



What does it mean *to face reality* and *level* with it? The tetra-cluster shown above, features positions that it is possible to conceive in a *unified* way—for instance as a method of proceeding as a designer—or, in a *fragmented* way: i.e., as though the positions were incompatible and divisive.

An example of the latter was given by Bruno Latour, during a keynote for freshmen at SciencesPo in Paris 2019, featuring a tactical approach to represent the current variety of positions on *climate change*: **1)** acknowledging; **2)** based on knowledge; **3)** critical of that knowledge; **4)** oblivious.

In the realm of assumption/opinion—*doxa*—real situations *always* comprise these positions. The question therefore is what makes the difference between the fragmenting/accidental process and a unifying/designerly one? And how does one explain that difference to oneself and to the world?



How can we understand a *facing* reality—turned inward—other than as a *self*, given that we ourselves are precisely like this: like you, my fellow human, who are reading these lines right now? And how can I address you like this when we are both turned away—writing and reading—at a distance?

From this infinite point of view—which is within and beyond the sensory-motor realm—I can only attribute *thought* and *extension* to you, according to our fellow B. Spinoza, *nothing else*. The point being that this is enough to intuit an *infinity of attributes* of critical importance belonging to *neither* of us.

We are therefore equipped to intercept the modes of the self. Featuring the movements in clusters of **1)** common sense; **2)** knowledge; **3)** critique and **4)** common practice (already discussed in **#01**). In this scope, the lateral drift of such tetra-clusters feature reality in its *interceptive* metaphysical aspect.

Given that language has a range beyond the sensory-motor realm, the act of *marking* words may be seen as a first act of *design*: summoning the relevance and application of language unto the sensory-motor realm. Involving language in description, analysis and synthesis. I.e., into finality.

Working with *logbooks* involving collections other than written elements—and therefore are explicitly involved in the sensory-motor—accordingly develop approaches and attitudes that are both propitious for *description*, *analysis* and *synthesis*, and operating as *responsive materials* to these.

It is in this relationship that we are working with the *re-pairing* of *written* and *sensory-motor* materials. And that will set tetra-clusters in motion: whether the *emotional* trace—through the *workings* of the affect—manifests as pain and pleasure, worry and relief, downfall and elevation, damage and repair.

The activities that set the tetra-clusters in motion actually constitute a way of initiating, understanding and monitoring changes in *doxa*. So, that the movements will indeed be perceived as change, rather than an opaque and impenetrable *status quo*. Working with dispositions and orientations.

It is therefore not the description, analysis and synthesis—even as they are striking—that, in themselves, impact *doxa*: i.e., which causes movement in the realm of *assumption* and *opinion*. But providing the tetra-clusters with a sensory-motor feed; with the characteristic phase-shifts called **T<sub>0</sub>**, **T<sub>1</sub>** and **T<sub>2</sub>**.

Here the first shift **T<sub>0</sub>** occurs as the operation called **find** is added to the doxic repertoire of the tetra-cluster. The positions are robust, and often likely to remain unchanged, but the *finding* causes the whole cluster to move. Not at the individual but at what is called the *transpersonal* level.

The next shift **T<sub>1</sub>** occurs as the operation called **compose** is added to the doxic repertoire of the tetra-cluster. The final shift **T<sub>2</sub>** occurs as the operation called **assume** is added to the repertoire. These become *present*—rather than simply current—as they are described, analysed and synthesised.