



In any human process of communicative interaction there will be an *opinion* that pleases to common sense, *knowledge* to back up this opinion and discuss it, a *critique* of this knowledge, and *assumptions* on what *common practice* demands. These are the dimensions of the tetracluster: configuring *doxa*.

If the different parties to a *tetracluster* trust each other, they have a working relationship based on the four dimensions of opinion, knowledge, critique and assumption. If they have resources, they can work and achieve their ends. But to assess their situation and position they have to exit this circle.

They have to *step out* of the social circle of the *tetracluster* into its orbit of *circulation*. The *joint* assessment on situation *and* position is a precision that corresponds exactly to the task of *tiling*. Tiling provides an occasion to establish a *lineage*—up/downstream—of *opinion* and *assumption*: an encounter.



The job of the *autocluster* is to establish a threshold lineage upstream of *opinion* and downstream of *assumption*, using the *six degrees of separation* to cover that aspect of the *topic*—emerging from the *tetracluster*—that has to do with *actors* in its trans-human, and *agency* in its distributed sense.

The *autocluster*—the knowledge and critique of common sense and common practice—leaves the circle of the tetracluster as specifically a human *common*, and establishes the vantage point (one step off) from the tetracluster, from where the *situation* and *position* may be established.

Working conjointly on the situation and position of the *tetracluster*, the autocluster identifies with a *wider* self (than the one featuring the tetracluster). The conjoint work on establishing the situation *and* position is the exact definition of what has previously be discussed formally as *tiling*.

When the *task* and *occasion* of the autocluster relates to the tetracluster in the mode of *encounter*, they can be considered to form a *whole*. *Accidents* in the tetracluster can be transformed into key players in establishing this relation of *adjacency* realised by the autocluster through the *synecdoche*.

The autocluster can either articulate in this way, or alternatively take off on its own. This kind of take-over—in the relations of empowerment between the two clusters—defines the *hegemony* of the metonym (which we here, in a rather unusual way, distinguish from and *oppose* to the *synecdoche*).

While the task of *joint* clarification of the situation *and* position of the tetracluster is one of *precisation* that belongs to the autocluster, the care of accident in the tetracluster makes it difficult/impossible for the auto-cluster to take off, and defines a second *precisation* belonging to the tetracluster.

Which is why *alternating* between the tetracluster and autocluster can home in on the interception of the **X**-factor (which defines *between* the position and situation, and the phase-transition to the hyper-scale causes to *mesh*). Alternating instantiates *superposition*, *intra-action* and *entanglement*.

The tactical drill: a *specific* topic emerges from the process of communicative interaction in the tetracluster, this topic is situated and positioned by the autocluster (*precisation 1*), by recording/replaying the accidents of the tetracluster in the autocluster, the **X**-factor is intercepted (*precisation 2*).

This second *precisation* belongs to the *tetracluster* in the sense that it plays its part in the whole (developed through alternation). Which means that the **X**-factor acquires *intentional depth* and thereby might bring credit to what we could call a *relational* business model, incorporating a force of *cause*.

This is possible through the following trade-off: what manifests itself in the autocluster as pattern reveals itself as potential/*virtual* energy that, when transposed to the tetracluster, is *actual* energy (bringing together actors/attractors and distributed agents). We move from *synecdoche* to *metalepsis*.