



Tiling offers a *model* at once **1)** capturing the difference between a *metric-count* and its *account* and **2)** to generate discoveries bridging *exploration* and *exploitation*. It therefore also proposes to model **3)** survey practices ranging from *field-studies*, *information gathering*, to *bureaucratic processes*.

This may therefore be of some interest to an *archive*—like National Library—that presently dedicates part of its research to the current development of *environmental humanities*. It may also be of interest to the development of criticality in the *STS* (Science Technology Studies) of *earth matters*.

In some studies—with a background in action research—complexity studies have been carried out from field-trips to oil-rigs, where the human and technological factors interact to define the parameters of *work-relations*. But how do these compare with *surveying* and *decision making* processes?



Tiling will here refer to a *joint* activity: **1)** the fit between standard sized elements to cover a *specific* area; **2)** the fit between optical elements on the tiles to yield a *generic* pattern; **3)** the *corrective* design of tile-sets which, when differently combined, will yield a variety of patterns. Flyers are *tiles*.

Here, two kinds of fit are competing for the same space, and the *design* plays with this competition. Evidently, the idea of tiling can be extended to the way *folding* affects the readability of maps. The *pattern* of folding and the *pattern* identified in the map will *provide differently* for the *terrain*.

Which opens for a connection between tiling and the way that we design *accidents*. Here, accidents are *not* considered the opposite of design. Neither are accidents considered as something *first* happening and *then* being included into the design, through the sensitivity of the designer.

In the present scope, accident is *not* something happening to tiling, but *internal* to it: since the competition between the available surface and the composition of pattern is *intrinsic* to tiling. The *vectorial sum* between *surface* and *pattern* is what turns the resulting space into a place.

That is, the vectorial sum between the *specific* (surface) and the *generic* (pattern) is *unique* (place). A space is turned into a *place* when the settlement of the “dispute” between surface and pattern not longer is broken down to surface and pattern, but *itself* becomes *dimensional*.

This is an idea inspired by fractal geometry, which allows for a number of dimension (D) that is *not* an integer: hence the name ‘fractal’. A prime example of the fractal is a map, because a map cannot be 100% accurate without ceasing to be a map:  $\text{map} + \text{territory} \neq \text{a whole number (D)}$ .

Which is why the *folding + reading* (= *tiling*) of a *map* in a given *terrain* will yield *discoveries*. Discoveries are, in this sense, *designed accidents*. The discovery appears as such when there is a shift from the recording of a difference from the map that makes a difference to the map & territory.

The discovery *reverses the hierarchy* of reading. From reading the map *unto* a territory, we read an *event*—one that is dimensional in the territory—*unto* the map. Three kinds of *search* and *find*: **1)** finding given spots from a map; **2)** making discoveries changing the map; **3)** finding exploitable resources.

So, there is a connection between tiling and *surveying*. And surveying is the bridge between *exploration* and *exploitation*. Exploitation may mean both mining/drilling—for example—and protecting a natural area, to make it available to enhance life: human life and the variety of other life-forms.

In *tiling*, the tensional gap that exists in any count—and reflect the nature of numbers in the human life-form—is held and contained by tiling. And it will apply to any context where metrics are *managed*: ranging from field-surveys to bureaucratic processes. Which invariably combine in big decisions/-data.