intellectual programmes behind their work. This again seems to reflect Pugin's position since he regarded his work as based on 'not a style but a principle'. Many architects today regard the styles of architecture more as inventions of the critics than as sets of rules which they themselves follow. Robert Venturi was surely making this point when he said:

> Bernini didn't know he was Baroque . . . Freud was not a Freudian and Marx was not a Marxist.
>
> (Lawson 1994b)

However, the word 'style' is used comfortably and with enthusiasm in other design fields, most notably in fashion. The word 'fashion' itself has come to stand for something temporary and passing. Perhaps because buildings are more permanent and costly, architects feel the need to describe their work as supported by more lasting ideas. We have already seen how design may even be used to create a throw-away or disposable consumerist approach to artefacts (Chapter 7). Principles thus are seen to confer greater authority of correctness than styles!

Perhaps at this point it is worth remembering a definition of design which we saw in Chapter 3. 'The performing of a very complicated act of faith' (Jones 1966). Perhaps this helps us to understand the almost religious fervour with which designers will sometimes defend the 'principles' which underpin their work. It is indeed difficult to sustain the effort to bring complex design to fruition with having some inner belief and certainty. If anything is possible, how can a design be defended against those who may attack it. With the sophisticated technology available today almost anything is possible so it is perhaps comforting to have some principles which suggest fairly unequivocally that some ideas are more right than others!

But there are dangers here. The comfort of a set of principles may be one thing, but to become dominated by a doctrinaire approach is another. The architect Eric Lyons (1968) spoke out against this even whilst the modern movement was still in full swing:

> There is far too much moralising by architects about their work and too often we justify our ineptitudes by moral postures . . . buildings should not exist to demonstrate principles.
>
> (Lyons 1968)

This has been reflected more recently by Robert Venturi who has argued that:

> The artist is not someone who designs in order to prove his or her theory, and certainly not to suit an ideology . . . any building that tries

> merely to express a theory or any building that starts with a theory and works very deductively is very dry, so we say that we work inductively.
>
> (Lawson 1994b)

So we begin to get a picture that the design process is essentially experimental. Design theories, philosophies, call them what you will, are not usually too well defined. Each design can therefore be seen simultaneously not only to solve a problem but to gain further understanding of these more theoretical generic ideas. Herman Hertzberger, the great Dutch architect has described his famous Centraal Beheer office building as a 'hypothesis':

> Whether it can withstand the consequences of what it brings into being, depends on the way in which it conforms to the behaviour of its occupants with the passing of time.
>
> (Suckle 1980)

In fact, this building is remarkable and seminal in its attempt to deal with the social and personal lives of the people working in it, rather than seeing its occupants as cogs in some office machine. Hertzberger had already written extensively on his structuralist theory of architecture. Here he contrasted the design of tools with the design of instruments. The latter, he argued, are less specific and encourage people to take possession of them and become creative with them:

> I try to make a building as an instrument so that people can get music out of it.
>
> (Hertzberger 1991)

Some designers seem to see their whole career as a journey towards the goal of ultimate truth, whereas others seem more relaxed and flexible in their attitudes to the driving forces behind their work. The famous architect Richard Rogers tells us that:

> One is constantly seeking universal rules so that one's design decisions do not stem from purely arbitrary preferences.
>
> (Suckle 1980)

However, not all designers find it necessary to strive consciously for some underlying theory to their work. The architect Eva Jiricna, is well known for her beautiful 'High Tech' interiors which show a consistently thorough attention to the choice and jointing of materials, but she explains this very pragmatically:

> It's not an abstract process. I think that if you are a painter or a sculptor then it's all very abstract but architecture is a very concrete job. I really think that all that philosophy is a false interpretation of what really