To *settle human settlement* on planet earth is not a one-time exertion, but requires a continuous effort and commitment. It expresses a human condition in which the *problem-solution* pair cannot be the main focus of life and work; and begs for an *alternative* separation of design from accident.

It is *not* enough for human beings to *compensate* for our life on earth; the compensation *also* needs to become settled. Without this criterion there is no design. It is like a brick wall: it needs to settle before you can build a another structure on it. Otherwise this structure is likely to crack/break.

Settlements are, in this sense, the *materials for* rather *than* the outcomes of *design*. Working with settlements is more likely to generate *variety*—as a key to a sustainable environment—than compensating for anticipated effects. We know the categories we steer by, through their effects.

If the insights gained so far are worth their salt, the chances are that an education in which *levelling*—with the world and life—is a domain of *enskilment* promised to life-long learning (LLL), is the *human infrastructure* needed in the *anthropocene*. Is *design* a candidate for such an education?

Is design promised to the rank of a *general subject* in an era when new products and services may not be promised to the first rank of what the world needs? If *re-pairing* the *ephemeral* with the *durable* in architectural timescapes are held by the way we live and work, this is what is needed.

But it will be sustainable only inasmuch as the crowdsourcing through a multiplication of life-ways—*in the making*—based on *re-pair*, succeeds at generating an *environmental orientation* in populations, over the entire planet. Anthroponomy is the geognostics of such happening/failing.

Anthroponomy therefore needs not only be established to solid scholarly foundations—through the creation of a *Journal of Anthroponomy*—but could reasonably be established through some association to the UNESCO. To span the possibilities of a design education worldwide, as a LLL-domain.

The propagation of design-education through our general education would then have framework in which its *aggregate* dynamics of effects could be monitored: that is, the prerogative of anthroponomics. In this framework, it would do impact studies relevant to a policy research for the future.

In fact, it would seem essential that it acquired this function, since the design education envisaged here is *not* a problem-solving agent, but child of the realisation that the Peacock-dilemma can *never* be solved, but only be *settled* in a variety of ways. Hence the need of impact-studies.

If the pairing of *ephemeral* with *more* durable entities is a candidate defini-tion of *categorisation*, then design features a *work* whereby the ensuing categories *compensating* for damage, are worked out as *settlements*. With due consideration for *all* life forms—including the present—*as* settlements.

Or, the *result* of such settlements. So, in one aspect, the work of design is to bring the settlement of compensatory categories *from* the current—i.e., that will come about no matter what—*to* the present. Submitting the movers of time to the care of our hands. Remembering that categories are movers.

Learning how to live, at last. Learning at last, how to life. At last, or finally. A version of the Peacock dilemma in Jacques Derrida's *deconstruction*: a design *not* to solve but to *settle*. A category is within and beyond the human scope: a vantage point with a *levelling translucency*, working for settlement.

We do not need to be full of ourselves in order to achieve the fullness of experience. On the contrary. If the ecosophic mission of human being on planet earth is to settle, it is for a life based on settlement. The Peacock dilemma is between human settlement on planet earth, and its settlement.