MedCrave
Step into the World of Research

Arts & Humanities Open Access Journal

Research Article

Open Access

CrossMark

Empowering shaping thought by using the body synergies—Why architects should keep drawing by hand

Abstract

This study presents a statement about the importance of thinking through the potential expression of the body's action. In this regard, despite the diminishing attention to empirical drawing in architectural teaching, which has been replaced by the emergence of computers and AI, we underline that the process of shape thinking can be improved when it is developed in response to the body's sensitivities. Thus, it will be argued that empirical drawing, using the hand and its gestures, activates several synergies that nurture and stimulate thought about and through shapes. The result is an expressive way of thinking, and also a means of creating a wider consciousness, a humanized creation, and a more profound self-consciousness. Thus, if a subject, and in particular one who develops a thought about and through shapes—as the architect—uses empirical drawing, it will increase his sense of thinking, reunifying it with the body's sensitivity and aesthetic sensitivity: in order to create a better external reality and, in the meantime, a deeper inner reality.

Keywords: thought, body, action, drawing, expression, architectural design

Volume 8 Issue 3 - 2026

Luís Filipe Salgado Pereira Rodrigues
Professor in the School of Architecture, University of Lisbon, Portugal

Correspondence: Luís Filipe Salgado Pereira Rodrigues, Professor in the School of Architecture, University of Lisbon, Portugal

Received: August 18, 2026 | **Published:** September 1, 2026

Introduction

In this study, we examine the importance of thinking through bodily expression. To this end, we will focus on empirical drawing and the reasons why its application is relevant to architectural thought. Indeed, this argument will be supported by the advantages of using the hand and its gestures as a means of expression and stimulation of the thought process about and through forms. As will be clarified, it is not just about expression but also about experiencing broader awareness, humanizing creation, and developing deeper self-awareness. Therefore, we will explain how a subject who develops thought about and through forms, using empirical drawing—such as an architect—can broaden their sense of thought, combining their thinking with sensitivity, both bodily and aesthetic.

So, the main goal of this study is to explain the importance of exploring our body to develop the process of thinking about and through shapes. More than that, it will be argued why consciousness is potentiated by the sensitive way of thinking, embodied thinking. With this statement, a justification is proposed for using empirical drawing to express sensitivity, by architects. This quality of embodiment is common to all humanity, and not to AI. As it is an intrinsic characteristic of human beings, it should be kept being explored in the creation process.

Material and methods

This study doesn't have quantitative data or concrete examples. However, it is based on my experience teaching drawing to architecture students and on my own practice as a visual artist. Based on this prior experience, bibliographic research was conducted as an extension of my theoretical studies on drawing since 2004, alongside my creative practice in drawing.

Conceptual context

From subjectivity to objectivity

To feel is common to all of us: it is universal. Since we all share the same nature—the biological nature, the same means of feeling and being affected—each one can understand this subjective experience in the other.

The way to (intuitively) understand another's subjectivity is through intersubjectivity, which is nurtured by empathy. That's why our growth in human knowledge depends on the relationship with the other, who is "an object" of knowledge. Even though he is "an object," intersubjectivity allows us to know more about the subject, subjectivity, sensitivity, and human consciousness. But it is not just an intuitive comparison between us and the others: it is an identification process.

When we speak about our own subjectivity, we refer to the individual experience of a singular feeling that only we can be aware of in our own. This sensitive individual experience includes consciousness about the external reality and, even more, the inner reality, the self-consciousness. Note that, as Damásio explains in several books, the phenomenon begins when our relationship with an object (in the wider sense) causes a change in our organism; and that change, as Damásio (2004) explains, starts with a feeling, an emotion, i.e., a sensation generated in our bodies. Thus, it is the biological reality, our body, the natural "site" where consciousness occurs. What this means is that we can be conscious of both the external and internal worlds, with which we have some kind of relationship, depending on the inherent sensitivity of our own body. This is the sensitive phenomenon of individual consciousness that AI can't replace in each of us.

Exploring the concept of subjectivity leads to other concepts, such as the "opposite" ones, like "objectivity" and "object". According to Matteis's.,[1] words, the objects "are made of tangible physical matter, have a shape, cohesion, stability over time, a precise location in space, and are either at rest or in motion". Based on this feature, an edifice, a building, could be considered an object. However, we shall add that another condition of being an object implies the possibility of being manipulated with our hands, arms, and legs, i.e., by our body. In another context, we might wonder whether our bodies can be considered objects. Thus, since our body is made of tangible physical matter, has a shape, and some cohesion, it can be at rest or in motion,

i.e., it could be considered an object; however, it isn't, because it lacks stability over time or a precise location in space. Moreover, due to its biological nature, it is not artificial; it is not constructed by rational means but by sensitive means, by nature. And it is its unstable and sensitive nature that gives life to our dynamic of adaptation, feelingness, consciousness, subjectivity, and our aim to recover stability (even though we never achieve it) by action.

In spite of the previous explanation, from another perspective, the object may be the result of our rational, logical "construct" thinking, which influences cognitive processes. That is to say, an object can also be something that can be understood or cognitively constructed; in one word, it can be manipulated by our reason and our will. If it is elaborated through a rational process (such as a geometric one), whether it has a strong or weak influence, it becomes objective, i.e., objectified, with a hypothesis of being objectively understood and explained; in the "opposite" sense, if it allows the manifestation of feelings, subjectivity gains importance, with a hypothesis of being felt and stimulating consciousness.

If we explore an object with subjectivity, becoming it external and perceptible, it is an expressive way of thinking. Above all, it means contributing to the creation of a wider consciousness, a humanized creation, and a more profound self-consciousness. Based on these motives, if a subject, and in particular one who develops a thought about and through shapes—as the architect—uses the empirical drawing, it will increase the felt thinking, i.e., reunifying the objective thinking with the body's sensitivity and aesthetic sensitivity.

Discussion

From the empty space to its filling with conscious representation of objects' ideas

The absence of objects or subjects corresponds to an empty space. In fact, space is nothing; it is emptiness. What defines a space is what occupies it: objects, subjects, natural elements—or representations, or objects' ideas —that give it shape, order, organization, meaning, features, and, eventually, utility.

As an analogy to physical space, we can understand our mind as a space. What that means is that memories, structured thoughts, and mind constructs are objects that grow in our inner "empty" space of mind, some kind of consubstantiality of sensitive energy. When we experience an objective, external space, it becomes internal through its mental representation—the subjective construction of an image, in some sense, a primordial consubstantiality of a thought.[I] This happens passively when we use perception through the primary sensations. However, it becomes intentionally constructed in our minds as a present object when we represent it with cognitive support and bodily sensitivity—mainly through drawing.[II] So far, when the image corresponds to an object or edifice that can be constructed outside our minds, the representation becomes, in effect, an object (material and inert). In synthesis, when an image is merely perceptual, an instant representation passively and subjectively occupies our mind; when we assume active cognitive construction (for instance, by drawing), the subjective inner image of perception, imagination, or memory, becomes external, objectivized and, so, object of perception, recognizing, understanding or subjective sensitization; when it is materialized, it becomes an object that occupies the physical space.

Actually, our body is what makes it possible for dialogue to occur between our subjective internal space and the objective space outside us (i.e., the space with "objects"). According to Damásio (2004), consciousness grows when the organism is changed by its relationship with an object—what happens naturally but that we need to seek intentionally—through our body. That's why our body and the phenomenon of consciousness provide us with the possibility to clarify what we really are as subjects, from the inner space, and what material reality is, in the external space, or what differs between the self and the "not-self" (i.e., what is beyond the fount of our unique sensitivity or, more than that, what is or can be separated from our body, without making us suffer or causing any kind of lack).

Regarding the subjective experience of perceiving external reality, if we think of space as a mirror, following Elkins.,[2] we must be aware that space reflects our unconscious contents, fears, desires, and, in a word, feelings, emotions, and affections—i.e., the sensitive objects that occupy our inner spacener space. Regarding the sensitive experience with external and objective space, are the objects in it what cause the imminent subjective and irrational resonance in our internal space—the space where affections happen and where objects are attached to sensivity. This is our immanent subjective field. And this experience is indelibly individual; nobody feels the objects inside our inner space except ourselves.

However, since these sorts of feelings are common in all of us, they are natural phenomena shared by all of us, and, under empathy, they are perceived and felt between us—if we break the rational boundaries between the self and the "not-self", becoming open to the sensitive experience of being affected. Several people can share any feeling as a reciprocal stimulus; and if so, there are conditions for a unifying experience in the same space, as the internal spaces of the other and ours become a familiar subjective inner space. In a broader sense, this leads to the unification of the selves, understanding the other as a similar self rather than a "not-self", an inaccessible object. In this view, not only objective representations of the external reality surrounding us may become part of our internal space, but other people may also become part of us. This means that we get linked with the other in a subjective and empathetic way by unifying what, within our inner space, represents our identity with what represents the other's (as identifications).

Then, perhaps it is expected that an architect seeks an architectural solution so that their own feelings, within their inner space, are well received by the users of the physical space created by them, thereby bringing together different inner spaces, unifying the selves in a common space, both objective and subjective.[III]

[I]Regarding this, we must be aware of what Grafton (2020, p. 10) says: "Although it remains difficult to determine how the human brain actually creates mental space, one thing cognitive neuroscience has nailed down is the way that a brain can use attention to control what will fill up space and to move the mind through the space."

[II]"Because we are disposed as we are to attribute our actions for a reason to that very reason, we tend to know noninferentially what we are about—at least psychologic direction—of our behaviour. […] The attribution condition helps to capture this cognitive grasp that we tend to have of our own agency: without the self-knowledge it provides for, we would be cut off from what we do; it could, to be sure, ne rather like acting for a reason, but it there is no such noninferential disposition at all, as opposed to one that is overridden by sellf-deception or undetermined error, then the behaviour falls short of acting for a reason. It might a pattern result of our reasons, but not fully action for a reason" (Mele, 1997, p. 87).

[III]This leads us to the concept of intersubjectivity that happens, in Matteis's (2021, p. 76) words, as "a powerful motion deeply influencing the ways subjects relate to each other in space. For various reasons, intersubjective dynamics play an important role in architectural design: we are rarely alone in built spaces, and some configurations can sustain or inhibit the interaction between subjects, influencing their experience of space."

Citation: Rodrigues LFSP. Empowering shaping thought by using the body synergies—Why architects should keep drawing by hand. *Art Human Open Acc J.* 2026;8(3):137–142. DOI: 10.15406/ahoaj.2026.08.00283

The intentional relationship with space through mind-body action

Whichever human product corresponds to a representation that begins with a feeling generated in the body (with varying degrees of irrationality) and becomes a form of thought. Moreover, whichever physical reality consciousness phenomenon occurs, it happens in our mind-body system.

When our action body is driven by some reason, our sensitive nature is activated, and, consequently, the reason as well. That is to say, our feelings flow and nurture our thinking, which becomes more creative (including creative reasoning) - and becomes integral to our experience; in one word, a sensitivated reasoning experience. However, even though, for instance, moving through space enables us to achieve a kind of objective acknowledgment, we need to be more conscious through deliberate analysis. That can be done, for instance, by elaborating its representation and making it external, such as through drawing. Such proactivity enhances (and is enhanced by) intentionality, so even consciousness of the shapes - for instance, through drawing-needs some intentional relationship—as Jack and Shallice (in Dehaene.,[3]) state—is "the principle that awareness is necessary for intentional action." If we could experiment together with all our senses and skills, our awareness would improve. This may be reinforced, once more, with Grof's.,[4] words: "A rich and complex connection to the physical world demands abilities that blur distinctions among mind, brain, and body; proactive decision-making regarding physiological events and action execution; physically challenging do-it-yourself projects in complicated situations that require ingenuity, strength, and a willingness to stray off the beaten path." Since such experience requires an integral approach, activating the subjective source—the body and the feelings—may help us grow as a whole.

To achieve this wholeness, it is helpful to develop structured thinking by molding forms of space and experimenting with them —i.e., interacting with them—to complement geometric schematic representations with a sense of their real references—such as through drawings. Matteis.,[1] names this interaction—of thinking-moving-experimenting-representation—a "cyclic co-determination." Indeed, as Damásio.,[5] states, "when we learn about an object, we make records not just of its appearance but also of our interactions with it (our eye and head movements, our hand movements, and so forth); recalling an object encompasses recalling a varied package of memorized motor interactions." From this perspective, the action body, when we draw, is a source of subjective energy that enhances objective thinking through its intentional strength of interaction between mind-body-representation-reality.

When we explore, for instance, the idea of space, we need to keep in mind that our body is an object that occupies space, moves through it, and allows us to think about it, while also generating feelings about it. Anyway, whether we are in that space at the moment, remember it, or design it, the external representation always comes from a feeling that first becomes an internal representation, and only then becomes external (when communicated). In this way, we suggest that through drawing we can have a wider consciousness of a space's shape, through a dialectic between space acknowledgment (by moving within it), its sensible cognitive construction (by doing the empirical representation), and checking it through a logical review (but with an intuitive approach). Reinforcing this idea, what Shusterman.,[6] says is the following: "Unlike some other perceptual dimensions, our sense of space does not directly depend on a specific sensory organ but is instead essentially the product of multisensory representations that build up a spatial map through a learning process, implicit or explicit." These considerations can be applied perfectly to the drawing process or, more broadly, to visual representations.

Dialectical interaction between inner and outer realities

If we have a passive experience of the external object/space, we accept what it causes in us, whether comfort or discomfort. If we don't accept what it causes within us, it is necessary to act to change the object or space so that it comes closer to our subjective criteria and to the feeling energy that flows in our inner space. In the creative process, when we are "fighting" with the external object of thought (including a drawing as an object of shaping thought) to arrive at a solution and restore harmony between sensitive and rational judgment, we construct something that needs to correspond to the main intentionality. Still, those processes, for instance to create an object, involve destroying something until the object's external reality is in harmony with the internal object in your mind.

Under these arguments, the point is that to perceive space, it is not enough to know what is around us, nor is it enough to explain that with geometric representation; we have to live, sense, and move within space, having dynamic stimuli perception that should be converted cognitively and sensitively into empirical representations. This may occur not only in the sensitive and cognitive processes that represent what we observe—in which mental and bodily actions are synergistically linked—but also in the abstract understanding of shapes and space. Anyway, by drawing, we connect abstract and spatial thinking, sensitive bodily action, and the representation of this mind-body experience. This statement follows Tversky's.,[7] argument that "continuum from perception to action is really a spiral, an upward one", and "the perceiving helps the imagining, the imagining helps the doing, the doing helps the perceiving." This does not mean simply relying on intuitive perception as we move through space; we must emphasize that, as already argued before, we need to explore the empirical drawing with its inherent tacit intentionality. In this way, by developing our thoughts through drawing, formal thought can be strengthened, since our body's sensitivity enhances the mind's productivity. By moving the body—mainly (but not only) your hands and arms—and experiencing the sensations of movement, we may gain a sort of stimulus or energizing effect on our cognitive and sensory thinking, and, in a broader sense, on the sense of being alive or reaching a free being. Not merely a sensitive freedom, but also an intelligence that is developed from our sensitive needs. That's why it is argued here that an architect would improve his work by using empirical drawing to develop thought through shapes.

The identity and the objective construction that fills the empty inner space of the self

Given that affection is an inherent quality we all share as a common subjective reality, and so it happens in different inner spaces as one, it is pertinent to approach it in relation to what distinguishes or does not distinguish each of us. Furthermore, it is important to be aware of what identity relates to: an original shape, achievement, thought, and what makes it our own product. Supposing that the self is an empty space, it is a subjective space that can be filled with objects of knowledge, including those that correspond to attempts to give an objective shape to what we think we know about ourselves. In this way, the concept of identity may be understood as the objectification of the self's subjective reality. Therefore, the identifications turn on objects that, rather than merely taking space from the true self, exert

Citation: Rodrigues LFSP. Empowering shaping thought by using the body synergies—Why architects should keep drawing by hand. *Art Human Open Acc J.* 2026;8(3):137–142. DOI: 10.15406/ahoaj.2026.08.00283

an external force that impedes the manifestation of our true self, our inner self.[IV]

Regarding the idea of self, if we adopt the idea that its essence is the reality of sensitive freedom, we may suggest that its original reality has no shape; when it gains shape, it is more about feelings becoming thoughts and somewhat rational—or, in other words, an object that freezes the energy-feeling flow. Actually, the true self shape is not structured by rational ideas, as an "idea space",[8] since it is empty and becomes free for us, giving us creative potential when it is driven by a strong energy toward the true self, the source of the "I".[V] This does not mean that the self needn't go through the process of thinking. Actually, we argue that a profound feeling requires a profound thought, and this, in turn, requires a profound feeling; objective knowledge and consciousness of the external world should be side by side with subjective knowledge—self-consciousness and bodily actions as well. This argument leads to the hypothesis that knowledge of the external world contributes to knowledge of the inner world only if we use external reality as a mirror reflecting the inner world. Actually, we develop our thoughts through the relationship between our inner reality and what the external world awakens in it, as a feeling reflected in our mind through our body.

In some sense, we argue that we awaken ourselves by maintaining a relationship with the external world, whether through action or thought. Whatever our action or reaction, it is a product of the relationship between inner and external realities, mediated by our body, which seeks to maintain equilibrium within its sensitive reality. Therefore, the relationship between the internal and external worlds depends on what the subject feels or thinks he is, and on how he represents this external conceptual reality within his inner world, thereby achieving a (more or less) close connection to his true self.

These ideas lead to another hypothesis: we always identify with the external world because we represent it based on what we construct about ourselves, yet in a process of struggle with what we feel. In one word, the external realities—mainly other people—work like a mirror, or, as Elkins.,[2] states, an object that stares back, and (we add) that it returns what lives in our profound space, that is, in the unconscious, censored part of our inner space. In a subjective sense, we may understand that what surrounds us is a sort of mirror that reflects our idea space. From that idea space, we identify the external world as a reflection of what we understand subliminally about it.

In a subjective sense, we may understand that what surrounds us is a kind of mirror that reflects our idea space. From that idea space, we identify what the external world reflects, which we may subliminally understand as a projection of ourselves. Regarding the mirror in relation to people (which, actually, is a Lacanian concept), Carl Jung.,[9] explains it as two possibilities for understanding what the other makes us feel and what he reflects on us: introjection, in which we nurture the affections we like in ourselves; or projection, in which we wish to be free of the affections we can't stand in ourselves. The following explanation is based on his theory.

Identification by introjection is a kind of reflection of an external element that works like a mirror, strengthening our connection to our self-image. In introjection, the outside space occupies our inner space, with a spontaneous harmony between the two—this occurs through perception. In an objective analogy, for instance, the space around us affects us passively. We may feel affection as we walk through a space. We may choose the way we like more, and we may drive our movements toward the parts that we expect to increase our affection. We search for something that, by perception, can give us an equilibrium—just a subjective balance. If we feel a lack of balance, we may actively change it, interacting with it, molding it, and acting on it cognitively, for instance, by drawing, designing, or modeling it. In this case, we transform the static image of the environment not only by moving our body to change our feelings, but also by changing our cognitive understanding of it (by drawing it or designing a new one). In this case, we bring rationality and irrationality together through the complementarity between subjectivity and objectivity—thereby recovering the balance between external and internal space.

In the other type of identification, projection is a kind of reflection of an external component that also functions as a mirror; although it is interpreted as an opposing quality coming from outside, it actually resides within us. This reflection reveals what belongs to us but that we do not accept in ourselves, so the other serves as an interface that awakens what is hidden in our "deep" unconscious, causing us discomfort. As internal censorship (to ensure that this image of ourselves is not known to others) gains strength, this feeling intensifies. Then we feel a compulsion to destroy the external object, convinced that this is what causes the discomfort. However, since this object only awakens in us what we truly are, of which we are ashamed, the consequence is to release an emotion, repressing the representation that originated it.

Both types of identification are part of our search for identity. With them, we attempt to clarify who we are by clarifying what we don't want to be; to get closer to what makes us feel a harmonized self-image, and to keep our distance from what makes us disharmonized, believing that the pleasure of the first situation is what eases the encounter with the true self.

An edifice as an "object" creation

Regarding an edifice as an "object" (of thinking and building), we suggest that a well-executed edifice design does not arise solely from correct geometric thinking; or better, it doesn't come from a rational geometric objectivation. As Matteis.,[1] notes, an architect's good performance in shaping forms and spaces and solving functional problems is not enough to achieve a good result. Regarding this, we are stating that what someone needs to think better about/through space —and the shapes that limit it—is, above a sort of spatial intelligence, several competencies and kinds of sensitivity—and other types of intelligence together. And, more than that, and not putting aside the crucial architectural knowledge that is the source of an architect's thought, it is important to pay attention to the following words of Matteis.

Objectifying it [the architectural experience] in scientific terms, we may well achieve a description that will, however, lack the pathos that grounds our life in space. We must thus acknowledge the primacy of feeling, since this ultimately seems to be the most interesting part of architecture, just as of love.[1]

[IV]Our sense of self is inherently subjective; in approaching identity, it is important to recognize that it is a construct shaped by multiple identifications. Thus, the search for identity is a continuous attempt to form an objective view of ourselves; it is dynamic and changes over time. For clarity, we refer to Decrop's (pp. 111-112) words: "The best way to see your non-self is to focus on the impermanent nature of the world. You are not the person you were five years ago, and you are not the person you will be five years from now. The 'I' from then is different from the 'I' of today. On a more granular level, 'I' is always changing from moment to moment as the world is impermanent, always changing from moment to moment as the world is impermanent."

[V]"The image in the mirror is not your true Self, nor is the singular reflection of your idea space. As Alan Watts said, "The true Self is Non-Self." In other words, your true Self is a combination of both these Selves, the combination of the science of objects and the science of the first person. Overall, your one-Self is the unification of the science of objects, things we can measure, and the science of the first person, things with zero measure" (Decrop 2023, p. 124).

Citation: Rodrigues LFSP. Empowering shaping thought by using the body synergies—Why architects should keep drawing by hand. *Art Human Open Acc J.* 2026;8(3):137–142. DOI: 10.15406/ahoaj.2026.08.00283

As Carl Jung explains, people's relationships can cause struggle in our inner reality, and sometimes we project guilt and hate onto external elements, even objects or spaces, expecting them to be a solution to our inner space. In this context, drawing on the analogy between human and romantic relationships, we suggest that, in creation, the struggle with shape-thinking appears to be caused not only by external reality and the physical space but also by an internal reality seeking a sensitive, intelligent solution. It happens when we fight against what is outside of us and threatens our love condition. Therefore, when we can't stand an external issue, we criticize it; however, it is not only about external reality. More than that, it awakens our inner reality and makes us react through projection; it actually comes from our subjective space; it is part of ourselves.

That's why we emphasize that projection—such as introjection—is present in our experience when we create, especially when we use drawing to represent our creative thinking. What we create results from the duel between what makes us feel self-love and what makes us feel the opposite. When we speak about feelings, we mean affections, which are bodily phenomena. So, aesthetic creation is a result of our mind-body system; even when we don't create through bodily movements, our feeling of aesthetic achievement comes from our body. As Shusterman.,[6] notes: "bringing aesthetics closer to the realm of life and practice entails bringing the body more centrally into aesthetic focus, as all life and practice—all perception, cognition, and action—is crucially performed through the body."

The expression of the thought

Through drawing, we exercise physical, cognitive, and psychological abilities, reconnecting rational thought with its irrational source: the energy of our bodies. In the process of representation, if you don't like the ideas you are developing, a rational judgment provokes an emotional reaction, that is, a bodily effect. It is a kind of bodily contraction that demands an affective response, driving rational, cognitive, and creative thought to turn the feeling into a good form. In drawing, this also happens in seeking a grateful process: it is at this moment that expression occurs.

This possibility of freedom can be supported by what state Jack and Shallice (in Dehaene.,[3]) describe: "The process which underlies the ability to freely report the identity of an unanticipated but known stimulus at the time of presentation, and which occurs when have the subjective sense of spontaneously recognizing or 'noticing' (Bowers, 1984), a stimulus." These are the circumstances that allow the "graphic intelligence" that Cicalò.,[10] defines as "the ability to use graphic skills and, more generally, the ability to integrate the use of eye, mind and hand to solve problems of various kinds and generate effective products aimed at creating, acquiring and communicating knowledge."

The expression is a means to react against what is contrary to your feelings and to drive thinking until equilibrium is restored. In this situation, our drawing becomes more expressive as we fight to find an idea that satisfies you, engaged in a duel between rational, objective thoughts and irrational, sensitive, subjective forces—in a word, between body and mind, between unconscious and consciousness. That means it is not just about developing a rational argument to resolve a formal problem; it is also about a sensitive effort to recover emotional equilibrium when you feel you are receiving positive affirmation for your achievements, and about transforming the representation of what we can't stand within us into an expressive, well-achieved external form. In a word, it is not only a mental issue but also a bodily issue; that's to say, a united rational, irrational, and sensitive experience—that happens in our body, with our feelings—from the primordial ones to the more complex ones, such as the aesthetic ones, through our own consciousness and our individuality.[11,12]

Conclusion

Consciousness is not static; it is a dynamic phenomenon that shapes our understanding of internal and external reality. In particular, our subjective understanding of internal reality is in constant change as our body changes. Our own body is in an inner "movement" and is not merely an alive "object" that moves through space. So, our inner world is always in motion and action, whether it is thoughts, feelings, blood, cells, etc. Life is action. However, when we speak here about human action, we mean bodily action that sensitizes our experience of life.

Thus, the point is that when we move our body, its dynamics generate an energetic manifestation that can stimulate brain activity (the action of our mind), an ordered process governed by cognitive mechanisms. Cognition is a process that can be developed in different types of human skills, whether more bodily or more mental. But drawing is neither one nor the other; it is an intrinsic dialectic between both, or between sensitivity and rationality. Through empirical drawing, we establish a dialogue among: the intentional thought of forms; the action of the body; the movement of the hand (arm and body); the possibility of verifying the thought process through visual observation; the sensitive manifestation; the rational influence when we use critical judgment, whether more logical, more affective, or aesthetic; all of which are unified in expressive thought. Therefore, we argue that those who use empirical drawing to develop thought make it more idiosyncratic, more identifying, and more human—thus, more attuned to the destinies of creations, that is, of humanity and the world with which we must live in harmony. In short, expressing oneself through the reunification of Nature—to which we belong and which, in a broad sense, is the source of sensitivity—and intentional thought, to achieve a comprehensive awareness of the external world and self-awareness of the internal world.

We may present a great idea to someone, but if it wasn't developed through our inner development, its result is a mere object. The challenge, I suppose, that architects face is to do something AI can't do for them, such as increase their experiential awareness and the sensitive growth of the whole being, mind-body. Facing the power of AI, if we forget knowledge through our bodies, perhaps we lose the possibility of knowing what the whole human is, what we are, and what we feel. But above all, we risk losing our intrinsic power to expand consciousness and to energize our thoughts with their real source, the body's biological nature. That's why it is not advisable to keep developing a distance between the object or knowledge construction and the phenomenon of sensitive consciousness.

Then, if we aim to reach real maturation in the professional field, if our body is the place where consciousness happens and where knowledge becomes embodied, and if we want to grow as human beings, we must transform our inner space, create new internal realities, and deepen the subjectivity of feeling; at the same time, we are growing in objective knowledge and using sensitivity as a way to empower thinking. That is, thinking (about and through shapes) improves when we use bodily actions, especially drawing, because the process unifies sensitivity, intentionality, and cognitive development. By this, we state that the unified circumstances in which drawing occurs empower the author to think more effectively in architectural creation or in other activities where shapes are fundamental. More: separating body-action from mind-action is disadvantageous because it is "two faces of the same coin."

Citation: Rodrigues LFSP. Empowering shaping thought by using the body synergies—Why architects should keep drawing by hand. *Art Human Open Acc J.* 2026;8(3):137–142. DOI: 10.15406/ahoaj.2026.08.00283

Acknowledgements

None.

Conflict of interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Funding

None.

References

1. Matteis F. *Affective spaces: architecture and the living body*. London, England: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group; 2021.
2. Elkins J. *The object stares back: on the nature of seeing*. New York, NY: Harcourt; 1998.
3. Dehaene S, ed. *The cognitive neuroscience of consciousness*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier; 2001.
4. Grafton S. *Physical intelligence: the science of how the body and the mind guide each other through life*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books; 2020.
5. Damasio A. *Self comes to mind: constructing the conscious brain*. London, England: William Heinemann; 2010.
6. Shusterman R. *Thinking through the body: essays in somaesthetics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; 2012.
7. Tversky B. *Mind in motion: how action shapes thought*. New York, NY: Basic Books; 2019.
8. Decrop C. *The idea space: the science of awaking your non-self*. S l: Idea Space Publishing; 2023.
9. Jung CG. *Psychological types*. Routledge Classics. New York, NY: Routledge; 2017.
10. Cicalò E. *Graphic intelligence, drawing and cognition*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature Switzerland AG; 2020.
11. Mathers D, Miller ME, Ando O. *Self and non-self: continuing the dialogue between Buddhism and psychotherapy*. 2009.
12. Mele AR. *The philosophy of action*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; 1997.

Citation: Rodrigues LFSP. Empowering shaping thought by using the body synergies—Why architects should keep drawing by hand. *Art Human Open Acc J.* 2026;8(3):137–142. DOI: 10.15406/ahoaj.2026.08.00283