As architecture students, we are encouraged to be creative. This is a healthy approach in our education, but only to certain extent. Being too "creative" sometimes can be crippling. Its deceptive nature should not be taken for granted. It becomes dangerous when we intentionally aspire to be creative for the sake of recognition, as opposed to being creative as a byproduct of genuine curiosity. Drawing as a form of inquiry – that is a novel pursuit; however, drawing unearned wisdom that we pretend to have a complete understanding of – that is a form of deception. The former is honest, while the latter, to me, seem very pretentious.

This is when “creativity” kills the spirit of Drawing itself. Drawing becomes an “act” – a misleading performance - which is in fact a facade masking our inability to comprehend a difficult subject. To some extent it worships aestheticism, centered around recognition versus wonder. Yes it is a different form of representation, but it seems like its not, in most part, aligned with rudimentary architectural questions one should explore. I worry that we value these kinds of drawings than the purpose of Drawing itself.

Instead of aiming for eye candy renderings and illustrations, perhaps we should first revisit our Origins, not as a way of hindering progress in architecture education, but only to ground us on what really matters. What constitutes architectural drawing/representation – is perhaps a question worth asking these days.

---

1 Aeron Regalado, *Parti, Intervention derived from five core concepts of Twin Towers*, 2018, pen on sketchbook, 6 x 3 in., Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba, Canada.
Aeron Regalado, *Deceptively “nice” collage to hide the insufficient understanding of Minuro Yamasaki’s works, “I know what to draw before actually drawing it“, 2017, drawing on vellum c/w photoshop, 36 x 24 in., Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba, Canada.*