

## Abstracts in category 2: 'Media and content'.

### Plenary presentation

**ABSTRACT ID: 3**

**Author: Fredrik Nilsson**

**Title:**

**Forming Knowledge –**

**On Architectural Knowledge and the Practice of its Production**

Since long time there has been a discussion about the nature of architectural knowledge and in what ways the architectural project and design work generates knowledge. How do we actually produce knowledge in the field of architecture and what kind of knowledge is it? Can it be seen as scientific of a traditional, "Royal" or Mode 1 kind or is it of another kind – minor, nomadic or Mode 2?

Bernard Tschumi argues that architecture not only is about knowledge of form; it is a form of knowledge that also is capable of exploring and expanding the limits of what we know. According to Michel Foucault – and elaborated by Gilles Deleuze – all knowledge is about form; what we can have knowledge about has a form – or is given form in the production of knowledge. Knowledge always relates to forms, to concrete assemblages or formations of matter, words and signs – physical environments like buildings, texts like laws, reports, programs; an open system of the visible and utterable. Knowledge consist, according to Deleuze, of the interlacing of the visible and the utterable, it goes from something visible to something utterable, or vice versa, but there is always a gap between the two.

Architectural design gives form; it is about conceiving a unity from a set of mutually contradictory requirements, factors or elements. Design integrates contradictory demands and transforms them into a unified whole; it can freeze, give form to diagrammatic – and previously formless – conditions and plays of forces in specific situations.

With the development of the notion of artificial science – formulated by Herbert Simon – design is highlighted as a way to explore a "possibility space" (Dahlbom). Artificial science is not restricted to realised facts or probable perspectives, it is rather concerned with possible facts. These possible facts can also be improbable or not thought of before, and where probable possibilities could be predicted, improbable possibilities have to be designed.

Architecture, with its strong connection to social, economical, political factors, could be an instrument to search the virtual (in the sense of Bergson and Deleuze) in a specific societal situation. Architectural design could by giving spatial form to existing but elusive and diagrammatic forces of different kinds produce new knowledge, and also explore and generate knowledge about potentials and previously unseen possible paths of development.

This paper discusses – with the point of departure in several explorative architectural practices (i.a. FOA, MVRDV, Chora, Ocean, UN Studio) – architectural knowledge in relation to contemporary notions of science and knowledge (i.a. Stengers, Latour, Deleuze, Gibbons et al), with the main concern in the possibilities to research and produce knowledge with the architectural project as focus. What is argued is that the knowledge produced in architecture could be of both a traditional, Royal, Mode 1 kind as well as of a nomadic, Mode 2 kind. The particular work of practices following processes in a context of application, as well as a conscious reflection on the form and the formations of matter and texts that every architectural project produces could generate new knowledge. Architectural research and doctorates in architecture can formalise this knowledge, and also give important contributions to the contemporary discussions on the notions of science and knowledge production.

**ABSTRACT ID: 5**

**Author: Ann Heylighen, W. Mike Martin, Herman Neuckermans and Jonas Lindekens**

**Title:**

**Mind the gap**

Towards knowledge exchange between practice and academia

*"If we accept the notion that there is an established body of knowledge, the question of its transmission, from a pragmatic point of view, can be subdivided into a series of questions: Who transmits learning? What is transmitted? To whom? Through what medium? In what form? With what effect?" (Lyotard 1993).*

The relatively recent 'academisation' of architecture has brought about a growing body of research, which produces a wealth of knowledge that hardly filters down to practicing architects or architecture students (Neuckermans 2002). Ph.D. dissertations have become everyday food in architecture schools, yet what are their implications for professional practice, and ultimately for architecture as built environment?

This gap between academia and practice is not unique to architecture. Increasingly, both industry and government see the problem less as a need to generate more knowledge than of using what is already available (Gibbons et al. 1997). In other words, the need now is “to strengthen the distribution network by increasing the flow of knowledge from universities and government research establishments to the centers of wealth creation” (ibid).

The paper starts by arguing that in architecture—as probably in other domains—this flow should be at least bi-directional: from academia to practice, but also the other way around. Since architecture tends to deal with unique projects, a good deal of the knowledge involved is experience-based, tacit, and embedded within the very act of designing (Schön 1985). Given this intimate relationship between knowing and designing, only the lack of a genuine research tradition in architecture may explain why architectural practice is not—and has never been—documented and studied more systematically. Despite the wealth of professional expertise embedded in the design and construction process, there are, apart from a few isolated pilot efforts, no consistent and systematic actions to establish and maintain access to the profession’s knowledge, let alone to extend its potential reach.

Within the context of the conference, it is tempting to propound the doctorate by design as cut out to fill this gap. However, while designing has been acknowledged as a way of producing knowledge, this production is often highly personal and almost ad-hoc. There still is—and in our view, should remain—a distinction between the aim of, or interest in, producing knowledge and other aims (Chalmers 1990), such as shaping our built environment. Moreover, it is far from clear whether and how the doctorate by design will help develop the field by benefiting the quality of this environment. Therefore, the paper advocates new ways of knowledge exchange—from academia to practice and vice-versa—that allow for cross-fertilization and mutual reinforcement while respecting the individuality of both.

The final part of the paper explores, by way of example, two forms such exchange can take without tending to blur the identities of both worlds or erode their difference. The first example engages teams of architecture students, interns and seasoned professionals in capturing the tacit knowledge embedded in ‘active’ design projects. The second uses participatory observation of competition designs by way of data collection. Viewed in a wider context, these mechanisms may start providing guidelines, however crude, for fruitful and respectful knowledge exchange in architecture.

Both examples are taken from design methodology, according to the call for papers a ‘peripheral’ discipline in architecture. That these exchange mechanisms pop up here is perhaps not entirely coincidental. Today, the interest in architects’ design process is no longer inspired by an urge for method or systematization, but by the hope that a better understanding of this process will ultimately advance the quality of our built environment by improving and supporting the design thereof.

#### **ABSTRACT ID: 53**

**Author: Yeoryia Manolopoulou**

**Title:**

#### **The Role of Design as a Creative and Critical Research Tool in Architecture**

I understand design as a research activity in itself and ‘design research’ as inherent in design practice. Design can drive architecture to new paths of knowledge and inventions. But the role of design as a vital research instigator depends on the extent to which it holds onto its creative and critical traits. Creative or critical work is not necessarily research but design research needs to be both creative and critical.

In this colloquium I would like to discuss design research primarily through reflecting upon my own experiences as a recent ‘PhD by Design’ graduate and now a supervisor at the Bartlett, UCL. My talk would be based on the presentation of visual material. Below I include the title and an abstract of my PhD.

Drawing on Chance: Indeterminacy, Perception, and Design  
(PhD by Design, Bartlett, UCL)

**Abstract:**

This PhD considers architecture as a physical and psychological construction, and examines the role of indeterminacy in it. It argues that architecture is a product and a producer of both design and chance.

Architecture influences our perceptual and aesthetic habits while our habits, in turn, tend to bound the limits of architectural language in a continuous circle. Still, an accident may help us break out of this impasse: chance events may upset the routines of perception to stimulate imagination. If accidents are unavoidable from how we experience space, the thesis asks if architecture might employ them as creative devices. Could chance itself be explored as a design tool and how could this affect the ways in which space is represented, produced and occupied? The argument is built on the investigation of relevant art projects, particularly Samuel Beckett’s *Film* and Marcel Duchamp’s *The Bride Stripped Bare by Her Bachelors, Even*, and the production of my own design work. It suggests the formulation of chance as a drawing apparatus for cultivating indeterminacy and defines the techniques of ‘impulsive’, ‘active’ and ‘measurable’ chance. These should not consist of an

absolute working mode but a complementary one that interferes with other design processes and favours collaboration between media and practices. In its conclusion, the thesis proposes that the mechanisms of chance may drive architecture to a non-optical account of space.

The PhD is presented in three interdependent parts: the notes (Volume I), the text (Volume II) and the design work (displayed). These parts reflect and complement each other, permitting multiple cross-readings: they document the three-way procedure through which the research was conducted.

**Abstract ID: c**

**Name: Selenitsch Alex**

**Title: The Altogether Different Project**

ABSTRACT

In his book *The Architectural Project*, Alfonso Corona-Martinez contrasts the student design project with those undertaken in architectural practice. He shows how they inhabit different worlds, with different expectations, rules and outcomes. The criteria (such as client type, budget, schedule) used by Corona-Martinez suggest that the Ph.D. architectural project, whether based on pragmatic actions or poetic reflection, also inhabits a distinctive world with significant differences to both academic and professional actions.

In a creative Ph.D., this world can be characterised by the need to define a personal voice in an explicit manner. The representation of architecture or rather, architectural thinking and invention then becomes the central concern, rather than the academic representation of buildings or the professional preparation of instructions to make them. At its best, the creation of a personal voice demands a rigorous acknowledgement of sources and references: these are considered here as the matrix from which an individual voice is born. There is also the question of how such work can be made public, through books, exhibitions and so on.

This paper will explore some of the problems that an architectural project must face from the point of view of making a voice explicit. These include the documentation of intuitive design processes, the interference of different kinds of spatial representations, the non-linear and variegated quality of references and sources, and the scarcity of venues for publication and exhibition.

As well as highlighting the example of work by architects such as John Hejduk, Peter Eisenman and Michael Sorkin, the author will draw on his own experience of architectural practice, teaching and exhibiting, including designs from his Ph.D research. The latter examples will include a set of nine designs for craft studios derived from traditional conventions of spatial representation, undertaken as an experiment to test their creative potential.

## Round-Table presentations

**ABSTRACT ID: 36**

**Author: Maarten Van Den Driessche**

**Title:**

**'DESIGN RATIONALE' vs. 'DISCURSIVE RATIONALE'?**

Het architectuuronderzoek heeft niet noodzakelijk betrekking op het 'ontwerpen'. Voor vele theoretische, historische of kritische benaderingen en vraagstellingen is het 'maakproces' van een gebouw en meteen ook het 'ontwerp' gewoon irrelevant. De vraag stelt zich of en hoe het ontwerpen - dat een *eigen* logica lijkt te hebben - het onderwerp van theoretisch onderzoek kan zijn.

Het ontwerpen laat zich best omschrijven als een 'maakproces', waarbij de logica van het 'maken' grotendeels aan een tekstuele uiteenzetting ontsnapt. Toch lijkt het ons belangrijk het ontwerpen te zien als een *beslissingsproces* met een eigen rationaliteit en niet als een geheel van irrationele, louter intuïtieve of formele handelingen. Een ontwerp bestaat uit een complex aan beslissingen die al dan niet van intentioneel of van belang zijn. Het resultaat van dit ontwerpproces is als één

geactualiseerde mogelijkheid uit een complex aan latente mogelijkheden. Dit betekent niet dat het ontwerpproces 'effectief' als een beslissingsproces verloopt waarbij men voor elke stap alle alternatieven overweegt en met goede weloverwogen redenen een bepaalde keuze maakt. Daarom verschilt het beschrijven en analyseren van het ontwerpproces van methodologisch theoretische benaderingen die voorschrijven hoe het ontwerpproces zou moeten verlopen. Tijdens het ontwerpen intervenueert het discours - de onderscheidende en reflectieve werking van de taal - slechts gedeeltelijk. Sommige ontwerphandelingen worden met woorden geëxpliciteerd, maar een groot aantal niet en hoeven zelf niet talig expliciteerbaar te zijn. Soms zijn andere motivaties aan het werk. Alle ontwerpbeslissingen 'vertalen' is zelf irrelevant voor het geschreven betoog dat evengoed haar eigen logica heeft.

Wanneer we erkennen dat ook het ontwerp(en) een impliciete of inchoatieve rationaliteit bevat, wordt het mogelijk om de onderzoeksfocus te verschuiven van het *resultaat* - een realisatie of een project - naar het *werk* - waarbij we veeleer de vraag stellen hoe en onder welke omstandigheden een ontwerp tot stand komt. Wanneer we een 'ontwerp' beschouwen als 'werk', verplichten we aan onszelf de logica die in het ontwerpen werkzaam is, te duiden; terwijl we ons tegelijkertijd afvragen hoe het werk zich uiteindelijk van de ontwerphandeling - de maker en de omstandigheden van het maken - scheidt.

Vervolgens stelt zich de vraag hoe we deze 'ontwerprationaliteit' in een tekst kunnen representeren. De reconstructie van het ontwerp als een ideaaltypisch beslissingsproces identificeert in het ontwerp de *keuzes* waarvoor de ontwerper staat, en expliciteert de mogelijkheden. Zonder te bepalen hoe een ontwerp 'werkelijk' verloopt, zonder te zeggen hoe het moet verlopen, creëert de beschrijving zo wel een ruimte voor een *gesprek over het ontwerp*. De 'talige reconstructie' biedt een de 'discursieve verdubbeling' van de ingebede ratio van het ontwerpproces, die herkenbaar is voor wie ontwerpt, maar er toch niet mee samenvalt.

## **ABSTRACT ID: 55**

**Chelle Macnaughtan**

**Title:**

### **Indeterminate Sound and Notation in the Space of Architecture**

The focus of this paper is to describe the strategy, content and obstacles of my doctorate, which is being undertaken by architectural projects and exegesis at the University of Melbourne's Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning, Australia. I am one of the first three people currently undertaking a PhD in Architecture by Design within the Faculty, and the only one who is otherwise employed as a practitioner. The intended outcome of this doctorate is focused on further application of the doctoral work and process both as a scholar and practitioner.

Through the production of architectural projects and exegesis, my doctorate's initial aim is to address indeterminacy as a design strategy in architecture and music since the mid 1950s to the present within the context of space, sound, and critique of representation. The exegesis topic centres on experimental composition method and process undertaken in the work of American composer John Cage and Polish born architect Daniel Libeskind. An initial intersection between the two is being established with the study of particular architectural and musical ideas about time-space relationships within both their scribed and built manifestations. The time-space relationships I am positioning the topic within initially relies on researching the methods and processes of indeterminate structure and notation strategies first introduced by Cage in the 1950s. In considering the attributes of indeterminacy, John Cage is central to all twentieth century literature that discusses its foundation!

ns and characteristics. It is from this understanding that I argue Cage's work has consequences for all creative disciplines, and the spatial nature of his work lends itself to transferability. This transferability is being contextualized through testing the processes of experimentation in which both Cage and also Libeskind's work might be understood as spatial figures rather than singularly as music or architecture. Cage practised within music and the visual arts, and Libeskind was formally trained in music, providing context for investigating both visual and aural aspects within their respective work. Locating both architectural and musical ideas within this context of indeterminacy enables characterization of an architectural theory and structural grounding for my architectural projects as dialogue with the exegesis, and the opportunity to exploit relationships/ points of departure.

Initiating the dialogue between exegesis and project work has begun with an installation being held in November 2004 at the George Paton Gallery in Melbourne Australia. Architectural interests are invested into this work through tools of space, notation and representation. An essential ingredient to the projects is to establish a context through the process of experimentation, in which the work might be understood as spatial rather than only as representative. To achieve this, active engagement with the audience must be experiential, and this is possible through the medium of installation where audiences are able to move through, around and participate with the ideas as they are offered. The engagement of installation as a medium also addresses a gap between architecture as represented through the drawing/model, and architecture as built

work. It is a structure of a 'real' which is not yet fully realized in a conventional architectural construction. Paralleling these ideas of

models and installations/ exhibitions is experimental investigations into how architectural ideas as represented through the drawing process, and the characteristics of documentation versus notation. This investigation medium privileges construction and detailing opportunities within the topic of indeterminacy.

The suite of work that comprises this doctorate includes a variety of media in which the ideas are being explored, tested and offered for examination. Of the most immediate obstacles facing the completion of this PhD in Architecture by Design, characteristics of the relationship between project work and exegesis, and the manner in which the work is submitted and examined, (particularly given the variety of media present), are the most relevant. To date, no criterion has been formalized within the University of Melbourne that addresses the specificities of content, submission or examination of a PhD in Architecture by Design. At this stage, this doctorate is categorized into a standard PhD by Research degree, which restricts the author to the regulations befitting a thesis submission. The invested interests within the doctoral investigation to a wider community, both architectural, academic and general public alike, is also of concern, as the question of what constitutes as 'architectural design' is brought into sharp focus within the discussion of what constitutes as an 'architectural design doctorate'.

## **ABSTRACT ID: 19**

**Author: Peter Schneider**

**Title:**

***Disegno: Design and the Unique Pleasures of its Text***

In April of 1542, Cornelius Grapheus, the clerk of the court in Antwerp, took depositions from six craftsmen who gave expert testimony on behalf of Willem van Noort, a master carpenter, in the lawsuit brought against him by Jacob van der Borch, a master mason, in the court at Utrecht. It was based on an allegation that van Noort had completed the *ontwerp ende beworp* (the design and setting out) of a building for the town of Utrecht. As Willem van Noort, a carpenter, clearly lacked the necessary qualification as a *metse/rymeester* (master mason) and/or *cleynsteker* (carver of capitals, decorations and relief), his completion of these 'design' services was in contravention of the ordinances of the guild, the regulations of the town, and even the common law.

The apparently clear and customary differences existing between the theoretical knowledge of the elements of a subject on one hand, and skill or mastery in the practice a discipline one the other, were supported, reinforced and confirmed rather directly in the testimony of the six Antwerp witnesses, and in a range of sworn affidavits collected by van Noort from other 'famous' artisans who were not involved in the mason's craft. The nature of the architect's expertise was recast, and the role of the architect re-imagined and redefined. The architect, based on the testimony of these historic authorities, was first and foremost a perfect master of design, and only incidentally a master of building. Van Noort's defense made it clear, both legally and publicly, that the architect, as an expert in/of design and the conceiver of buildings, was no longer what guild tradition had thought him to be. The testimony in the Antwerp depositions and affidavits exists as a potent symbolic marker that legitimizes the appropriation of design as an intellectual, learned, conceptual and esoteric art by those adopting the newly-coined title of 'architect' in Italy, France, the Low Countries and England in the middle of the sixteenth century. The act of design became the symbolic and cultural capital of that new profession, and constituted its defining and expert practice. Those who practiced design – as opposed to those who practiced construction - were rapidly socialized into the domain of its focused discourse, and into the practice of the new technique that established its validity – the method of producing the *disegno*. That technique rapidly established itself through the new practice of architectural drawing: the depiction, delineation and representation of the imagined artifact in the euclidian space of a sheet of parchment or waxed linen. The rapid development and spread of the new technology of the drawing established it as the singular technique that is still the defining practice through which the contemporary architect continues to legitimize and defend his/her symbolic contract with the general culture. The practice of drawing "has such crucial value for architects that being unable to think without drawing becomes the mark of one truly socialized into the profession of architecture," as Rayner Banham aptly puts it. Banham's characterization of the contemporary architect's work as a matter of making drawings depicting buildings is echoed rather forcefully by the sociologist Magali Larson in her studies of the contemporary aspects of the profession. If these views of the means – the drawing – in and through which architect's engage in and advance their appropriated discourse – design - are correct, then any discussion of doctoral studies in design must inevitably confront the fact that a doctorate in design, *disegno*, is in effect inevitably a doctorate in drawing. If the drawing is the way that architects think, then the production of the design – the crafting of the *disegno* – contains within it the record of the thinking that informed its production. The drawing becomes, in and of itself, the singular text that carries the echoes of the architectural thought and the design ideas that inhabit it. This paper will initially discuss the van Noort vs. van der Borch case to establish the point at which cultural forces separated design from construction, and allowed for the appropriation of design as a distinct, expert discourse. It will then look at the connections between the development of the post-medieval technique of the architectural drawing and the evolution

of design as the unique cultural capital that validated the formation of the 'modern' profession of architecture in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It will suggest that the disegno – the drawing – constitutes architecture's unique version of the text, and that the pleasure of its text is in all ways equivalent to the pleasure of the text that enthralled Roland Barthes. The paper will finally show, through an exploration of the way that a young American designer – Douglas Darden - approached the problem of the production of the architectural text, that design and the *disegno*, considered from this particular perspective, are uniquely appropriate vehicles for the production of significant architectural discourse within the privileged domain of doctoral study.

**Abstract ID: g**

**Name: Indrek Peil**

**Title:**

### **Fight fire with fire: art(-)iculations, contradictions and meanings through alternative architectural practices.**

The aim of this paper is to provide the propositions and examples - mainly for myself - about how to transform/ convert academic doctorate from architecturally motivated research into *architect's research*. A challenge will be taken up for the original research programme for 'architecture through architecture' research.

The ways of knowing are always situation-specific. Moreover, architecture itself can be constantly re-defined. For example, the way how Richard Long re-defined a sculpture as the walking - i.e. the walk as a sculpture - the same way one can view onto architecture too. This open-endedness is my premise.

However, to be more clear, I will start from simplified hypothesis about what is the very thing of architecture or what it should be.

As much as architecture is always (more or less) merely partial re-shaping of some part of our material world it actually differs from the common use of the verb 'to architecture' i.e. rather than a composer's limitless creation of structures, textures or atmospheres its worlds are (or become later) more profoundly site- and situation-specific.

In our most successful practical cases it seems us we actually have fought fire with fire depended on the found material of the certain case (the site, the location, the social, weird client etc) rather than on a pre-conceived methodologies or any abstract tools. We have new 'urban-oriented' architectural paradigm in Tallinn ten years already. Despite of all the positive impact on widening the local discourse of architecture there is a specific lack of the human touch in all of these abstract spaces of representation.

The social content of my research programme implies rather to maintain a simply well awareness of social implications of certain projects instead of any "opticalization" of theoretical concepts. It is more radical because mere illustration of a rhetorically radical theories is actually not radical in the real places. I believe the hacker ethics in broader sense will replace the ethics of engineering services and it will give new commitment for the profession without emptying it from any indigenously architectural content. Foremost it means sharing one's competence. All other potential meanings and interpretations are deliberately postponed/ delayed as long as possible in favour of all un-expected knowledge got through alternative professional practices.

Subsequently some original but general strategies how to think productively in/ through architecture will be outlined.

### **Knowing through architecture.**

#### **Proposal 1 (and example)**

is to find new art-iculations of the urban situations and in a thought process itself. These 'dadaist epistemologies' can culturally transcode through 'artistic articulations' of world an abstract 'control-machines' into the sensual perception of space or into the face of the city and vice versa. These strategies are much more effective and productive in architecture than any 'seriously' academic effort. As architects we can learn from artistic research to outline the new perspectives for architectural invention.

Introducing this non-representational thinking into the architect's research obliterates any bureaucratic distance also.

#### **Proposal 2 (and example)**

looks for enough attention to the contradictions in the real places. One who has practiced as an architect certainly have dealt with a task to create intensities and "interest" in real spaces as well as rather 'alive' than merely abstract look of materiality of buildings.

For me, despite of all its synthesizing abilities (hybrid buildings and city plans etc.) the architecture is 'the discipline of contradictions' *par excellence* dealing with contradictory spaces. An 'architectural dialectics' (dialogue) will outline various modes of contradictory space and respective identities.

**Proposal 3** (example)

is to create distinctive locations ('critical parallel') in city which operate through spatial antinomies to create intensity and tension between extremes.

Conclusion.

Architecture differs from critical theory, philosophy, methodology and formal history.

Architectural thinking is best described by and developed through usable practices at work.

Instead of proliferating and superficial theoretical production of alternative logics, geometries or spatial algorithms (pseudo-exact-science) I decided to investigate/ develop the perceptible content of these different concepts of contradiction.

Presentation is illustrated with materials from personal practice and research (slides or Powerpoint).

**ABSTRACT ID: 15**

**Author: Bradley Starkey**

**Title:**

**Hraeser - Turning Research on its Head: *Bridging the Voids* (A PhD Design Project)**

Along with the architectural drawing, the architectural model is traditionally assumed to be a neutral tool, which projects the architects design onto physical and social reality, at the scale of the building, with minimal loss in accuracy. Drawings and models are understood as though they are truthful representations of buildings. But the tools of drawing and modeling are far from neutral and value free; rather they enact specific subject-object relations. These relations have generally been overlooked by (or have been seen as a threat to) the profession and one of the concerns of professional accreditation bodies, such as the Architects Registration Board in the UK, is to keep the traditional relationship between drawing and building, intact.

Historically, the architectural drawing allowed architecture to 'associate itself with abstract thought, and thereby give it the status of intellectual rather than manual labour'<sup>1</sup>.

This association can be thought of as enacting a 'mind over matter' relationship and its perpetual reproduction has dominated architectural research over the past 300-400 years. This paper adopts the position, that the dominance of the 'mind over matter' model is one of the reasons why 'research by design' has been deemed unthinkable and why it is not easily admitted alongside other forms of investigation? Research by design is seen as a threat to the intellectual status of architecture, hence the need to turn the traditional notion of research on its head.

Schools of Architecture in the UK are accredited by the ARB and design projects at degree and diploma level are limited and regulated by the ARB's criteria which by and large, reinforce a 'mind over matter' model. PhD's are not professionally accredited and thus doctoral research has the potential for challenging the assumptions latent within the professions regulatory criteria. However, academic research has been unconscious of its important position in relation to the profession and has made many of the same assumptions. Research has generally undervalued the act of designing itself: regarding it as the negative and subordinate counterpoint to a dominating intellect; with design containing only the potential to be rationalised, categorised, analysed or predicted. Academic research has generally either involved the historical or scientific post-rationalisation of existing buildings or the application of an abstract theory to analyse design methodology, technology or use. The first part of my paper will address ways in which PhD research 'by design' can challenge some of the assumptions concealed within existing modes of design, practice, pedagogy and research. The second part of my paper will present my ongoing PhD design project entitled Bridging the Voids.

Bridging the Voids challenges the understanding of the design process as the projection of an idea which is first formulated at the level of intellect. Consequentially it is critical of the view that design can be reduced to the specific, precise

---

<sup>1</sup> Language and Drawing' in Adrian Forty, *Words and Buildings: A Vocabulary of Modern Architecture*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 2000) p. 30

or defined meaning that was intended by the architect. Rather it adopts the notion that architectural drawings and models create realities of their own: that they are not simply the projection of an idea. Furthermore, if we allow it to, the design process can surprise us in unexpected ways. Bridging the Voids plays with an ambiguity which could not have been predicted and which creates an architecture which we may not yet know how to relate.