



The norm-sets that are involved in gap-games need not be the rules of the game. In the test-game that I am homing in on, two sets of norms—selected from two different/gapped sources (a list of precepts and a card-deck)—are considered as affordances and resources/assets of the game.

The draw from the card-deck (Eno/Schmidt's *oblique strategy cards*) instructs one procedure, while the list of precepts is used to sign off from the task. The first procedure is called ENTER. The other procedure is called EXIT. The task proposed in the game placed between ENTER and EXIT.

The task is to come up with a readable output from a book, based on a sample of 20 spreads. In addition to this, the task is to hatch a theory from the output, yielding a plausible synthesis with an original twist (departing from the simple summary). It should invite testing, as does a hypothesis.



The gaming-experiment at the backdrop of this flyer-series combines two different rule-sets with the following common feature: they are hatched by people with a longstanding creative experience—Norman Potter with his *literalist precepts* (20), Eno & Schmidt and their *oblique strategy cards*.

What characterises the injunctions that come from these two sets, is that they appear as being both cohesive and cogent. Meaning that they are characterised by their internal *consistency*, and that their application in a given practical setting is likely to be of some *consequence*. Both defining.

So, in clarifying the premises of the game it must be clear that not all rule-sets are like this. Many rule-sets are made up, in the sense that they lack this accountability. Rule sets that are accountable of experience cannot only be defended as such, they can also generate accountability.

That is, they can generate accountability in *new* situations. In this precise sense they are ethical in a productive sense, also by producing a receptivity to what is at hand. What one currently is working on. In the case of the current game, the material at hand is a book by Sarah Davies: *Hacker-spaces*.

This book (2017)—*making the maker movement*—is random in the sense that it features on a list (the curriculum of the first year of the MA), and comes after Norman Potter's volume: *Models & constructs—Margin notes to a design culture*. They also came into the course from different sources.

In the ordered sequence of the curriculum the books are seen as broadly connected, in the sense that following the steps from one to the next is relevant as an introduction to *theory in design practice*. But they are connected in a systematic way by *contingency*, rather than by necessity.

It is under these specific conditions that a chance-method is used to set up conditions for a (possible) logical outcome. Here the random draw is used to access the systemic properties that are *prompted* and *parsed* by the two rule-sets. These systemic properties are better seen as *passive affordances*.

As such, they are activated by resorting to a passive register that defines gaming—no matter the draw, or the throw of dice, the result has to be routinely accepted (as a defining and binding framework of the game). It is doesn't happen because it is important, but important because it happens.

In this aspect, the game activates a certain disposition which also disposes of the situation—its affordances and resources—differently than under circumstances where the hierarchies of importance are given (in the sense of habit, cultural education, ideology, political conviction, or simply wealth).

The game is a (methodological) *time-out* from these things. But “on the other side of the Möbius-strip” it is (obversely) a *time-in*. And it is in this aspect that the game holds the potential of generating knowledge. Not because it is over-and-above what it deals with, but because it is *immersive*.