The challenge of *computers*—after they became a *mobile*, *personalised* and *transportable* item—is that it combines two of three ascending **X**-factors (cf, **#04**): that of *metrics* and of *intrinsic* value. The metrics: it *computes* in the environment where it is located. The intrinsic value: it is *mobile* (etc.).

The intrinsic value *determine* the transposable *qualia* of landscapes that are marked and known (though practise). What is thereby *weakened* is the *singular* relation *between* digital implement that we bring around, and the environment. Which means that the *landmarking* aspect is underplayed.

Because the site is *singular*, and the digital implement, for instance used for **GPS** readings, constitutes an *excrescence* in the situation, the digital use will *not* be normalised *before* environmental data *connecting* the singular *and* the excrescent—the hiccups of data-analog use—are *worked* in.

hand-held GPS: metric & intrinsic, but does not work as a landmark (no specific/fixed relation to the site)

Within the Spinozistic framework, claimed rather *freely* by Arne Næss, acquiring *substantial* knowledge by beginning with the *specific* is quite standard. However, including *metrics* in a qualitative study of systemic features of time-space is by *no* means trivial. It relates *phase-transition*.

There are two levels of *metrics* we have been considering so far: **1)** the metrics of *distance* [site]; **2)** the metrics of *loads* [materials]; **3)** the metrics of *plans* [building]. Then there are the *generic measures* resulting from the actual *walk*, the work of *transportation*, and the *building*-activity itself.

The *generic* measures result from the work process—*walking*, *carrying*, *building*—that transforms the *specific* metrics: in the sense that the specific now will *move* to define the *landmark*. The landmark that indicates the site called Tvergastein. The landmark defines the *sum* of the generic measures.

The landmark is *not* defined by the metrics of the walk (distance), the loads (materials) or the plans (building). But *itself* constitutes a metric that is released form the *landscape* itself, that gives itself up to it. A landmark is like a *cairn*: we know that there is *some* distance, transport and building.

But in addition to that the function of a landmark/cairn has a *testimonial* function that sums all the measures that are relevant to *that* place: proportions, geological structures, plants and animals. It provides a metric to a landscape *seen* by *someone else* than you, who was there *before*.

People—statistically minded ones—who claim that “if you cannot count it, It doesn’t count”, would appear to oppose the metrics of the *landmark*. However, the point of *fractal geometry*, as I understand it, is to establish the potential *dimensionality* of any given item, measured by a *fractal number D*.

It is called D, because it indicates the *dimensionality* of the given item. The *landmark*—like Tvergastein—is *dimensional*, in this sense, and this is the determination of spatiotemporal measures that could be done from it, which is precisely what establishes the landmark as a metric. It *coordinates*.

The landmark is a *metric* in the sense of providing a *local* coordinate system. In sum, the *landmark* is simply constitutes a metric *re-paired* with the land: constituting it as a landscape. And is similar in nature to the *technical implements* used for *precision drawing* of land/scapes.

Like a *coordinate* system it constitutes a *metric* for the measures that extend from that particular spot. What makes it distinct from standard metrics, since the landmark is *tied to the land* and has a *specific* relation to it. But something happens once the *value* landscape around it becomes *intrinsic*.

The landmark then becomes the *carrier* of this *intrinsic* value, which is *transposable* and connective to other sites. It is a key to how we orient ourselves *environmentally*, and that clusters of *agency* becomes available as *embodied* knowledge. *Do* computers *hold* any of this potential?