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Synopsis
This paper contributes to evolving the urban environment, which the city commonly represents, by understanding the post-oil period as transitional toward a new paradigm. Transforming the urban toward the coming great changes is developed through orientating toward well being in cities via architecture and spirituality as practices. Turning from circumstantial technological targets, the post-oil city can be planned in specific terms for well being that evolve the urban in terms of its integration with the landscape of the world.

This paper contributes to the evolving urban environment, as represented by the city, through understanding the post-oil period as transitional toward a new paradigm and reshaping urban metabolism through realizing architectural value. This paper interweaves the post-oil city as the familiar technology of Modernism within the existing paradigm of urbanity and the city, architectural value and the practice of architecture’s provision. It describes enabling a transformational period through the ‘post-oil’ moment, whereby ‘post-oil’ is understood as counter to the use of oil and not yet the period that will follow. The end of mineral oil energy and material indicates such a paradigm change, which climate change, biosphere collapse and the vulnerability expressed through 2020 pandemic that so easily causes us to crush the economy, signals to us.

The city is but one kind of urban structure. Perhaps it was once the only kind. The city is our focus due to it typically housing high consumption of material, energy (even if it is less intensive per-capita) and financial centres. It houses the control and power of ‘urban’ development to largely symbolize our civilization. Today the needs of great expansion of humanity, both in numbers - having doubled over a life-time - and personal consumption, have extended the urban condition far beyond city pin-points of intensity. ‘City’ is proposed as an intensity of urbanity, while urbanity has extended to cover the globe. Supplying the city with resources extends over the horizon and deep into the ocean.

The urban system of urbanized striation, valuation and communication is global ubiquitous state of dwelling in the world, while the character, depth and breadth of non-city urban is not clearly taken into consideration. The words ‘city’ and ‘urban’ are commonly used interchangeably, tacitly opposing urbanity-as-city to the rest of the world.

To explore urban technological space fully we may consider the quality of ‘rurality’. A village or town is a kind of rural space, but are we simply creating opposing elements by considering ‘village’ as a parallel entity to ‘city’? Rural places are assertions of a relationship to the Land that supersedes the pervasive urban striations across the world. In the past century many governments went about eradicating nomadic cultures. Why? The nomad occupies rural territories that the urban needs to re-territorialize with striations and limits for the sake of creating reserves and control points for the flows it generates. In North America, the majority of peoples as well as the buffalo and caribou that travelled great migratory routes are not permitted. They contradict the static urban structure of economy of ownership and finance based capital management rather than stewardship.
Villages and towns are integrated with the landscape having at least in their past had an agrarian basis or one of harvesting from nature, such as wood, minerals or sea food, by which they were founded and formed. Rural settlement tends to adhere with the geographic and life forms of the land and are more interactive with nature through agriculture and cultivation that is more directly dependent on the earth’s life. Rural places are generally in a functional relationship with urban structures, e.g. the economy of farming in landscapes that are under the influence of urban structures and systems. They serve urban centres and are coordinated by them financially. The urban refers to attributes of the land for specific tasks such as terrain in terms harvesting resources or simply slopes for drainage or for collection of water, limits for erosion and vehicular movement, lakes to sequester toxic materials, as well as proximity to transport and economically derived centres. Urbanizing structures include industrial farming to harness nature ever more deeply, enframing nature according to human production values. This is much as scientific method forms questions that isolate attributes in terms of problems and solutions. Urban systems overlay natural environment and may allow nature to continue, contradict it or act to eradicate it. Urban structures appear as cuts and deformation in a natural setting, appearing as damage in most cases. This is not appealing, so it is largely ignored. We do not often experience the urban as such in a natural or rural setting. Figure 1. This urbanized intensities and intensively farmed areas cause profound diminishment of life. Nevertheless, we all feel the quality of rurality. I propose to reverse for many of the readers the concept that we are settling in the natural world, huddled in towns and cities. It is the rare valley such as the Incomappleux that is free from urban overlays. Figure 2. It is now the rural that ekes out its corners lovingly and beloved of its citizens. Such places supersede the urban experientially and yet they are also different from ‘being in nature’.

The relationship of the urban to nature and to rurality, and the latter to each other, will be profoundly important as the present status quo dissolves and evolves. How does the rural supersede urban territorialization at rural places? What are truly rural features? Where does the urban end? This is questioning to understand what the urban is. It is a matter of sensitivity and honesty to recognize the signs of urbanity.

How does this relate to the post-oil city and architecture? Architecture is proposed as the successful outcome of planning and settlement development. Architecture is proposed to be based in consciousness. Material, construction, technology, with building, design and
planning not conflated with architecture are considered architecture’s means. Although they are intertwined with our needs and intentions, those are not the outcome of architecture and its value. We will outline a definition and grounds for architecture about life’s need for consciousness and its support for well being that expresses the post–oil city as threshold to an evolved urbanity and the city, whereby rurality may gain strength, absorbing globalized urbanity.

1. Technology and Nature as Other.
The Land, nature and its life are understood today through technological valuation as quantification of narrowly appropriated qualities. These are parameters that do not comprehend what cannot be asked as a scientific question. Modern science is method leading to decisive conclusions to posed theses. Architectural and planning education promotes ‘inferences’ as taken from case studies in the same sense. We intend objective proven tenets that require parameters that ‘enframe’ the world, using Heidegger’s term, according to the technologically defined purpose at hand. What cannot be addressed becomes exterior to, or concealed in or as our technology. (Karassowitsch 2015) We have taken up a technicist proxy of building and planning for architecture and well being.

Urbanity is part of this. Nature’s reality eludes our technological urban-encoded landscape. Nature is ‘the other’ in this arrangement, often seen as an enemy. Rural life is often seen as backward according to the advancements commonly accepted as part of the technology driven future. The values of ‘progress’ are based in technology and its corresponding material values are formed to correspond to financial assets. The unspoken, un-integrated and concealed aspects of world include almost everything that makes us human, such as capacity to grasp nature’s not-systems and purpose, the source and nature life, love, consciousness and its purpose, and life’s value for its own sake. The terror of our enviromental disaster is that it is the result of this absence. Technology has evolved from its antecedent forms to facilitate a capacity that, with a vast increase of humanity in numbers and in the power we harvest from earthly life, has come to operate at a scale that has an effect challenges the planet’s nature altogether. This is not withstanding the evidence that very small events also have repercussions of change in the flow of life around us. Either way, every particle of energy we use would need to be considered, whether we are sensitive to each particle or the sum. Where the measure of life and consciousness is determined it is partial as ‘enframed’ reserve, circumstantial or as common signifiers. The difficulty of thinking other to the concealing technicist tropes of our culture is daunting because the concealing of (our) nature is itself concealed.

Architectural practice and urban planning often intends the same concealing. The use of styles in the 19th century is exemplary. The proper application of a style was socially safe both in terms of opinion and any lack of skill on the architect’s part (Ruskin 1984, Obedience) and as a symbol that architecture was intended for a project. The eclectic use of styles by 19th century architect has migrated to building technology in Modern and Post-modern architecture where it is incumbent on architects to use ‘proper’ technology to signify architectural merit according to technicist economy and finance by which a project gets its general social approval. It is taken as scientific and reasoned, but the vast failure for betterment belies lack of efficacy. To understand this we need to look beyond technological reasoning and see the integral, emotional and loving assumptions that are concealed.
2. Architecture’s Capacity.

Architecture was part of humanity long before our present Modern machine ages mineral hydrocarbon and electricity based technology and its economy and cultures. We recognize architecture even if it was made in cultures other to our own or in vernacular structures (Rudofsky 1964) or in the distant past. It is a common human capacity based in mind and its conscious awareness. This has long been required when we find the need to change our environment as how best to accommodate ourselves. This ‘questioning’ is not about problems. Architecture comprehends human consciousness that demands recognition of being and purpose. The issue that we face is the reduction of needs to physical and material evidence, when in fact everyone is dependent on aspiration.

The positive aspect that founds architecture is aspiration. When any situation is dealt with consciously, human aspiration is addressed. Architecture is at a locus that provides for aspiration, even if this is concealing in materialist objectivity. We are all dependent on love and we claim the need for quality of life for the wellbeing of those whom we love, including ourselves. As we find ourselves in our world where valuation is as object measurable terms of science and technology, the beautiful soft subtlety of love and life’s meaning is concealed. An environment that we call architecture is, therefore, not directly objectively architecture. Experience in such an intentional environment is how we attain architecture. Architects prepare such a locus, be it an alcove, a room, a building or a sector of a city, for unknown persons to experience as architecture. It is our individual awareness itself that is re-formed when we experience architecture presencing of architecture. Many of these places are so iconic that their symbolization of architecture is more important and overshadows their quality as experience. The Mona Lisa by Leonardo Da Vinci is an example of the object’s meaning replacing its experience. See Figure 3.

The experience of presencing aspiration is awareness as their inner aspiration that is presenced at that prepared locus. Architecture is experience with one’s original aspiration at that locus. It seems miraculous that anyone could ever do this, yet we have many examples over time and across humanity. These are amazing factors that shift the miraculous reality of humanity to attributes of architecture.

We are not taught this as practitioners and we do not get paid for it. Instead we are paid by the brick. There is no structural discrimination between architecture and its (building) technology within the modern profession. Architecture is the venue of the human condition that presently creates the technological problem/solution mode of approach concealing in the technological hegemony. We gladly use the word architecture while few of us do more than heartfully realize what that is. However, what other aspect of human life is so widely accepted with so little agreement as to what it is, or deeper comprehension? It is necessary for practicing architects to be mindful of this and evolve a more definitive common approach. Project-based conceptual thinking of planning and architectural practice to facilitate the provision of architectural value informs any scale in the world-as-urban and comprehends the limitations of technological urbanism. (Karassowitsch 2016) Architecture is proposed,
therefore, as the value original to consciousness whose only sibling is spirituality. Not religion, but the inner value of heartfelt evolution and practice is meant by spirituality; the glowing heart of any religion is the experience of it founder. Architecture is the worldly outer form while spirituality is the inner form of the freedom—of—choice in individuality and freedom—of—duty to life’s purpose, which we confront when we take action. Architecture’s capacity is that it supersedes current technology in comprehending aspiration and well being. This can be evolved in practice. See Figure 4.

The current transition that we face is not only away from oil or all fossil hydrocarbon power generation, it is not CO2 or other greenhouse gasses. It must be away from the values and expectations embodied as tapping the power of nature in ways that kill its life. In part, mitigation of technology’s harm, which we call sustainability is needed. But technology must evolve, as it has been for millennia, to a form we will no longer call technology. This is after post-oil cities. Developing after-technology architecture is for other papers. This paper is about a post-oil city as threshold experience that embraces that capacity.

If a post-oil threshold city is to support “continuous improvement of urban material, environmental, social and economic conditions” by “leveraging improving the urban quality and efficiency, “what are the key issues? This paper engages the ‘Understanding Urban Metabolism’ track’s terms of approach in terms of resolving specifically: “separation of urban functions (1), low environmental quality (2) , unequal development (3) or insufficient support for urban renewal (4)” to express this.

3. Leveraging our Capacity to Evolve in the Post-Oil City
Before entering into these four specific areas, we will address “continuous improvement of urban material, environmental, social and economic conditions” to express conceptual issues in urban metabolism. Essentially, let us admit that continuous improvement of cities with current technological concepts has not resulted in a culture that functions in a sustainable way, even if it is in a socially stable context such as many in Europe (e.g. Switzerland, Finland or Norway, or many parts of Germany, and France). Even those that are locally stable require wealth of the standing reserve that the earth’s natural being cannot sustain.
The material and energy inputs of modern technological processes required for their form of culture are those responsible for extracting and harvesting energy and matter on narrow parameters that leave the nature of Gaia staggered and at the threshold of deep perennial change. Cutting the enabling wealth, which includes finance and banking, in countries like Austria, Germany and Switzerland, and they would nevertheless be a well placed compared to 150 years ago on the basis of today’s gains. Such changes will not force us to forget what is essential knowledge, including material gains understood through the modern machine ages technology. But those remnants would remain piecemeal fragments of nature.

To claim that our urbanism has a metabolism is aspirational. It may be euphemistic. The systems we use are a facsimile of metabolism, which is a natural condition. We are far from having a metabolism. We are far from having even ‘circular’ systems. Cities and the world would suffer from fatal metabolic issues, if we think it to be metabolism.

The need is for more foundational grounds than altering and improving so-called metabolic pathways. Our society will disintegrate along with the changes required of large components of the environmental context that we have so generously and lovingly been brought to this stage by. Urban metabolism as city versus rural and machine age technology versus nature will come to a close.

This is not as frightening as it may sound to some. Every minute of our existence we rely more on our inner experience than we do on what our systems may give us. It is possible to move beyond the need for belief in matter and technological systems and to be able to say, “I don’t need belief. I know.” Our individual inner worlds demand the focus on improvement that we have so lavishly on the outer world. There is ample evidence that it is our inner spiritual world that many of us yearn to perfect in order to have the life that functions with the greatest possible success. Spiritual practice, which is ancient and ongoing develops this. This paper relies on such practice and the sciences behind them. The science of evolving consciousness is directly involved in the higher attainments of intentional environments that provide for architecture, registering the well-being that technological science cannot measure. When we look at this from the point of well-being, accepting that we are consciously aware and rely on that every day for everything we do, urban metabolism must include conscious awareness that the human made world might one day join the metabolism of the earth.

If we strike enabling "continuous improvement of urban material, environmental, social and economic conditions" based on technological means that do not inherently support wellbeing or the earth’s natural capacity, what is available to us? Then what do we look toward? It must be through refining the role of human consciousness or conscious awareness and its role in the world. It is in support of this, which is commonly called spirituality, that the capacity of architecture may be leveraged and appropriately valued. Architecture inherently leverages this as both need and capacity. Architecture has for millennia been the worldly manifestation of the need and the discovery of our role in the world because of this link. A vision for an after-technology planning and any environment has as its base the conception of human life as an essential role in the life of the earth. This is not merely poetic. It is far beyond sustainability as a concept. Nothing less will do. This must be valued by a functional quorum
of many others. It is a blessing that architecture is already accepted by the vast majority of people.

4. Four Parameters
Accepting the possibility of an after-technological transformation lead by architecture based on the above, the following 4 elements are developed to challenge what leveraging cities’ “metabolic quality and efficiency” means in terms of well being. This becomes an architectural project based on its superordinate programme to provide environments that support the responsibility that consciousness gives.

4.1. separation of urban functions

becomes cooperative whole of transformed after-urban settlements

There is a symbiosis between rurality, nature and architecture. Rural settlements derive a functioning structure from the landscape based on its whole intensity. The matrix of settlement is integrated with nature on its terms, in the way that rural settlements are created with the Land, rather than urban settlements that impose on and oppose nature. The urban superimposes across the world while the rural supersedes the urban where it occurs. This may begin with farming but as we see in Feng Shui and Vāstu, we may create settlements from within landscape and have done so for millennia. This means farming of all sorts, not only urban/city–farming and other land-based activity zones which has already long been within the urban structure.

Our current technology, including communications, allow for distributed power, services and manufacturing. If planning cities aspires experience of architecture, which is by nature service to human aspiration, and not service to modes of technological enframing, urbanity will evolve, to its after-technology form. The city will dissolve within the current urbanized world. Distributed technology is meant to provide the means to live in a local manner, in many places, with minimal shipping. This may include all production and higher quality with changed motives for mass iterative production. The relationship between the Land and settlements will change.

The foundational tier is architecture as service to human consciousness and the life that we are indebted to. Systems can be light and the hardware needs to be light. After-technology architecture can, however, only be living and production will turn to nature as nature produces. The growth of this would de-emphasize density (i.e. as not a priori bad or good) and prioritize integration of distributed services and integrated with of the Land. We all live in the Land, no matter what the structures we make appear as. This begins to absorb the city and its division.

4.2. low environmental quality

high quality environments depend on high quality society

Low environmental quality is a direct result of goals other than well-being. The argument goes that if we increase wealth and if we increase technological efficacy we will also increase well-being. It is unfortunate to have to recognize that these are circumstantial targets have no obligation to result in well-being. The inexorable growth of a wall of difficulties that do not allow themselves to be solved by technical means is becoming undeniable. Climate change, which has not seen any significant remedial results over decades of producing initiatives and
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agreements, is one of these. Another is the entrenched slums in countries such as India where the development of wealth depends on the very poor. The evidence that slums are central is relentless claims of removing and reducing slums whereas economies are socially and economically dependent on differential wealth. The occasional eradication of a slum, like pest removal, only demonstrates the powerlessness of those people, not betterment. See Figure 5.

Architecture as a profession languishes because it reflects the same structures of exclusion and misappropriated energy, if our professional association’s aims are also based on circumstantial goals. Our means for intentional environments are building technology, like a form of equipment. Science and technology and all of the learning of architects needs to be applied to well-being not to building and physical places. We discuss ways to ‘design’, (i.e. to use the equipment) within parameters that set a careful limit as to what is asked; we end up playing games. Nevertheless, necessary aspects of architecture are responsibilities that we cannot leave behind fully and still claim to be architects and planners. They are combined with or subverted in terms of the value of technology. I refer to the discussion of Heidegger in his Questioning Concerning Technology (Heidegger 1977) that technicist action and society conceal what technology cannot measure and capture.

Urbanization brings material and power toward cities. It changes the Land where the resources are taken. Bringing that harvest to cities’ intensified urban locations of habitation has a great deal of force against the environments through which such action passes. If we are concerned with wellbeing the damage to these corridors and spaces of transport would also need to be vastly reduced. If sound and pollution are removed we would enable awareness that the movement and the vectors of energy created by transporting gigantic amounts of material and energy remain unpleasant and harmful. We may gradually enhance our sensitivity to find that no matter the refinement of process for the speed and tonnage of movement current technology facilitates, it is to our detriment. An example of this can be taken is the orcas in the Salish Sea in western Canada and the northwest USA. They suffer dramatically due to increasing tonnage of the ships moving through the sea. Noise is a factor, also ship strikes and their environment is deteriorating. Are orcas be more sensitive than human beings? Is it possible that if they are harmed, we are not? The attention that they get makes it clear. The contaminated water problem in Flint Michigan that has not been corrected for a generation belongs to this questioning. We are unable to fix the circumstances of the Indigenous people of Canada. Technological thinking in the form of norms, appropriating resources and controlling movement is the harm. Urbanism requires corridors of power that destroy quality to deliver circumstantial goals. We are hoodwinked by our circumstantial needs and by inability of our conscious minds to overcome negatives - this includes delusion. Those negatives amount to legions of mentally ill people, and misuse of millions of lifetimes. Lack of sensitivity is not grounds for acceptance. Technology cannot measure well being, but we must, nevertheless, know our well being within.
High quality environments would reflect high quality cultures and societies. Without consciousness of this fundamental contradiction we cannot provide betterment. Architects and planners who gain awareness of architecture’s essential character are among those who contribute to ‘high quality’ culture, reflecting it in the intentional environment. If architecture and planning have wellbeing as a primary goal, they will begin to be activist in supporting higher quality environments.

4.3. unequal development

**environmental equality decoupled from personal wealth**

Unequal development is the manifestation of our social systems that thrive on inequality and create social and individual issues for exploitation. Unequal development stems from the need for environments to support well-being. Inequality is grandfathered in to planning and architecture that have not developed based on inequality. Unequal development manifests a system that does not prioritize well being. The phenomena of our machine ages enframing action of technology is to gain maximum standing reserve in the service of humanity’s expansion and the improvement of access to material and power based means. This is concealing whatever it is that nature is actually doing with this technicist understanding that is expressly not nature’s. Because we use this technicist form of knowledge that functions to conceal, although we are part of nature, we will not comprehend nature on her terms and those terms that support all life are subverted.

We ‘enframe’ nature, including our brothers and sisters, for material benefits. To express that nature is generous is qualified, since we are an integral part of nature so that we would not exist without it while nature would not be whole without us. We may perceive it as generosity, but the inherent responsibility of human consciousness in the world requires that our lack of generosity reflects in nature’s action. Our ‘utilization’ of nature’s attributes through technical economy and finance does not exclude people’s poverty. We seek to gain a maximum of power and capacity out of nature’s realm as thieves. It means admitting that our current materialist objective science based building technology is a tool that can work for well-being but is not bound to. Removing poverty from its integrated role in the economy will mean that our economy and its finance, if finance needs to still exist, will need to be re-grounded.

Cities functioning with inequality implies a mandate for evolution of consciousness or spirituality. Such a mandate includes aspiration, as per architecture’s superordinate program. If this is absent architects and city planners who are not conscious of this will “build” inequality. The battle that Edmund Bacon, the Executive Director of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, fought with Louis Kahn around Louis Kahn’s planning for the centre of Philadelphia can be taken as an example. The debate is nuanced and explicit. Bacon was a recognized city planner, what Kahn was proposing was unrecognized. It is made poignant by the animosity and apparent anger he still held on the disagreement decades after Kahn had passed away. (My Architect 2003) Non Arkaraprasertkul in his paper on Kahn’s plan and Bacon’s opposition brings us to the threshold of the essential quality that keeps us building inequality. (Arkaraprasertkul 2008) See Figure 5.

Kahn’s proposed re-development of Philadelphia’s centre is based on speed of movement and a civic centre. It is opposed by Bacon’s creation of city destinations that are orientated to
economic growth, adding elements to enhance an unchanged city form while supporting the automobile at all locations equally. Bacon considered Philadelphia fully structured, while Kahn planned a layer of infrastructure, addressing well being directly. Bacon attends the economy. While Bacon claims Kahn was merely scaling up architectural planning to city scale, Bacon’s plan provided for buildings around the central city space. The contention of how to handle the automobile resonates with the theme of the post-oil city. Both featured the automobile. Both create space for it, but Kahn handles its character as ‘fast’ and different from walking and other modes of travel while Bacon claims it must occupy the civic space. Kahn’s planning discriminates movement infrastructure that has the attribute of making possible de-linking Philadelphia from being an oil-based city. Bacon’s city includes the automobile as an “honoured guest”. Kahn’s planning for Philadelphia is not post-oil, but it facilitates de-coupling from fossil oil-based power in how he deals with movement.

While the current technological form of planning and architecture is concealing humanity’s nature and the nature we depend on, architecture remains at its heart. It cannot be excluded, and there lies the trouble: Production that is circumstantial to architecture seems possible from within the space of such practice – Bacon’s space – but not from without. Economy concealing the possibility of architecture in its means creates unequal development. Equal development would not by definition engage the difference between wealthy and less wealthy people. If we can agree that the issue is to attain architecture as defined above, as the aim of all human intentional environments, equal development would give everyone the quality of architectural space, whether made of straw or plated in gold.

4.4. insufficient support for urban renewal  

Urban transformation in light of well being

Urban renewal will need to be replaced in post-oil cities with a concept that renews our relationship within nature based on community informed by the above three points. Urban renewal would only bring us back to the condition which requires us to create separation of urban functions low environmental quality and promotion of inequality for economic gain. Urban renewal is, therefore, replaced by urban transformation and dissolution and evolving the rural. Even the glossiest most complete and perhaps highest rent areas of the city would fall under this transformation that evolves the city and wealth. The architect whose realm is of conscious awareness that includes the millennia of seeking its fruition, the entertainment of its goals and the duty that humanity has within nature as a
part of its functioning is a key player. The architect is a practitioner of the preparation of environments that support well-being, gaining sophistication like the medicine man who knows the action of every plant and creature. The duty to make gardens on earth, whether it is a machine or of vegetables and flowers, is duty in harmony with ‘whatever nature is’, which very few of us will grasp consciously or attain with our super consciousness. Living architecture does not need renewal, it evolves.

5. The Transitional Post-Oil City

This paper concludes that the post-oil city is potential for defining well being in terms of its support by a built environment which is by its nature architecture, developing a cooperative whole of elements (1), architectural value as ‘high quality’ of value giving measure and form to well being and daily life’s satisfaction in terms of any input situation (2), to support environmentally unified comprehension of human life (3) for evolutionary transformation of urban environments (4). Urban renewal is pointless if it only brings us back to an inadequate model that induces planetary disequilibrium and human discord. Being ‘green’ and sustainability are low order targets. Professionals may set more informed goals that include transformation based on aspiration. Environmental and social threshold events of greater transformational technological change become ‘Urban Well-being Agreements’.

1. Living and production will turn to nature as nature produces. The growth of this would de-emphasize density (i.e. as not a priori bad or good) and prioritize distributed services, integrated with the Land. Separation of urban functions can be dissolved. Considering the urban rather than only cities allows us to create in the form of the Land, transforming urbanisation to dissolve the city as isolated intensity. Such after-post-oil places form in harmony with the Land and would eschew the capacity to striate, overlay and ‘replace’ nature with reductivist process that cuts and obliterates. Our intentional environments become a cognitive whole that understands human responsibility in terms of the earth.

2. High quality environments represent our social cultural and individual condition materially and spirituality. Architecture is aspiration from within that. Architecture inherently supports spirituality and fullness of parameters in its superordinate programme. If this is taken up, the environments will evolve the higher quality.

3. Equal development. Architecture as the higher aim of any intentional environment creates equal development in terms of well being. This has less to do with the material used and more to do with the experience of architecture.

4. Urban renewal is replaced by environmental transformation beyond urbanism-as-technology. The post-oil city is a threshold for transformation beyond sustainability and toward the after-technology architectural paradigm for well being.
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1 Karl Popper clarified this aspect by challenging the 'method/inference' model that science generally holds with his concept of 'falsifiability' which says that, "A theory is scientific only if it is refutable by a conceivable event." Even if one does not accept this, it does indicate purpose in clarifying what science and the technology based on it represent. See Thornton, Stephen, "Karl Popper", The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy (Fall 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL=https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/popper/ Visited August 14 2020.

2 "Enframing" is term created by Lovitt, Heidegger's translator for the German Das Gestell. "As "Enframing," that claim ceaselessly brings both men and things to take their places in the stark configuration that is being wrought out through ordering for use. This challenging summons, ruling in modern technology, is a mode of Being's revealing of itself. Yet in it, also, Being withdraws, so that the summons that thus "enframes" is all but devoid of Being as empowering to be. Compelled by its claim, ordered and orderer alike are denuded. All that is and man himself are gripped in a structuring that exhibits a mere skeleton of their Being, of the way in which they intrinsically are. In all this the essence of technology rules." Heidegger 1977 p. xxix-xxx.

3 These practices include ṣaṣṭitantra, Buddhism, sāṃkhya, gnostic forms of Christianity (Cloud 2005), the many approaches of hathayoga and rajayoga (Vivekananda 1978), e.g. Heartfulness.