COMMENTARY

Making is inextricably tied to living. From a daily perspective, their connection underlies our sense that we are always "making" something (e.g. time, love, friends, money). From an industrial angle, the link is self-evident in the all-pervasive question: "how do you plan to make a living?" In academia, their bond informs disciplines like anthropology, the life sciences, and material culture. Put together, these dimensions suggest that while the method of making varies and evolves, the fact of making is consistent. History manifests this as well. Tooling gave way to craft, craft transformed into fabrication, and fabrication has evolved into constructing and collecting information; life goes on and making persists. But if life and making are indeed reciprocal then a change in one will undoubtably have an effect on the other. It is a bromide to suggest that technological changes have impacted our daily lives. But the inverse question has been largely neglected. How does our current way of life alter, enable, or threaten making?

Our way of life is unequivocally impacted by two hazardous conditions: climate crisis and class conflict. Beyond their obvious threat to survival, climate and class also undermine the critical elements that form the bond between living and making. This fact comes in to view when we combine climate and class into a single geological term: the anthropocene. The anthropocene designates an age—our age—in which humans have dominant impact on the earth and its inhabitants. Put in these terms, living and making are at risk because human dominance has led to a decaying earth and human suffering. But these tragic circumstances have a hidden value. They unveil the operative principles of living and making—surface and agent—and present them as tools for reimagining life. For example, the scarred earth testifies to the role of surfaces while abused voices bear witness to the question of agency. Inversely, skin and gender call attention to surfaces while a violated earth introduces concerns about the viability of traditional agency. The anthropocene and its aftermath raise an important question. If climate and class outline the indispensable role of surface and agent and offer them as conceptual tools for redress then why do living and making remain on a collision course? The answer may lie in the philosophies and models which currently configure surface and agency.

Over the last century, academia has understood living, making, surface, and agent through the lens of writing. Writing is not just a manual operation but is a theoretical model for all creativity. It arranges living and making into a certain kind of relation by conceiving of surfaces and agents in specific and paradigmatic ways. Importantly, writing does this by pivoting the elements around a central philosophical assumption: incommensurability. Surfaces are unapproachable and agents vanish. In the terms of writing itself, writers and readers are fundamentally estranged. More generally, no two things can converge because any substantive exchange between the two would be tantamount to the violation of one or the other. As a result of this conceptual presupposition, writing has largely positioned life as death, making as networked emergence, surfaces as limits, and agents as specious authors. This configuration translates making into a kind of transgression or an impossibility. This pattern is more than an academic subtlety. Common experiences like expropriated labor, racial injustice, and gender discrimination can all be read as untouchable or violated surfaces (i.e. things or skin) and impotent agency. In industry, the battles over proprietary content, ownership, and even invisible market forces may be vestiges of the writing archetype. Despite writing's attempt to prevent an "inherent" violence in the act of making, violence abounds on earth's surface and amongst its people. Writing's commitment to incommensurability does not abate problems.; it aggravates them. Thus, if we want to make and living and live with what we make, something other than writing must deliver a viable account of living and making.

My research takes up this burden by investigating the fundamental premises and problems that belie writing and offers a counter-thesis in drawing. The investigation itself proceeds abductively. When writing is taken as a given premise or normative condition for making, it should deductively produce its desired effect. But as problems arise or inconsistencies surmount, we must return to the fundamental ground or premise of making and explore an alternate position in hopes of gaining accuracy, applicability, and explanatory scope. The alternative must then be refined through systematic combining. It expands upon the abductive realization of a failed premise, which is, in this case, writing. Therefore, the procedure begins where the status quo model ends. It brings four quadrants of understanding—a proposed

I only offered scant citations just for readers to see the general framework of the reading list, the coming bibliography and my subsequent usage of those resources.

COMMENTARY

alternative framework, a case study, a guiding theoretical field, and the material world—into close proximity in order to establish a conceptual harmony that the dismissed approach failed to achieve. My research schematic takes the re conditions as material world, phenomenology as the field, drawing as the new framework, and architecture as the case study. Together they establish drawing as the paradigm more properly suited to our current needs.

Phenomenology's long standing focus on daily life and shared experience befit the questions of making and the problems of our day. Other systems of philosophical analysis might yield highly nuanced and abstract insights but they would be inaccessible to most human constituents of the anthropocene. Conversely, quantitative studies of making methods and creative procedures might only offer highly technical or specialized insights which also fall short of the general need to recover living and making. Phenomenology's distinct advantage for my research lies in its innate commitment to systematic combining—both methodologically and substantively. It is not forced to choose between estranged dimensions of thought as is affirmed in writing's central assumptions. Phenomenology's continued focus on experience coupled with reflection is evidence that it tries to hold any two perspectives, dimensions, or entities together whether in union, overlap, or exchange. This defends phenomenology against criticisms of simple subjectivity and puts it in direct relation with writing's tendency towards philosophies of pure exteriority. Phenomenology challenges the dichotomy of exterior and interior by drawing towards life, drawing forth new ideas, and drawing things together. Alternatively, it avoids homogeneity by drawing lines. In this way, phenomenology helps outline the twofold nature of reality which is best satisfied by drawing; which has a resilient capacity to hold two things in common. If this holds, drawing can be both a concept and operation. It is both descriptive model and prescriptive instrument. Nevertheless, in true phenomenological fashion, these claims must be examined materially and experientially.

Architecture provides a the ideal case study for testing drawing. Historically, architecture has directly aligned drawing and making. In more recent years architectural drawing has been sidelined by computer aided softwares, algorithmic design processes, and smart fabrication techniques. This transformation has led to an intradisciplinary debate about the function, mode, and nature of building (i.e. making). Drawing continues to be an essential (though often unseen) current of this conversation. The specific discussion between computer advocates and phenomenologists takes up many of the elements mentioned above. All of which orbit drawing. Materials, surfaces, agency, labor, perception, ecology, and more frame the future and viability of drawing. My prior phenomenological analysis affords a non-specialist entry into this dialogue and supplements it with a revised understanding of drawing. The revised model is coupled with architecture's historical testimony to project the usefulness and viability of drawing in other modes of making.

Drawing could significantly reorient and revitalize digital craftwork commonly known under the aegis of "new media." Today, the preeminent and most accessible form of making is found on a screen (surface). Likewise, the digital screen is where life and expression often take place (agency). For this reason, scholars, activists, and entrepreneurs have proffered the digital solution as a magic bullet for the anthropocene's gravest dangers. But they have done so without renewed consideration of surface, agent, and their interplay. Digital infrastructures continue to wreak havoc on the earth's surface and the screen is often where lives are threatened or marginalized. The "digital"—as it stands now—circles back to these problems time and again because it has inherited the paradigm of writing. Copyright issues, trolling, identity, ethnography, and more confirm that writing's conceptual schemes are still operative. Consequently, digital structures mired in writing might propose new possibilities but they all too often achieve them by leveraging death, opening distance, and concealing hierarchies of violence. With the help of a few new media theorists, I sketch out what new media might look like if the tyranny and privilege of writing were traded for the collaborative potentiality of drawing. In conclusion, any surface of making, including the digital, can invigorate the earth and its inhabitants when they are drawn to life.

My particular variant of phenomenology are defined by these works and more: Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible: Followed by Working Notes* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968); Michel Henry, *The Essence of Manifestation* (Netherlands: Springer, 2014); Renaud Barbaras, *Desire and Distance: Introduction to a Phenomenology of Perception* (Redwood City: Stanford University Press, 2006); Gail Weiss, Gayle Salamon, and Ann V. Murphy, *50 Concepts for a Critical Phenomenology* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2019).

There are too many works to note these are a few : Works by Mario Carpo specifically with respect to digital drawing; Juhani Pallasmaa, *The Thinking Hand* (Hoboken: Wiley, 2009): Patrik Schumacher, *Parametricism 2.0:* (Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2016); Gottfried Semper, *Style in the Technical and Tectonic Arts,* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2004); Paul Emmons, *Drawing Imagining Building:* (London: Routledge, 2019); Malcolm McCullough, *Digital Ground* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2005).

My exploration of new media will cut across media ecologies and theoretical insights: Sean Cubitt, *Finite Media: Environmental Implications of Digital Technologies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016); Jussi Parikka, *A Geology of Media* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015); Vilém Flusser, *Writings* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004);

I only offered scant citations just for readers to see the general framework of the reading list, the coming bibliography and my subsequent usage of those resources.