Summary—Thank you for your presentation! I will use this occasion to summarise your theory-piece titled *Rules as tools—A dive into the world of the unexpected*. I am using a course-standard to address your piece in 3 aspects: **1)** your field of inquiry: **2)** your discussion; **3)** your conclusions.

Specifically—your theory-piece inquires into rules: the *aspect* of rules that can work generatively as constraints, and that *aspect* which is restrictive. You inquire into the matter of what rules *do* when put to work, rather than what they are. How hit and impact process as a kind of process tools.

Eventually, you develop a nuanced perspective on rules: when we talk about rules it is really *not* one thing. Since, on the one hand, they can be used to make an ally of chance, or random. While, on the other hand, they can be used to exert control. That is, both on process and on outcomes.

What I read from your theory is that you distinguish between such rules that will have negative consequences—whether social or causal—if you don't follow them; and such rules that are contingent: you could do without them, but having them and keeping them opens the world of the unexpected.

Precisation 1—So, this is where you dive in. You have three main bodies of references: your own experience with machines with no obvious purpose—contraptions inspired by Rube Goldberg machines—experimental process you have been involved in at school and some distinctive art projects.

Basically, you mobilise these as experimental resources to inquire into Guy Debord's *theory of dérive*: the concept as explained in text, and how it currently is supported by smartphone app. There is a difference between operational rules of a handheld device, and a concept to break up habits.

Hands-on situations where you are involved in making require a clearer set of rules: whether you are making a synthesis as you did with your group on this course, you are staining birch in a vacuum chamber, or exploring art projects in which the *tooling* and *material process* are part of the *narrative*.

Precisation 2—You do *not* end up with a theory that opposes the two kinds of rule-sets, but investigate the dialogue between them in the aspect of design-work that involves *decision-making* and *intention* (for instance, by increasing or decreasing opportunities). Distinguishing *instinct* and *intuition*.

Breaking up habits may be to facilitate intuition, or control instincts. But in some situations we have to rely on instinct. *Responsibility is also the ability to respond*. When instinct is relieved by intuition somehow is a key to the civilising process, the hatching of form and the development of aesthetics.

You start with by using rules to explore the unexpected as an *oxymoron*, you end with placing human being at the centre of an enigma. You move from the operational rules of the *dérive*, to instructions of Brian Eno's *Oblique Strategy Cards* to which we can respond intuitively or instinctively.