



Summary—Thank you for your presentation! I will use this occasion to summarise your theory-piece titled *Social Spaces in the Scope of Interior Architecture*. 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—When you write about tools, I read your theory-piece to indicate that, in your practice, you consider *tools* an expanding universe. It is an *expanded* notion of tools, that appears to be directly linked to your growing repertoire as an interior architect, and as a student at/of KHiO.

Moving from objects, the concepts behind, the space and the site. So, when you list honesty and gratitude as *tools* I take it to indicate that the field of application of your tooling is educational. Or, your concept of tools is educational, in the sense that you are a student *at* and *of* KHiO.

This meant in the concrete sense that you have made yourself acquainted with the school's workshops and done some work in them. Outside the precincts of a school is an urban reality where special knowledge is a key, if not to jobs then to a growing range of professional socialising.

Precisation 1—in my reading of your piece, it comes out clearly that your aspiration to work *site-specific* is linked to the expectation that the site is the key in articulating the relationship of spaces *within* spaces—some of which are—and *expanding* the notion of tools. The site can be *learned*.

The examples you use to elaborate your point are two seaside sauna projects: respectively the duck (Anda) and the seagull (Måken). They extend and alter a tradition of bathing, with precedents in the bathing machines of Victorian England; contraptions used by women to take private dips.

They also have precedents in the floating sea bath houses of the 19th century. Presently, the duck and the seagull are outposts scouting into the anthropocene. The site for uncanny harvests, of human waste and reuse. Perhaps the saunas are hotspots for reinventing society. Scouting for paths.

Precisation 2—Maybe the IM-exhibit in the White Box at KHiO can be seen as an experimentarium for relations of this kind: relations of search, making and socialising. I think that maybe it has this appeal in the sense that the visitor was invited to evoke the site that brought the elements together.

What happened before this—that which we saw exhibited in the White Box—what made it happen? The course of your theory-piece seems to follow a similar path. In the beginning of the text you bring of up a list of topics that you want to take the reader through, given to the contingency of senses.

In the conclusion you come back to the list through a curious reference to Jean Luc Godard: “I believe at this point more in the alphabet.” The sections of your theory-piece logically conclude in an alphabetically ordered list, like Godard's guidelines. There is an evident potential in this work.