# *DRAWING OUT GEHRY*

RIET EECKHOUT

I propose to submit a paper to annotate a set of drawings to be exhibited.

Drawing Out Gehry is a set of drawings in dialogue with Frank Gehry's drawing of the Boyarksy collection.It forefronts the autonomy of information, in this case, Frank Gehry's drawing and its capacity to distance itself from acquired meaning and assigned representation.

In this particular drawing process, there is a transfiguration that takes place from one drawing to another, from one point of view to another. The transfiguration of visual information from one state of the drawing to another is a process of mediation and cannot be accurately described in words, but is to be seen and sensed in the drawing.

This paper forms part of a series of investigations towards an understanding the status and positioning of the drawing within the discipline of architecture. Drawing does not have a fixed relationship with architecture,and remains-in my drawings-within the associative realm (spatial association) and on the exterior of spatial intent.

In that sense, the drawing's relationship to architecture stays at arms length.

As I am raising the issue, I'd like to nurture an understanding through this new set of drawings.
I'd like enter the drawing I am kept from at arms length and expand on the Drawing Out Gehry- drawings. These new drawings are to interrogate a relationship to architecture and qualify the nature of their architectural capacity.

This field of investigation is situated in a battleground between Eisenman's and Hejduk's differences regarding the status of an architectural drawing. The conviction that architecture can only exist in its ultimate build form by Eisenman is dismissed by Hedjuk, as a drawing for him is a complete piece of architecture. The essence of their difference in point of view is touched upon with the following excerpt:

"I remember dr.Eisenman coming to Berlin and seeing these two pieces in this great hall. they were 50 foot high ( ), they were giving off something. We talked about an aura. A thing like that. And he said to me: "That's not architecture, because you can't get int them." And I looked at him and said: "You cant't get in them." In other words, he was not in the position to get into them. You can only get into something if you understand or are willing to. (Michael Blackwood Productions. John Hejduk: Builder of Worlds)