



The above diagram **A** features a distribution of **responsibilities** in a household according to **fe/male roles**. It rests on a method of correspondence analysis, whereby more/less frequent tasks of a household are matched against the *distribution* in fe/male tasks/responsibilities in a coordinate system.

It shows how a household can be seen as a *categorising* machine, in which desire and custom yield personal prerogatives: the initial conditions from which a given household system originates. Below a different aspect relating to the *logistics* **B** of the same household is shown: featuring a *home-office*.

The home-logistics is first on foremost sensitive on *timing*—requiring a threshold amount of precision—to maintain a sense of *where* the household is moving, and is critical to maintain it in a “good enough” *state* (final condition). The vectorial sum **A + B** yields **X**: featuring the *slippery slope*.



If indeed the relation between human *being* and *nature*, is determined by *human nature*, we have to change ourselves: to change our nature. Peter Sloterdijk stated the problems in philosophic terms in [You must change your life](#). From a *design* point of view, the question relates to the *way we work*.

That is, we must *change* the way we work. Then our lives will change, and the future of the planet will change. We must change the way we work as *desiring machines* ([Deleuze](#)). And we must change the way we work at *all levels of society*: no matter what our jobs are, we must change the way we work.

Which means that the present statement moves *from* philosophy and therapy, to politics and economics. The way we presently work lacks “wheeling”. What we presently see is the proliferation of what might be called *avalanche-behaviour*. With our present use of computers as a *sensitive* initial condition.

Think about this: when does e.g. a dispatch of *rollers* shift from allowing us to move a heavy object, to triggering an *avalanche* of rollers? Alternatively—what we perceive is significantly *less* than what we receive: the sample detail of perception allows us to act adequately. But what is the critical *threshold*?

What is the *critical* threshold at which we *either* hatch a new behavioural *repertoire*, or our ability to respond adequately starts *slipping*? When and how does our computer technology drive an amplification of fluctuation, causing a *phase-shift* (i.e., unpredicted behaviour that will not be governed)?

The current surge of electricity prices is likely to be a good example. As electricity moved from being a *utility*, to a *commodity* to fragment new *goods & services*, it also *ceased* to partake of a *public domain* to which political governments can *respond*. After the surge of C19, the electricity surge.

In both cases, the developments are *monitored* by the day, hour, second. The relevance of *averaging* trends—and select the important ones—is obliterated; because there is *no* political apparatus to take action at that level. Monitoring the day-to-day development of facts becomes a prerogative of *tabloid news*.

It is a phenomenon which is likely to come directly *from* the deregulation of public *infrastructure*: despite its strategic importance, in a critical situation, it *no longer* constitutes the backbone of national security. This is brought down to vaccines/face masks, and the ability to pay for exorbitant electricity costs.

And it is the regular *citizen* who pays. The *ailing* ability to earn, evidently *affects* the ability to pay. What is more: in both cases—C19 and energy—the situation appears on the public horizon, as though completely out of the blue. If we do not connect the dots the frequency of such turns will likely increase.

Hence the following question: can we really call something *technology* if it is not somehow *wheeled*? Can we “wheel” computer technology by working differently? If to proceed in this direction, we indeed need to determine the foundations on which our present use of computer technology rests.

Our current use of a computer for *categorising*- and *logistic*-purposes: that is, *stochastic data* and *contact-points*. A third kind of *knowhow* ensues from handling stochastic data and precision-work *jointly*. Meaning that if they are conjoined in a model, a *third*—manageable—process is likely to come out.