for undergraduate and postgraduate programs at a minimum of AQF7 or equivalent education in interior design/interior architecture/spatial design;
- (b) to support the rich diversity of individual programs within the higher education sector;
- (c) to create collaboration between programs in the higher education sector;
- (d) to foster an attitude of lifelong learning;
- (e) to encourage staff and student exchange between programs;
- (f) to provide recognition for excellence in the advancement of interior design/interior architecture/spatial design education; and
- (g) to foster, publish and disseminate peer reviewed interior design/interior architecture/spatial design research.

membership*Institutional Members:*

Membership is open to programs at higher education institutions in Australasia that can demonstrate an on-going commitment to the objectives of IDEA.

Current members:

AUT University, Auckland
Curtin University, Perth
Massey University, Wellington
Monash University, Melbourne
Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane
RMIT University, Melbourne
University of New South Wales, Sydney
University of South Australia, Adelaide
University of Tasmania, Launceston and Hobart
University of Technology Sydney, Sydney
Victoria University, Wellington

Affiliate Members:

Affiliate membership is open to programs at higher education institutions in Australasia that do not currently qualify for institutional membership but support the objectives of IDEA. Affiliate members are non-voting members of IDEA.

Associate Members:

Associate membership is open to any person who supports the objectives of IDEA. Associate members are non-voting members of IDEA.

Honorary Associate Members:

In recognition of their significant contribution as an initiator of IDEA, a former chair and/or executive editor: Suzie Attiwill, Rachel Carley, Lynn Chalmers, Lynn Churchill, Jill Franz, Roger Kemp, Tim Laurence, Gini Lee, Marina Lommerse, Gill Matthewson, Dianne Smith, Harry Stephens, George Verghese, Andrew Wallace and Bruce Watson.

publishing

© Copyright 2020 IDEA (Interior Design/Interior Architecture Educators' Association) and AADR (Spurbuchverlag) and authors

All rights reserved.

No part of the work must in any mode (print, photocopy, microfilm, CD or any other process) be reproduced nor – by application of electronic systems – processed, manifolded nor broadcast without approval of the copyright holders.

ISSN 2208-9217

ISBN 978-3-88778-917-6

Published by Art Architecture Design Research (AADR): aadr.info.

AADR publishes research with an emphasis on the relationship between critical theory and creative practice. AADR Curatorial Editor: Dr Rochus Urban Hinkel, Melbourne.

IDEA (Interior Design/Interior Architecture Educators' Association)
ACN 135 337 236; ABN 56 135 337 236

Registered at the National Library of Australia

idea journal is published by AADR and is distributed through common ebook platforms. Selected articles are available online as open source at time of publication, and the whole issue is made open access on the *idea journal* website one year after its date of publication.



IDEA Interior Design/
Interior Architecture
Educators Association

idea journal editorial board

Dr Julieanna Preston, Executive Editor, Professor of Spatial Practice, Massey University, Wellington, New Zealand

Dr Anthony Fryatt, Program Manager, Bachelor of Interior Design (Hons), RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia

Dr Susan Hedges, Senior Lecturer, Spatial Design, School of Art and Design, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland, New Zealand

Dr Antony Pelosi, Senior Lecturer, Interior Architecture, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

Dr Luke Tipene, Lecturer, School of Architecture, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Professor Lois Weinthal, External Advisory Member, Chair of the School of Interior Design, Ryerson University, Toronto, Canada

cover image

Animation by Jo Bailey (2020) of "Giacometti Strata, Bioscleave" (2015). Robert Bowen, Photographer

online publication editor

Dr Antony Pelosi, Senior Lecturer, Interior Architecture, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

copy editor

Dr Christina Houen, Perfect Words Editing

design + production

Jo Bailey, School of Design, Massey University, Wellington, New Zealand

correspondence

Correspondence regarding this publication should be addressed to:

Dr Lynn Churchill
c/o *idea journal*
Interior Architecture
Curtin University
GPO Box U1987
Perth 6845
Western Australia

l.churchill@curtin.edu.au

**co-constructing body-environments:
provocation**

Presenters at *Body of Knowledge: Art and Embodied Cognition Conference (BoK2019)* hosted by Deakin University, Melbourne, June 2019) are invited to submit contributions to a special issue of idea journal "Co-Constructing Body-Environments" to be published in December 2020. The aim of the special issue is to extend the current discussions of art as a process of social cognition and to address the gap between descriptions of embodied cognition and the co-construction of lived experience.

We ask for papers, developed from the presentations delivered at the conference, that focus on interdisciplinary connections and on findings arising from intersections across research practices that involve art and theories of cognition. In particular, papers should emphasize how spatial art and design research approaches have enabled the articulation of a complex understanding of environments, spaces and experiences. This could involve the spatial distribution of cultural, organisational and conceptual structures and relationships, as well as the surrounding design features.

Contributions may address the questions raised at the conference and explore:

- + How do art and spatial practices increase the potential for knowledge transfer and celebrate diverse forms of embodied expertise?
- + How the examination of cultures of practice, Indigenous knowledges and cultural practices offer perspectives on inclusion, diversity, neurodiversity, disability and social justice issues?
- + How the art and spatial practices may contribute to research perspectives from contemporary cognitive neuroscience and the philosophy of mind?
- + The dynamic between an organism and its surroundings for example: How does art and design shift the way knowledge and thinking processes are acquired, extended and distributed?
- + How art and design practices demonstrate the ways different forms of acquiring and producing knowledge intersect?

These and other initial provocations for the conference can be found on the conference web-site: <https://blogs.deakin.edu.au/bok2019/cfp/>.

reviewers for this issue

Charles Anderson
Cameron Bishop
Rachel Carley
Felipe Cervera
Harah Chon
Chris Cottrell
David Cross
Rea Dennis
Pia Ednie-Brown
Scott Elliott
Andrew Goodman
Stefan Greuter
Shelley Hannigan
Mark Harvey
Susan Hedges
Jondi Keane
Meghan Kelly
Gini Lee
Marissa Lindquist
Alys Longley
Olivia Millard
Belinda Mitchell
Patrick Pound
Remco Roes
Luke Tipene
George Themistokleous
Russell Tytler
Rose Woodcock

in this issue

- 06 in this issue
- 08 introduction: unknowingly, a threshold-crossing movement
Julieanna Preston
- 13 enacting bodies of knowledge
Jondi Keane
Rea Dennis
Meghan Kelly
- 32 'how do I know *how* I think, until I see what I say?': the shape of embodied thinking, neurodiversity, first-person methodology
Patricia Cain
- 58 how moving is sometimes thinking
Shaun Gallagher
- 69 movement, narrative and multiplicity in embodied orientation and collaboration from prehistory to the present
David Turnbull
- 87 'stim your heart out' and 'syndrome rebel' (performance artworks, autism advocacy and mental health)
Prue Stevenson
- 105 gentle house: co-designing with an autistic perception
Chris Cottrell
- 121 sympathetic world-making: drawing-out ecological-empathy
Pia Ednie-Brown
Beth George
Michael Chapman
Kate Mullen
- 144 shared reality: a phenomenological inquiry
Jack Parry
- 163 embodied aporia: exploring the potentials for posing questions through architecture
Scott Andrew Elliott
- 180 embodiment of values
Jane Bartier
Shelley Hannigan
Malcolm Gardiner
Stewart Mathison

- 201** sensing space: an exploration of the generation of depth and space with reference to hybrid moving image works and reported accounts of intense aesthetic experience
Sally McLaughlin
- 215** sound, silence, resonance, and embodiment: choreographic synaesthesia
Lucía Piquero Álvarez
- 230** musicking as ecological behaviour: an integrated '4e' view
Michael Golden
- 248** everything of which I was once conscious but have now forgotten: encounters with memory
Mig Dann
- 265** re-presenting a dance moment
Ashlee Barton
- 275** hidden worlds: missing histories affecting our digital future
J Rosenbaum
- 289** is my body out of date? the drag of physicality in the digital age
Elly Clarke
- 326** seeing not looking
Anne Wilson
- 335** dance as a social practice: the shared physical and social environment of group dance improvisation
Olivia Millard
- 350** performance and new materialism: towards an expanded notion of a non-human agency
Alyssa Choat

introduction: unknowingly, a threshold-crossing movement

Julianna Preston

Executive Editor

idea journal

It is in this special issue that the editorial board holds true to our promise to expand the horizons and readership of *idea journal* while reaching out to associated and adjacent art, design and performance practices and drawing connections to seemingly distant disciplines. The articles in this issue have provenance in a 2019 conference event, Bodies of Knowledge (BOK), which was guided by a similar interdisciplinary ethos. With an emphasis on cultures of practice and communities of practitioners that offer perspectives on inclusion, diversity/neurodiversity and disability, this conference, and this subsequent journal issue, aim to increase knowledge transfer between diverse forms of embodied expertise, in particular, between neuroscience and enactive theories of cognition.

This brief description suggests that there are shared issues, subjects and activities that have the potential of generating new understanding in cross-, inter- and trans-disciplinary affiliations and collaborations. My experience in these modes of inquiry points to the importance of identifying what is shared and what is not amongst vocabulary, concepts, pedagogies and methods. Holding these confluences and diverges without resorting to strict definition, competition or judgement of right and wrong often affords greater understanding and empathy amongst individuals to shape a collective that is diverse in its outlooks, and hopefully, curious as to what it generates together because of that diversity.

cite as:

Preston, Julianna. 'Introduction: Unknowingly,
a threshold-crossing movement,' *idea journal* 17, no.02
(2020): 08 - 12, <https://doi.org/10.37113/ij.v17i02.412>.

The breadth of the knowledge bases represented within this issue necessitated that the peer reviewer list expanded once again like the previous issue. It was in the process of identifying reviewers with appropriate expertise that the various synapses between scholarly and artistic practices became evident. It is these synapses that shape sturdy bridges between the journal's existing readership, which is predominantly academics and students in interior design, interior architecture, spatial design and architecture, and the wide range of independent scholars and practitioners, academics, and students attracted to BOK's thematic call for papers, performative lectures and exhibitions. At the risk of being reductive to the complexity and nuances in the research to follow, I suggest that the following terms and concerns are central to this issue, aptly inferred by its title, 'Co-Constructing Body-Environments': spatiality; subjectivity; phenomenology; processual and procedural practice; artistic research; critical reflection; body: experience. All of these are frequent to research and practice specific to interiors. In this issue, however, we find how these terms and concerns are situated and employed in other fields, in other ways and for other purposes.

This is healthy exercise. To stretch one's reach, literally and metaphorically is to travel the distance between the me and the you, to be willingly open to what might eventuate. Imagine shaking the hand of a stranger—a somatic experience known to register peaceful intent, respect, courage, warmth, pressure, humour, nervous energy, and so much more. This threshold-crossing movement is embodied and spatial; it draws on a multitude of small yet complex communication sparks well before verbal impulses ensue. This significant bodily gesture sets the tone for what might or could happen. Based on my understanding of the research presented in 'Co-Constructing Body-Environments,' I propose that this is a procedure in the Gins and Arakawa sense that integrates theory and practice as a hypothesis for 'questioning all possible ways to observe the body-environment in order to transform it.'⁰¹ I call this as *unknowingly*—a process that takes the risk of not knowing, not being able to predict or predetermine, something akin to the spectrum of 'throwing caution to the wind' and 'sailing close to

the wind'. My use of the word 'unknowingly' embraces intuition where direct access to unconscious knowledge and pattern-recognition, unconscious cognition, inner sensing and insight have the ability to understand something without any need for conscious reasoning. Instinct. The word *unknowingly* also affords me to invoke the 'unknowing' element of this interaction—to not know, to not be aware of, to not have all the information (as if that was possible)—an acknowledgement of human humility. I borrow and adapt this facet of unknowingly from twentieth-century British writer Alan Watts:

This I don't know, is the same thing as, I love. I let go. I don't try to force or control. It's the same thing as humility. If you think that you understand Brahman, you do not understand. And you have yet to be instructed further. If you know that you do not understand, then you truly understand.⁰²

Unknowingly also allows me to reference 'un' as a tactic of learning that suspends the engrained additive model of learning. Though I could refer to many other scholarly sources to fuel this concept, here I am indebted to Canadian author Scott H. Young's pithy advice on how to un-learn:

This is the view that what we think we know about the world is a veneer of sense-making atop a much deeper strangeness. The things we think we know, we often don't. The ideas, philosophies and truths that guide our lives may be convenient approximations, but often the more accurate picture is a lot stranger and more interesting.⁰³

In his encouragement to unlearn—dive into strangeness, sacrifice certainty, boldly expose oneself to randomness, mental discomfort, instability, to radically rethink that place/ your place/ our place, suspend aversions to mystery—Young's examples from science remind us that:

Subatomic particles aren't billiard balls, but strange, complex-valued wavefunctions. Bodies aren't vital fluids and animating impulses, but trillions of cells, each more complex than any machine humans have invented. Minds aren't unified loci of consciousness, but the process of countless synapses firing in incredible patterns.⁰⁴

In like manner to the *BOK2019* conference which was staged as a temporally infused knowledge-transfer event across several days, venues, geographies and disciplines, I too, ingested the materials submitted for this issue in this spirit of unknowingly. The process was creative, critical, intuitive, generative and reflective—all those buzz words of contemporary research—yet charged with substantial respect and curiosity for whatever unfolded, even if it went against the grain of what I had learned previously. For artists, designers, architects, musicians, and performers reading this journal issue, especially academics and students, this territory of inquiry may feel familiar to the creative experience and the increasing demands (and desires) to account for how one knows what one knows in the institutional setting. ‘Explain yourself,’ as the review or assessment criteria often states. If you are faced having to annotate your creative practice or to critically reflect on aspects that are so embedded in your making that you are unaware of them, I encourage you to look amongst the pages of this journal issue for examples of how others have grappled with that task such that the process is a space of coming to unknow and know, unknowingly.

Figure 01:

Meeting the horizon; A still image from *Shore Variations*, a 2018 film by Claudia Kappenberg that reimagines *Waning*, a 2016 live art performance by Julieanna Preston. <https://vimeo.com/user11308386>.

There are a few people I would like to acknowledge before you read further. First, huge gratitude to the generosity of the peer reviewers, for the time and creative energy of guest editors Jondi Keane, Rea Dennis and Meghan Kelly (who have made the process so enjoyable and professional), for the expertise of the journal's copy editor Christina Houen and Graphic Designer Jo Bailey, and to AADR for helping to expand the journal's horizons.

Okay, readers, shake hands, consider yourself introduced, welcome into the *idea journal* house, and let's share a very scrumptious meal.

acknowledgements

I am forever grateful for what life in Aotearoa/ New Zealand brings. With roots stretching across the oceans to North America, Sweden, Wales and Croatia, I make my home between Kāpiti Island and the Tararua Ranges, and in Te Whanganui-A-Tara/ Wellington. I acknowledge the privilege that comes with being educated, employed, female and Pākehā, and the prejudices and injustices that colonialism has and continues to weigh on this land and its indigenous people. I am committed to on-going learning and practicing of Kaupapa Māori.

notes

- 01 Jondi Keane, 'An Arakawa and Gins Experimental Teaching Space; A Feasibility Study,' *INFLeXions* 6 (2012), accessed 29 October 2020, http://www.inflexions.org/n6_keane.html.
- 02 Alan Watts, *Creating Who You Are* (Video) (n.d.), accessed 29 October 2020, <https://vimeo.com/76888920>.
- 03 Scott H. Young, 'The Art of Unlearning' (2018), accessed 29 October 2020, <https://www.scotthyoung.com/blog/2018/04/12/the-art-of-unlearning/>.
- 04 Young, 'The Art of Unlearning.'

sympathetic world-making: drawing-out ecological-empathy

Pia Ednie-Brown

University of
Newcastle

[0000-0002-4498-0659](tel:0000-0002-4498-0659)

Beth George

University of
Newcastle

[0000-0002-0129-304X](tel:0000-0002-0129-304X)

Michael Chapman

University of
Newcastle

[0000-0002-4381-2266](tel:0000-0002-4381-2266)

Kate Mullen

La Trobe
University

[0000-0003-2706-8753](tel:0000-0003-2706-8753)

abstract

This article reflects on an experiment in drawing, titled *Surrogate Drawing*, in which an assemblage of people, materials and artefacts engaged in a live, improvisational process of co-production. The group was interested in how empathy might be cultivated through architectural drawing.

The article develops an argument across three main parts. The first part offers a brief overview of the drawing experiment, situated relative to some key assumptions and conventions of architectural drawing, via the work of Robin Evans and others. In particular, this involved unsettling the idea of translation and its underlying premise of projection—a premise that resonates with the concept of empathy. The second part moves into a series of first-person accounts, one from each author. This experiential access reveals degrees of complexity that question the model of projection as a primary operative principle for either drawing or empathy, calling for an alternative conceptual framework. The third part offers such an alternative, via Jakob von Uexküll's work concerning the *Umwelt*, or perceptual life-worlds. Via Uexküll we come to better understand drawing as less of a process of translation or transmission, and more of a process of creative world-making. Through Uexküll's depiction of the *Umwelt* as a 'bubble,' the paper offers an alternative diagrammatic to that of projective geometries: that of a foaming.

The manifestly *collective* world-making inherent in this drawing experiment leads us to conclude by opening up something we discuss as 'ecological empathy'—or sympathy. It is proposed that drawing, if conceptually liberated from projective models, may be an important technique to cultivate ecological-empathy, or sympathy. This points toward a way that architecture might be reoriented toward sympathetic world-making.

cite as:

Pia Ednie-Brown, Beth George, Michael Chapman and Kate Mullen. 'Sympathetic World-making: Drawing-out Ecological-Empathy,' *idea journal* 17, no.02 (2020): 121–143, <https://doi.org/10.37113/ij.v17i02.372>.

keywords:

drawing, empathy, sympathy, projection, architecture

introduction: the drawing experiment

In 2019, a spatial drawing assemblage was constructed in a gallery space, as part of the exhibition for the *Body of Knowledge: Art and Embodied Cognition Conference*, at Deakin University. The work was titled *Surrogate Drawing*, as conceived by Michael Chapman and Beth George, who developed the initial concept and invited others (Kate Mullen and Pia Ednie-Brown) to participate. The aim was to experiment with how a group might act in unison and seek out attunement through drawing together, as a way to explore potential relations between architectural drawing and empathy. A finger injury meant that Chapman had to keep drawing actions small and discrete, prompting the inclusion of a televisualiser that could relay small scaled drawings to the full scale of the wall, in order that those lines be reiterated and expanded by George and Mullen at another scale of bodily action. This effectively stretched the space of the drawing, distributing control, and incorporating multiple bodies. The projection from the televisualiser aligned with six A1 sheets of drafting film, which George and Mullen drew onto with an array of materials—graphite, charcoal, crayon, and paint—through additive and subtractive techniques. Ednie-Brown's role was to document the process with a range of recording devices, with a view to analyse the exchange. She entered into and modulated activity in a variety of ways. A simple, white, rectangular table, placed between the televisualiser and the drafting film on the wall, supported the smorgasbord of materials. Music was often playing while drawing was underway, and both humans and the evolving drawing danced.

Talking did occur in relation to what was happening, but mostly, noises took the form of laughter, exclamation, and sounds made by the drawing materials as they made their way onto the drafting film—scraping, rubbing, scratching. On a few memorable occasions, the drawing activity became a high-intensity drumming on the wall/drafting film with fingertips. The materials of drawing smeared their way across faces, clothes and the floor. The overall assemblage gradually smudged itself into itself.

Figure 01:
Diagram of *Surrogate Drawing*
framework showing televisualiser,
projection and full-scale drawing.
Beth George, 2019.

Figure 02:

Surrogate Drawing 1 with projection from televisualiser. Beth George, Michael Chapman, Kate Mullen, Pia Ednie-Brown and an ecology of nonhuman agents, 2019.

Three drawings were produced, each taking 90 minutes, in three half hour blocks. Photographs were taken every ten minutes, and the whole process was filmed in time lapse. In order for the time lapse camera to capture all people drawing at once, a projector displayed video footage of the televisualiser drawer on the wall adjacent to the wall drawing activity.

The third drawing in the series was done in the context of an exhibition opening with a 'live audience,' with prior drawings and a quickened time lapse video of prior production displayed alongside the action.

The title *Surrogate Drawing* emerged through an interest in the 'surrogate balance' in kinesiology. This process allows one's body to 'stand in' as a physical substitute for another person. The drawing assemblage was designed along these lines, with Mullen and George 'standing in' for Chapman between his hand (with broken finger), drawing in small sketch book, and its enlarged projection on the wall. As we go on to discuss, any idea of a one-directional 'transference' or translation from one place to another, was blown apart by the lived reality of this collective drawing exploration.

Figure 03:

Surrogate Drawing 1. Beth George, Michael Chapman, Kate Mullen, Pia Ednie-Brown and an ecology of nonhuman agents, 2019.

Figure 04:

Surrogate Drawing 2. Beth George, Michael Chapman, Kate Mullen, Pia Ednie-Brown and an ecology of nonhuman agents, 2019.

Figure 05:

Surrogate Drawing 3. Beth George, Michael Chapman, Kate Mullen, Pia Ednie-Brown and an ecology of nonhuman agents, 2019.

part 1: drawing, empathy and projection

The idea of translation plays a powerful role in the way that architectural drawing is understood to operate: as a vehicle for moving ideas onto paper and subsequently into built form. Drawing becomes imagined as a unidirectional passage, where images in the mind are translated onto the page via the drawer/designer. With an arm's length between body-mind and surface, the distance is mediated by an implement. The drawing then becomes something of a surrogate, standing in for the mind's eye of the designer.

However, drawing is never unidirectional: percepts (thoughts, images, feelings, and ideas) develop as part of the drawing process, looping back and forth between percept and paper. Moreover, this loop does not pass through a neutral medium, because drawing always involves a variety of possible media and takes place in a specific situation or environment, all of which play into the overall activity. By taking into account the many situational and material dimensions of drawing,⁰¹ the linear idea of transferring, or translating ideas through drawing, breaks down into a network of agents and affects.

Famously, this issue was taken up by Robin Evans in his essay 'Translations from Drawing to Building.'⁰² Evans raises the spectre of 'translation' as an idea of moving something from one place to another without altering it, which he recognises as a necessary fiction for architects, who draw representations of buildings in order for them to be materialised. The idea of translation

rests on the assumption of an entirely 'imaginary condition,' that of 'a uniform space through which meaning may glide without modulation.'⁰³ This may, as he suggests, be an 'enabling fiction' but the degree to which its fictionality remains unacknowledged leads to other (non-translational) properties of drawings remaining unrecognised. Evans's concluding remarks suggest the possibility of writing a history of western architecture that concentrates on the manner of working rather than style or signification. Such a history, he suggests, would in large part:

... be concerned with the gap between drawing and building. In it, the drawing would be considered not so much a work of art or a truck for pushing ideas from place to place, but as the locale of subterfuges and evasions that one way or another get around the enormous weight of convention that has always been architecture's greatest security and at the same time its greatest liability.⁰⁴

The collaborative drawing experiment under discussion here did not, as per Evans' suggestion, focus on the gap between drawing and building, but rather, on drawing and drawers. The drawing was not of a subject, not translating from an object to a depiction of it, and also did not seek to predict any formal outcome. It was the product of its own spatial assemblage.

While the gap between drawing and building in architectural practice, as messy and evasive as its reality may be, is functionally

and contractually required to operate in translational terms, what happens between the drawing and the drawer tends to fall into the realm of 'mystery,' leading to many fables of the (generally male) 'creative genius.' In the opening to his book, *The Projective Cast*,⁰⁵ Robin Evans discusses this mythology in relation to geometry, pointing to accounts of drawers who travel the 'desperately incommunicative' realm of geometrical drawing 'alone,' and 'lock the mystery into place as a professional secret, or even a personal secret.'⁰⁶ He comments upon how this makes architects susceptible to delusion, through their inexpressible 'faith' that geometry holds and conveys truth. These delusions, as Evan's detective work reveals across the book, are caught up in related conceits around ideas such as 'rigour,' and operationalised via the fictive geometrical armature of projection. As Evans writes:

What connects thinking to imagination, imagination to drawing, drawing to building, and buildings to our eyes is projection in one guise or another, or processes that we have chosen to model on projection. All are zones of instability.⁰⁷

Other attempts to explicate drawing processes have stepped into these 'zones of instability.' In her intricate analyses of her own and other's drawing processes, Patricia Cain explores 'drawing as a recursive co-dependent process between the practitioner and the drawing.'⁰⁸ Through Francisco Varela's elaborations of 'enactive cognition' and mobilised via a range of methodologies—first-person accounts

of her drawing process, interviews with others, and a process of enquiry through copying other drawings—Cain shows how the supposedly simple, translational and reflective relationship between drawer and drawing is not simple at all. The implication that we lose ourselves in this complexity, complicating claims of sole authorship, can also be read in Peter Cook's suggestion that '...the architect can make drawings that transport him or her into a form of séance.'⁰⁹ Both Cain and Cook refer to a communion with one's drawing and the constitution of a feedback loop between person and work.

While the linear and regulated act of projection contravenes the expansive complexity of drawing as a process, architectural drawing is something, as Evan's points out, that we have 'we have *chosen to model on projection*' (*our emphasis*).¹⁰ While the fiction implicit to the model is certainly enabling, we need to also ask what it hinders. A similar problem, we came to realise, is at work with the concept of empathy, also tied to questions of translation and projection.

A key question driving this drawing experiment was how creative activity might cultivate empathy: Can we develop drawing techniques that might usher a greater emphasis on empathy into architectural creation?

Those of us involved in architectural education had discussed, on numerous occasions, our fatigue and scepticism with many familiar architectural design refrains emphasising 'problem solving,' 'ideas,'

'critique,' 'rigour,' etc, that had become ruts of rationalisation in which the discipline was stuck. Motivated by concerns for architecture's diminishing contemporary agency—particularly in the face of new types of problems presented by the Anthropocene—we were curious about ways to shift design activity out of these ruts. Our proposition was that this might be approached through rebalancing the dominant, rationalist framings of practice (such as rigour) with more explicit attention to affective orientations, with empathy taking on a potentially productive lead. Bringing Mullen into the process as an artist interested in 'deep listening' was significant for these reasons, helping render it more difficult for disciplinary habits to take over. As such, the framework for the drawing process was designed for a diverse group of people to engage in drawing-feeling together through shared mark-making, as it was emerging via multiple forces. Would this sharing of marks-in-the-making accentuate empathy?

Empathy as a concept has a strong historical relationship with the arts, being developed through the field of nineteenth century German aesthetics, as a translation of the word *Einführung*, which is literally 'feeling into.' Robert Vischer's 1873 text, *On the Optical Sense of Form: A Contribution to Aesthetics*,¹¹ argued that art created a forum to engage with and connect with the object, not as an observer, but as a participant. As he famously wrote, 'I transport myself into the inner being of an object and explore its formal character from within.'¹²

As Joanna Ganczerek puts it,

...the term 'Einführung' literally means 'feeling into' and refers to an act of projecting oneself into another body or environment ...[as] some kind of imaginary bodily perspective taking, which is aimed at understanding what it would be like to be living in another body or another environment.¹³

Empathy as a concept is historically rooted in the idea of projection, and this has underpinned its future. *Einführung* was linked to the phenomenon of 'embodied simulation' or 'mirror neurons' by neuroscientist Vittorio Gallese in 2008.¹⁴ Mirror neurons were originally observed through the study of macaque monkeys, showing correlations in brain activity between a monkey that is eating a peanut, and one that is watching. This offered a scientific lens through which to consider the operations of empathy, which came to reinforce its representational and projective assumptions, wherein specific neurological patterns (arguably, a form of geometry) are translated across space between one body and another, through visual means.

Surrogate Drawing very literally involved projection through the mechanical projection of images from sketchbook to wall. However, acts of 'feeling into' occurred, not just by looking at something or somewhere else, but by being inside the drawing process, as a constituent part of an eventful, distributed spatial assemblage, involving many bodies all at once. Arguably, and demonstrably in

the first-person accounts below, moments of empathy abound. However, the drawing process could not be reduced to simple acts of empathy or projection, because so much more was happening and interceding; nor could the drawing become a surrogate for any one person's creative impulse.

This collaborative drawing process rendered visible a network of agents, by both adding more drawers to the dialogue and adjusting the physical environment to 'thicken' the plane of the drawing. The assemblage stretched the arm's length, cracking it open to collaborations within an open network, proving to be far more complex than a strictly 'surrogate' relationship where drawers 'stood in' for another drawer. Influences entered a web of interrelations, involving multi-directional prompts issued by all parties, as well as responses to the physical space, the media, the music, and so on. As such, this drawing experiment broke down the projective, translational model of drawing: the distribution of stimuli was not only across bodies, but commissioned the environment, both immediate and distant.

Just as the idea of drawing as translation and transference became disturbed by the *Surrogate Drawing* assemblage, so did the idea of empathy as a projective transmission between entities, raising questions about what empathy becomes when it shifts out of a one-to-one relationship.

part 2: the drawing event

This section offers some access to the experiential and perceptual differences of each

author, in order to demonstrate the degree to which the complexity of interrelation so far exceeded anything reducible to projection or translation, even while (and perhaps because) a mechanical projection device was a key player. These post-drawing reflections start with the two authors who took on the wall-drawing, followed by the author with broken finger, who drew at the televisualiser, and finally, the first author of this article, whose role in the experiment was recorder/analyser/observer.

Beth George

There is a very physical immersion in the drawing. First, this occurs through scale, as this is much larger work than I would usually create and the impact of working across such a broad surface is that you can only see part of the piece at any given time. This added a sense of autonomy in the making—you worked with the blinkers on and had to step away to gain comprehension of the whole. This proximity to the drawing resulted in feeling like I was walking through it—touring it—and this was amplified in the second drawing which felt pictorially like a landscape.

The second form of immersion is due to the fact that Kate and I were physically sandwiched inside the drawing. I was responding to marks directly in front of me that were coming from behind me. This put me 'inside' the visual rays between Michael and the picture plane. I am reminded of the section in 'Translations' where

Figure 06:

detail of *Surrogate Drawing 2*: a sense of emergent landscape. Beth George, Michael Chapman, Kate Mullen, Pia Ednie-Brown and an ecology of nonhuman agents, 2019.

Robin Evans describes the construction lines moving between an object and its representation, and questions just how long and abstract these lines could get. It feels as though we lived out this scenario, and 'made space' within it for distortions and unexpected interpretations to occur.

It was also emotionally immersive, and I found myself on various sliding scales, involving levels of 'care,' faithful recording and invention, satisfaction with my own drawing, enthusiasm for others' mark making, enjoyment, boredom or dissatisfaction, high and low energy, even physical discomfort from the bigness and physicality of the process. I'd lapse in and out of focus on

Michael's projected mark-making, and perceived varied levels of resonance between him and me, Kate and me, and him and Kate.

At a particular empathic moment, Kate seemed to exhibit frustration—her marks became a little noisy and violent, and my reaction was to move into the part of the drawing that frustrated her so she could leave it. Other times, we did what felt like a *do-si-do* by agreement, or would work past each other. Sometimes, a switch on the projector by Michael from white to inverted would re-energise me. Always, a shift in scale, an inversion, an appearance of his pen in front of me would affect what I was doing.

Figure 07:

detail of *Surrogate Drawing 1*:
picking up 'pores' from the wall
surface. Beth George, Michael
Chapman, Kate Mullen, Pia
Ednie-Brown and an ecology of
nonhuman agents, 2019.

The space and surfaces themselves impacted the process—tapping against the hollowness of the wall, dipping my fingers into fragments of charcoal dust on the concrete floor, feeling the slipperiness or grain of the page as it amassed more material. Tapping out 'rain' with my fingers involved the body and the resonance of the wall.

Figure 08:

detail of *Surrogate Drawing 1*:
'rain' from finger-drumming. Beth
George, Michael Chapman, Kate
Mullen, Pia Ednie-Brown and an
ecology of nonhuman agents, 2019.

The setup itself broke down the fear of white space and diminished the onus of the individual drawer. It emphasised process over outcome, and was genuinely and richly collaborative. I think about how Walter Pichler might crumple his paper before creating a drawing—on the one hand to offer up cues, but on the other, I think, to devalue it—as in removing some of its preciousness, you relieve some pressure. We were, in this sense,

each other's crumples, and gave and received marks with openness and little expectation for their fate.

Perhaps most curiously, there were forms of reward in how we concentrated our own mark-making on parts of others' marks that resonated with us. Noises made, particular body movements, and the focus by someone else on a territory you had drawn were all forms of encouragement.

What resounds for me now is an accretion of memory—what Henri Bergson called the durational dimension, where the mind gives meaning to present action by recalling embodied memories. These are accessed during the making process, and in turn cement a new set of memories: those embedded in the media of the drawing itself. The durational quality of the work means that effort and attention are locked into the artefact. Certain territories in the drawing now resonate with the memories of that attention, and it is easy to focus on parts of the piece and recollect precisely my feeling-into them. Furthermore, this duration projects forward, as Kate and I, and Michael and I, work on new drawing projects, instances of *déjà vu* or recollections of the *Surrogates* persist in a wrinkling of feelings over time.¹⁵

Kate Mullen

I view drawing foremost as a trust exercise—enacting, through the forging of lines, a trust in what will be brought forth in the exchange between one's bodymind and one's given situatedness. The act of drawing brings a degree of heightened consciousness to the body's innate sensorimotor intelligence and the perpetual, reciprocal dialogue playing out with the ecologies it inhabits. This exercise invited a departure from the styles we were each independently trained and versed in and, as such, a freeing of our approaches to movement and mark making occurred. The scrutiny of rational cognition was abated in favour of an activation of our emotional and feeling bodies. It was the contrast of contexts, disciplines and natural sensibilities between each of my co-drawers and I that, I feel, became as interesting and integral to the physiological impacts of the process as was our initial hypothesis.

In this sense, we ourselves—the four practitioners' bodyminds—parodied the array of artistic media that were spread before us on our work bench. It was an aesthetic decision as well as a pragmatic one for the diversity of media to remain monochromatic in tone. These parameters were instigated to, in a sense, 'frame' the action. Other than this, textures and marks were unrestrained except by the page, but even then, action bled on to the surrounding walls and debris and drips built up on the floor beneath us.

Beth and I became one in the act of shaping media on wall; our lines responding concurrently to Michael's, at first, and then to each other's as the narratives built up. A conflation of scales occurred, with Beth and I experiencing a sensation of being microscopic organisms. At this scale, one became more fully aware of one's total body within the spatiality informed by the microscopic lens. This was a negotiation between micro versus macro translations of one and the same thing, forcing the question: what do we not see before our very eyes or within our very flesh?

The idea of being 'inside' a drawing translates to being immersed in the act of production, of weaving, of recording, and thus truly 'in' the present moment—key to deep listening. This collaborative drawing practice proved to be a way of tracing a state of presence that cannot be documented in words or symbols. To attempt to do so would elicit one's removal from the state of presence that is of essence here.

Pia, as a fourth party in the role of observer, recorded her responses to the action and exchange by way of stream of consciousness note-taking, both raw and poetic. Her presence in this role unintentionally 'held space' for those of us engaged more directly in the drawing. As is spoken of in art therapy terms, Pia maintained through the duration of the performances a 'safe space' that, without knowing it at the time, permitted each of us to psychologically 'drop' into a state of presence beyond the conditioned, ego mind—a sense of safety a necessary prerequisite here. Once we were immersed wholly in the surrogate drawing process, Pia became almost like our 'surrogate mind's eye.'

Figure 09:

Detail of *Surrogate Drawing 1*. Beth George, Michael Chapman, Kate Mullen, Pia Ednie-Brown and an ecology of nonhuman agents, 2019.

In occupying her steady, gentle state of observation, she permitted us drawers to enter a deeper state of fusion within the enactment; to more fully occupy the ecosystem of presence and play we had co-devised.

A practical negotiation between my body and Beth's body was another layer of activity and required sensitivity both physically and emotionally. I say emotionally, as into play came the awareness of Beth's marks—more fixed in my reality within the loop than Michael's more distant perch and changeable patterning. As Beth's marks accumulated, I was conscientious not to overly violate them (erasing, concealing or distorting them beyond recognition),

out of respect. Though equally, this also sprang from a genuine desire not to conceal the history of the drawing; to avoid any 'forgetting' of what had been woven sequentially upon the page, fattening our drawings' bodies layer by layer. Here a threshold could be tasted: the precipice of maintaining mindfulness and the cusp of seizing control of a drawing's properties. It grew increasingly difficult to resist any compositional authorship as a given session progressed, and one was acutely aware of this throughout the process. One of the prominent successes in conducting the process was, I feel, the inescapable self-awareness it elicited.¹⁶

Figure 10:

detail of *Surrogate Drawing 1*. Beth George, Michael Chapman, Kate Mullen, Pia Ednie-Brown and an ecology of nonhuman agents, 2019.

Figure 11:

detail of *Surrogate Drawing 3*. Beth George, Michael Chapman, Kate Mullen, Pia Ednie-Brown and an ecology of nonhuman agents, 2019.

Michael Chapman

The drawings are constructed on an A5 sketchbook, placed on a televisualiser in a fixed location, with a camera on me. In front of me is a projector, and there is a window to the left. The sketchbook is also its own window to a world of projection which folds the visual field from the horizontal to the vertical. It is a representational hinge. The scale and edges of the projection become a frame within the visual field. As I alter the scale and size of the image, this frame contracts and enlarges. What happens within the frame echoes on the wall. And what happens on the wall, works

its way back to the frame. The wall and the sketchbook create a conversation.

If empathy is a process of feeling into, there is a subsequent feeling 'out of' that the folding spatialisation of the projector creates. If Kate and Beth are inside this field, my hand is positioned outside of it. It is within the frame, but without the space. My pencil, or pen, is against its edge as it feels its way across the contours of space and time. The televisualiser provides a centre for my drawing, but also a periphery. This centre anchors me in space and time for the duration of the drawings. My

finger hurts. And I don't like cameras. It's cold. And I've hardly slept. I sit against the edge of the space, and draw within the centre of the frame. It is various forms of disembodiment and embodiment at once.

There is also the outside of this, in both space and time: the space outside of the gallery and the time outside of the drawing production. There is the space of the icy bike rides from the city to the gallery, through the pristine but foreign landscape of Melbourne and its lonely but beautifully alien ecology. There is the music that accompanies me on these rides, that links me to other spaces and times I have known. There is the emptiness of the hotel room where I am writing in the evenings, from its cramped and homogenous Laminex interior. There is the artificial window of my iPhone, which connects (and disconnects) me with Zurich, Newcastle, Sydney, and my friends, my dog. There is the sequence of drawings from Melbourne Zoo to Borobodur to Sukhothai, that begin to intrude on the fixed 'frames' of the surrogate drawings in the weeks before and after the demarcated time intervals of the drawings. They de-spatialise these drawings and de-temporalise them. All of these memories and experiences—the experience outside the frame—resonate with the space of the frame, the window, the boundary of the gallery, the start and end of the timer. The frame records the space and time, but

also the memories of space and time beyond.

The set-up focuses and concretises my position in a place and a universe. And anchors it to a chain of representational events. It is a space of connection and disconnection, where space and time are folded into an arbitrary rectangle in space. This is an existential space of embodied drawing. As I draw, I ask: Why am I here?¹⁷

Figure 12:

Sketchbook image for televisualiser.
Michael Chapman, 2019.

Figure 13:

Sketchbook image for televisualiser.
Michael Chapman, 2019.

Figure 14:

Sketchbook image for televisualiser.
Michael Chapman, 2019.

Pia Ednie-Brown

I can see them dancing with one another and the paper/screen, but the process is so complex that cause and effect relations are difficult to discern. I had hoped to try to track interactions and the transfer of rhythms, exaggerations, etc., between one another. It seemed this might be a way for me to engage Daniel Stern's work on 'vitality affects'¹⁸ in relation to the nonverbal exchange via the drawing assemblage, and to analyse the development of the drawings in these terms. My hopes were soon dashed as I watched a complexity that seemed to exceed the possibility of making (non-reductive) meaningful sense of what was happening through analytical means. The role of recording and holding the space took over. When it all began, Michael was focused on his drawing under the televisualiser and rarely looked up. When I commented on this, he looked up and, it seemed, hardly looked back as he started to work quite actively with the marks emerging via Beth and Kate. The dance had begun.

By the third drawing, my frustration concerning not being involved in the messy, material act of drawing became too much, and I started my own drawing process on an iPad screen. In part, this was also a response to the 'audience' as the third iteration took place in the midst of the gallery opening. There were already plenty of observers and comments being made, and my

colleagues no longer needed this from me—other than, at times, fielding the questions that came in so they could continue to focus on the drawing. When I took up my iPad pen, I tried to enter into the drawing as it was emerging. This was just a following or copying. And yet, this simple act taught me a great deal about the flows and feeling of the activity. I was entering the drawing process through another door: I was forced to move fast—following two bodies drawing large on the wall, one hand projected large, all folding into the small iPad screen. The telescoping back and forth was intense and dizzying. There was no way of keeping up the following or copying—I had to diverge and extemporise in ways that took me away but brought into the conversation differently. It was all rhythm and stroke and flow and tempo. It took me into the heart of my fascination with 'vitality affects' in a way that had been missing all along: this was entirely qualitative and highly complex. In trying to follow, I found myself 'feeling in,' but it wasn't a feeling into any one individual, but into an overall musicality—offering a way into the shared event via a mimetic dance.¹⁹

These first-person written accounts, collected together after the event, were revealing for us. Different perspectives on a shared event can demonstrate the degree to which access to one another's feelings, thoughts, and perceptions is limited. Something else was at stake.

The drawing process involved a more complex assemblage than immediately evident. Chapman draws attention to the felt presence of many spaces beyond the actual space at hand, folded into the one process, place and time. George makes note of the expanded temporal field at play, discussing the presence of duration both in the making of marks, each 'making recourse to past embodied memories,' and then how areas of the drawing later becoming sites of embodied memory. All participants discuss the shifts in negotiating one another, perceptions of the other, sometimes hinting at the very complex interpersonal histories and dynamics at play. References to drawing materials and bodily movement as cue and interaction give a sense of the dance-like quality of the drawing process as a more-than-human assemblage of activity. Non-verbal cues were at the core of this process and often difficult to account for, such as Mullen's comments about 'this life force pulsing through' and George's reference to 'energy' which 'is laid into the drawing.' This brings us back, then, to the appeal to mystery that so often arises when we try to explain what happens inside the activity of drawing, and to the sense of something hard to articulate in words.

Perhaps one of the more surprising outcomes of the process—through both the drawings event/s themselves and the protracted process of thinking it through well after it happened—is the sense that empathy also became as inadequate as the idea of drawing as translation or projective transmission. Projection was far from eliminated from the drawing process—it was literally embedded

in the assemblage after all—and empathy remains an adequate way to describe moments and aspects within the event. However, something more was happening here than the actions of projection, translation or empathy could capture—something more 'global.' If we wanted to look at ways out of the architectural 'ruts' of rationalisation, as discussed earlier, this 'something more' seemed both important, and in need of an alternative conceptual framework.

part 3: drawing as world-making: foaming Uexküll's bubble

Jakob von Uexküll's discussion of the Umwelt—a given organism's perceptual life-world—became another way to think about the space of drawing and its relevance to the role of empathy, without the burden of 'the projective cast,' letting go of its particular 'enabling fictions.'

Uexküll's *A Foray into the Worlds of Animals and Humans*, is quite an extraordinary 'travelogue,'²⁰ as he calls it, through the Umwelts of many creatures. Through drawings and descriptive text, the book strives to sketch out many very different perceptual life-worlds, offering a window into empathising with otherness, while acknowledging the limits of that striving.

In his foreword, Uexküll describes the Umwelt very picturesquely as a bubble:

We begin such a stroll on a sunny day before a flowering meadow in which insects buzz and butterflies flutter, and we make a bubble around each

of the animals living in the meadow. The bubble represents each animal's environment and contains all the features accessible to the subject. As soon as we enter into one such bubble, the previous surroundings of the subject are completely reconfigured. Many qualities of the colourful meadow vanish completely, others lose their coherence with one another, and new connections are created. A new world arises in each bubble.²¹

Uexküll's study focuses on the entirely different perceptual life-worlds of non-human animals, starting (famously) with a detailed account of the Umwelt of a tick, moving on to describe how humans also occupy different Umwelts to one another. A plurality of co-existent worlds is not differentiated just by species, but also by individuals. The sense that we all occupy our own worlds, none entirely accessible by another, is related to why we might have a concern for empathy in the first place.

Drawing is interesting in relation to the Umweltian bubble: immersed in the act of drawing, a drawer arguably constructs a bubble of attention and perception around them, focused on the surface of the drawing, the implements of drawing, and the subject of drawing (whether a scene/object presented to them, or being imagined). This bubble of activity is not a closed-off containment but a somewhat paradoxical way of *opening up* to the world more acutely, more intensely, and with focus. The act of drawing something—say a creature—is often discussed as a way to develop higher levels of empathic connection

with that creature. Whether these claims concerning empathy are always or only sometimes true, those familiar with drawing as a practice of exploring perception know how the activity invites new ways of seeing/sensing, feeling and thinking. Drawing can help usher new perceptions into our Umwelt such that we evolve, or shift, ever so slightly through drawing, forging new connections. Drawing, as such, is not just an activity *in* the world, but is a process of active *world-making*. Echoing current understandings of the plasticity of the brain, this perceptual life-world is not given, but made and developed, and—importantly here—drawing can be understood as a process that fosters this creative world-making.

The drawing itself may convey to others something of that way of perceiving—a small window into that life-world—and the history of aesthetic theory has spent considerable energy thinking about what happens in this observer-artwork relationship. However, as discussed earlier via Evans, the active space of the drawing's coming-into-being is mostly discussed as inaccessible and mysterious. Uexküll himself suggests this is the case in his *A Theory of Meaning*: 'We can very well see how the painter's hand put one spot of colour after another onto the canvas, until the painting stands finished before us, but the formative melody that moved the hand remains completely unknowable for us.'²²

The paradoxical status of the drawing process as both internal/mysterious and inaccessible, while also offering outwardly visible/expressive ways to access otherness,

is perhaps why all the various forms of what is considered 'drawing' retain ongoing cultural vitality. Along these lines, the painter offers a useful metaphor for Uexküll, because the activity sets up a kind of perceptual cradle of attention, in which something simultaneously inside and outside happens all at once. An interior world of perception can be partially entered through the artwork: a window onto the Umwelt.

In the situation of *Surrogate Drawing*, each of us, arguably, occupied (and were occupied by) our own, idiosyncratic, perceptual life-world. And yet, we were also all constituent parts of the same ecology of actions, which was a shared, relationally alive assemblage of activity. Our collective drawing experiment aimed to move multiple, mark-making hands, machines and materials into shared melodies. We set out to explore whether and how the assemblage cultivated empathy, allowing us to feel-into one another's Umwelts. Was it a collection of different melodies that came to overlap in fleeting moments, or did we find a shared melody? Or both? The paradoxical status of drawing in terms of embodying both the inwardly contained and outwardly expressed, an inaccessibility and a letting others in, as sketched out above, would suggest it was likely to be both.

This paradoxical situation of occupying both shared and separate worlds-in-the-making could be imagined, to resonate with Peter Sloterdijk's *Sphere's* trilogy,²³ as a *foam*: many bubbles that share adjacent, tensile and filmic surfaces of negotiation. Each bubble affects every other in a foam, and this drawing

process might be productively seen as an active foaming, with affects always on the move as part of the making. The surfaces, where one bubble of foam meets another, are precisely what define the shape of each bubble: every Umwelt is inflected by every other. If drawing alone can be aptly described in terms of an Umweltian bubble, drawing together becomes foaming. The distinction, however, does not necessarily hold. Even when a single human draws 'alone,' are they not joined by live, collaborative acts with a vast array of materials, images, durations, environmental influences, etc? Does this shift from the bubble to the foam reveal that the bubble actually never existed in pure form? Haven't so many enabling fictions—the mythologies of sole authorship, creative genius, translation and projection—held us hostage in lonely bubbles, left with the struggle of empathic connection?

beyond empathy: in-sympathy

The creeping suspicion that something other than empathy was at stake in this experiment starts to flower in the midst of this foaming, which attains a complexity of co-dependent interrelations one can see as 'ecological.' The expansion beyond one-to-one correspondences, implicit to this set-up, broke down the projective geometries imagined in terms of mirror neurons and translation. In a sweet twist, the projector at the centre of the spatial assemblage acted out the projective cast in a way that was critically important but also revealed its own limitations: projection was enabling, but was radically exceeded.

Empathy was critical to the experiment, but was so far exceeded that it required recalibration, having become something like 'ecological-empathy.' This leads us toward the related but alternative concept of *sympathy*. According to Merriam-Webster, 'sympathy' is when you share the feelings of another; empathy is when you understand the feelings of another but do not necessarily share them.²⁴ Empathy involves transporting yourself into the place of another, emphasising translation and projection, whereas sympathy is from *sympathēs*: having common feelings. Importantly: what's common is not always personal, or specific to any given entity.

Sympathy, as Brian Massumi writes, '... is the mode of existence of the included middle.'²⁵ Sympathy, in other words, offers a way into the middling 'gap' between drawer and drawing, and drawing and building.²⁶ Through a related ontological bent, Jane Bennett has written about the significance Walt Whitman's writing gave to sympathy, which offers 'a non-modern sense of Sympathy as a natural or vital force operating below, through, and beyond human bodies or experience.'²⁷ Of value here is Bennett's attention to 'the question of how one might deliberately channel or harness this (onto) Sympathy ...' through 'One of the techniques – both literary and practical – that Whitman himself used [which] was "doting" or paying slow attention to ordinary objects, things, shapes, words, bodies.'²⁸

'Doting' sounds a bit like 'drawing.' Drawing, if liberated from the projective, translational framing that architecture is so keen to clamp around it, may well be an indispensable

technique for cultivating sympathy, and architecting our way toward more affectively shared, ecologically inclined world-making.

We are conscious that in visual art practice, there is far more precedent for approaching drawing as experimental acts of 'world-making,' even if expressed in different terms. While rafts of techniques dedicated to perceptual experimentation, 'opening up' the hand-mind connection, and for leaning towards fluid, automatic production, can be located across art history, this project offered a provocation particular to the translational, projective, surrogate-like assumptions of architectural drawing, always tied, as it is, to spatial constructs. But even in visual art contexts, episodes of live co-creative collaboration as integral to a spatial assemblage are uncommon; the focus on sole authorship, restrained to human agency, is no less entrenched in art contexts than it is in architecture. The deliberate intention to distribute one act across multiple, more-than-human actors, defined this experiment, discussed here as a shift from a process held within an Umweltian bubble, into a foaming that raised sympathy as a way to understand the sharing of event-based feeling. How such a framework might invite a more sympathetic architecture is of ongoing concern.

acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge that this drawing experiment took place in the Country of the Wurundjeri and Boon Wurrung people of the greater Melbourne region.

author biographies

Pia Ednie-Brown is a Professor of Architecture at the University of Newcastle. Her design practice, onomatopoeia, explores creative ways of unsettling anthropocentrism. Her writing and creative works have been published in diverse national and international contexts.

Beth George is an educator and practitioner in architecture, with a focus on drawing and urbanism. She is a Senior Lecturer at the University of Newcastle, and taught at the University of Western Australia and Curtin University. Beth researches broadly, through book chapters, articles and papers, competitions, exhibitions, and built work.

Michael Chapman is Professor (Design Thinking) in the School of Architecture and the Built Environment at the University of Newcastle.

Kate Alida Mullen is an artist, curator, arts facilitator and writer based in Naarm (Melbourne, Australia), where she is undertaking a creative practice-led PhD on the transformational potentiality of deep listening practices. Mullen is engaged in consultancy work with arts organisations Australia-wide, many of which are Aboriginal-owned, remote community-based corporations.

notes

- 01 This issue was the subject of Nicholas Skepper's PhD, *Forms and Ideas Materialise: The Material Agency of the Design Medium in Architectural Practice* (Melbourne: RMIT University, 2017).
- 02 Robin Evans, 'Translations from Drawing to Building,' in *Translations from Drawing to Building and Other Essays* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997), 153-193.
- 03 Evans, *Translations*, 154.
- 04 Evans, *Translations*, 186.
- 05 Robin Evans, *The Projective Cast: Architecture and its Three Geometries* (Cambridge, London: MIT Press, 1995).
- 06 Evans, *Projective Cast*, xxv.
- 07 Evans, *Projective Cast*, xxxi.
- 08 Patricia Cain, *Drawing: The Enactive Evolution of the Practitioner* (Bristol: Intellect, 2010), 44.
- 09 Peter Cook, *Drawing: The Motive Force of Architecture* (West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, 2008), 177.
- 10 Evans, *The Projective Cast*, 3.
- 11 Robert Vischer, *Über das optische Formgefühl. Ein Beitrag zur Ästhetik* (Leipzig: Herman Credner, 1873), translated as 'On the Optical Sense of Form: A Contribution to Aesthetics' in *Empathy, Form, and Space: Problems in German Aesthetics, 1873-1893*, eds. Harry Mallgrave and Eleftherios Ikonomou (Santa Monica: Getty Center for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1994), 89-123.
- 12 Robert Vischer (1873), in Carol Jeffers, 'A Still Life is Really a Moving Life: The Role of Mirror Neurons and Empathy in Animating Aesthetic Response,' *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 44, no. 2 (Summer, 2010): 31-39, accessed 20 October 2020, <http://doi.org/10.5406/jaeduc.44.2.0031>.
- 13 Joanna Ganczarek, Thomas Hunefeldt, Marta Olivetti Belardinelli, 'From Einfühlung to Empathy: Exploring the Relationship between Aesthetic and Interpersonal Experience,' *Cognitive Processing* 19, no. 2 (May 2019): 141-145, accessed 20 October 2020, <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10339-018-0861-x>.
- 14 Vittorio Gallese, 'Empathy, Embodied Simulation, and the Brain: Commentary on Aragno and Zept/Hartmen,' *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association* 56 (2008): 769-781, accessed 20 October 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003065108322206>.
- 15 Beth George, reflective text, Jan/Feb 2020.
- 16 Kate Mullan, reflective text, Jan/Feb 2020.
- 17 Michael Chapman, reflective text, Jan/Feb 2020.
- 18 Daniel Stern, *The Interpersonal World of the Infant* (New York, London: W.W. Norton and Company, 2000) (original publication 1985), and *Forms of Vitality: Exploring Dynamic Experience in Psychology, the Arts, Psychotherapy, and Development* (Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- 19 Pia Ednie-Brown, reflective text, Jan/Feb 2020.
- 20 Jakob von Uexküll, *A Foray into the Worlds of Animals and Humans, with A Theory of Meaning*, trans. Joseph D. O'Neil (Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press), 43.
- 21 Uexküll, *A Foray*, 43.
- 22 Uexküll, *A Foray*, 203. *Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*, 'What's the difference between sympathy and empathy?', accessed May 28, 2020, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/words-at-play/sympathy-empathy-difference>.
- 23 Peter Sloterdijk's *Spheres* trilogy is an obvious connection here that remains unexplored in this context but warrants further discussion at a future time. Sloterdijk is significantly influenced by the work of Uexküll, so the connections are strong.
- 24 *Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary*, 'What's the difference between sympathy and empathy?', accessed 20 October 2020, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/words-at-play/sympathy-empathy-difference>.
- 25 Brian Massumi, *What Animals Teach Us about Politics* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), 35.
- 26 This publication deserves acknowledgment here, for its related work on sympathy and design: Lars Spoebroek, *The Sympathy of Things: Ruskin and the Ecology of Design* (Rotterdam: V2_publishing, 2011).
- 27 Jane Bennett, 'Whitman's Sympathies,' *Political Research Quarterly* 69, no. 3 (September 2016): 615, accessed 20 October 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912916656824>.
- 28 Bennett, *Whitman's Sympathies*, 615.