

Questions :

1. How do the uncontrollable things of the framework (bread) and materials (thread) step by step influence the output during the weaving process? (Alternatively, how do technical challenges such as controlling thread length, thread tangling, and bread breakage shape the process?)
2. Can irregularities (e.g. uneven patterns) or disruptions (e.g. bread fracture) during the weaving process be considered as 'normal' conditions rather than issues to resolve? Under multiple accidents, could a structured weaving process produce wild patterns or even create a space?
3. If the stacking of threads is fully understood as 'layers,' could weaving evolve into a new tool for graphic design?
4. As a 'canvas,' how do the physical properties of the framework, such as its size and material, direct or limit the weaving process and results? Similarly, how do the physical characteristics of the canvas in graphic design determine its content?

Proposals :

1. Strengthen randomness through various methods (e.g. pulling the thread very tight or using very short lengths of thread at a time) while ignoring the breakage of the bread, and continue weaving as usual.
2. Digitise the weaving process within some graphic design tools, such as Adobe Illustrator.
3. Weave using the same method within frameworks of different shapes, sizes, and levels of rigidity.

After reading the *Conditional Design Workbook*, I would summarise Conditional Design as: setting up one or a series of instructions or conditions for the design process, turning it into a shareable system.

This design approach is guided by established rules, allowing the process to be standardised. While the outcomes remain unpredictable due to factors such as materials, the works generated under unified instructions are clearly connected, forming part of a shared system. This is what we are exploring as 'iteration'. Additionally, as designer Karl Gerstner (2007, p. 12) wrote in his book *Designing Programmes*, 'The more exact and complete these criteria are, the more creative the work becomes. The creative process is to be reduced to an act of selection.' This reflects what I aimed to do in Week 2. In my iterations, I would like to preserve the weaving technique itself but subvert its purpose to 'hack it'. One main purpose of weaving is to fill a gap—such as patching a hole in clothing or creating a dreamcatcher—making an object more complete or visually pleasing. In my experiment, I kept the idea of weaving as a filling technique but deliberately chose objects that, once filled, would become unusable, thereby achieving the goal of 'hacking it'. In my iteration, my instruction was to find a hole, use its edges as a frame, and weave within it. The condition for choosing the hole was that the object, once woven, could its original function. Under precise rules, all I—or anyone else—needed to do was select objects that met the criteria, making the designs easy to reproduce on a larger scale.

At this point, within a standardised design process, weaving as a tool only influenced my instructions, while the simplified act of selection seemed almost unrelated to weaving itself. Anyone who understood my rules could directly choose suitable materials from a wide range of ready-made objects. Compared to a designer-led, non-systematic design process, Conditional Design significantly lowers the barrier through its text-based, easily understood instructions. Moreover, tools are not unique; they exist objectively, circulate widely, and, with rapid information exchange, technique is no longer the main obstacle between professionals and amateurs.

However, this doesn't mean that a series of design works will end up looking identical. Taking my iterations as an example, I found that the design process

still involves two highly subjective steps: setting the rules and selecting the objects. Rule-setting reflects my personal subversion of weaving and includes my thoughts. The selection of objects is variable, as a wide range of ready-made items can meet the conditions. As long as the choices are not binary, the act of 'choosing' inherently carries strong subjectivity. It can be influenced by the environment, personal habits, or even hidden preferences of the participants. Therefore, I believe that technique, as a ready-made tool, should assist designers in expressing their personal ideas rather than being the main purpose of creating art—where the work is made solely to demonstrate a particular technique.

1. Gerstner, K. (2007) *Designing Programmes*. Baden, Switzerland: Lars Muller Publishers, p. 12.
2. Maurer, L. et al. (2013) 'Conditional Design Manifesto', in *Conditional Design Workbook*. Amsterdam: Valiz, pp. ii–vi.

