theodor.barth@khio.no

A

Architecture+Permaculture+Community

In the diagram above, what we (for short) may call the **3R**—repairability, recyclability and resilience—contrasts with the example of new **materials** display (*below*). Not because they are opposed, but that they tend to provide competing foci: the best focus to work for a sustainable future on earth.

This flyer/leaflet discusses what can be obtained when, even when separate, they are methodically conjoint. And, what alternately can be lost if we do not. To establish *competing* perspectives where a conjoint approach will harbour critical events—that are essential to our understanding—is a bad idea.

In our perception—which samples what we receive—resides a potential to discern stable states from slippery slopes. But it depends on our ability and willingness to combing competing approaches. This is based on the idea that there is nested information available by juxtaposing competing approaches.

B

Referring to **A** stochastic- and **B** logistic- models does not *per se* invite measure-meets and calculations; nor abstract mathematical reasoning. Beyond making a third factor **X** appear—for which formal models (**#04**) are useful—we must ask: what are we measuring? And: why, indeed, measure?

In design there is an ongoing debate whether **3R**—repairability, recyclability and resilience—is the principle framework, making **materials** research next to irrelevant. Or, whether material research is a cultural vehicle to develop understandings of environmental complexity, and the planetary future.

The alert reader of this series will have noted that we are not here pledged to causes alone, but also to ends: and—most importantly—how initial and final conditions are *wedged* (as a determining aspect of how the two coalesce). That is, how the two are wedged; alternatively are sliding on a slippery slope.

For instance, how can we know that **3R** does not veer into empty semiotics, if the dimension of materials is not integrated? How do we know that **3R** will merely adapt us to living in a *junkyard*—like advanced *scavengers* on a garbage heap—and that materials are **material** to look for desired end states?

Again, how does our knowledge of thresholds—between stable states and slippery slopes—link to *individuation*: to that individual in which the relation between **3R** and **material** is *specific*. That is, the concrete reality of an item which escapes both **3R** and **material** but provides us with critical *information*.

Whether/not such information is indeed *critical*, hinges on *precisation*: that is, how the interception of *specific information* behaves when we develop more *precision* on the workings of **3R**, *and* on **material** qualities. In other words, when *two* precisations reconnect at a *deeper level* of object-understanding.

From a specific connection a deeper connection is hatched (or, iterated) through precision, or NOT. In the latter (*negative*) case we will pass over the information, will in the former (*positive*) it is *sustainable*. This is what is meant by the "wheeling" of **3R** *and* **material** in stable/slippery compounds.

If there is no yield of precisation, the slope is slippery. If precisation yields a deeper connection the compound is stable. The problem is that if we champion **3R** *or* **materials** we are bereft/frustrated of the possibility to even examine things at this level. Do determine **X** we need to have **A + B**.

At the object-level we therefore need description, analysis and synthesis—we need to be accurate—more than measurements/calculations *per se*. The question is then whether numeric/calculated processing is more accurate, on some scales. Evidently, we need to determine when it *is/not* more accurate.

But in both cases—whether the approach is quantitative, or qualitative—there is a *basic operation* needed for precision to do do its work and bring its yield. This operation is to turn elements that are related and separate *from* **1)** being conceived alongside each other *to* **2)** being conceived in *orthogonal* relation.

That is, the 'quarter turn' (*quart de tour*) that produces the event: or, rather, a *placeholder* in our perception, allowing us to receive the event. Thereby making us equipped to intercept a category of events that also determine logistics. This kind of event exists *neither* in **3R** *nor* in **materials** alone.