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...like a circle in a spiral, 
like a wheel within a wheel. 
Never ending or beginning, 
on an ever spinning wheel…
As the images unwind
like the circles that you find
in the windmills of your mind.
Alan Bergman, dalla colonna sonora del film” Il caso Thomas Crown”

Preface

Memory is articulated in two separated contributions: the first one, is addressed on the process of different classification in the situations of local crisis; the second one, keeps in mind the problem of the specific re-skilling the user implements to employ organisms, handwork and components, outlined apart his own will.

Knowledge and Identification.

Knowledge and identification are like a spiral, unwinding an endless wrapping –up on themselves, a building of images following one another in the mind like words, like the will to imagine a certitude, by who is involved in a ruinous situation; and, the more the wheel of modification turns round, the more the subject is in search of references and invent them, like objects stopped in the mind, like safe buildings in their urban firmitas, with the possibility to evoke and keep certitudes.
So, the problem is not just to set technical solutions, consistent with the local conditions of time and space, but even to use in safe way projects, confirming the cultural places’ inheritance, their ordinary life, process, their relationship among people and objects, the buildings and the ways of building, materials and tactile sensations. So, the disaster is not a sudden natural event or the unexpected one, the loss of goods and people, but even more the local bewilderment, the no more guaranteed recognition of known things, the inability to evoke and employing usual process of life and converting them.
The disaster is not a mere natural calamity, but also the following one another of unexpected events, depriving us of references’ certitudes, stressing where to reflect expectations, or believing mind’s images can be “hard phenomena”.
Neither a phenomenon doesn’t arise from the emerging crisis, nor disasters are the topological point of discontinuance between the current running of a process and the uncontrolled turning; it's sufficient to think about the absurd condition of New Orleans on Kathryn, while the disaster was, and must be interpreted in the same genesis of settlement and in the systematic negligence of partnership between men’s pride and the active
capability of Nature. The relationship among man, his settlement and Nature, is a continuous project involving catastrophic events, not the rescue culture, even if spontaneous at human level.

The stay and stability, are not fixed features of a place; the identification, the concepts clearness and the necessity of transition’s stages, of instability of the system, keeps on concerning situation to face. The difficulties to act in a disaster conditions, is just in the extreme softness of understanding the point of gap, and leading it to a new current forms, almost as it was a fixed habit.

Sometimes, I had the opportunity to say that structures don’t exist by themselves, but only because they’re known: *the historical presence does non exist on their own but it exists if understood*” (from: Cultures and shapes of the built civilisation, 2005, Rubbettino).

Firmitas, is not neither the ability of a material structure to resist intact along the time, nor an architecture of a material disposition, but the ability to offer services complied with the programmed requisite for the planned time. It’s a relative quality, and it must be planned, together with the possible interventions, connected to the “out of paradigm” events, or better, classes of parameters and markers’ categories, to make sure the arising action and recognising the morphology of the same, for new reshuffling techniques, and making readable the kind of intervention.

**Rescue and Criticality**

On the whole, we must think about to the exact meaning of this kind of intervention in connection with the possibility to act in fixed times, with the certitude of having an outcome, according to the different categories of answers, the technical behaviours in extreme conditions, and the identification of joint fruition and cultural placing.

All this, entails a new method projects, sensing that the “disaster”, is not always a natural calamity, and the same in every place( climate, habitat, morphology), and even the intervention cannot be the same. The impact of the event, can’t be planned according a storage traditional logic of production, or a catalogue one; it cannot use fixed material or available in a uniform way sources, because they lack demand and total definition. In such cases, the sudden temporal and space, are the memory and the reason of the project, not arisen to joint exigencies, requisites and capabilities.

Technical times and nature’s ones, as Le Goff says, are not and will never be the same, even because, often, both are not coherent; they are the cause of the event, and their aim is not the spectrum of the suddenly arising questions.

More than emergency, I’d like to talk about criticism.

Emergency reminds an unexpected, sudden circumstance, arising by the linearity of the common stage and by the current form of an asset, to overlap with the existing outlook: even a particular concert, a sport event, a particular rebellion are emerging.

The criticism, on the contrary, is not a linear, localized and recognisable situation; it requires cures and specificities, belonging to the same intervention; we cannot generalise them, neither in equal conformities, nor in ways, because they are part of different classifications of the event, and of the same place.

Try to think about the reversals, due to a tsunami or the before mentioned New Orleans: in this case, we must talk about criticism, thinking about the categories of intervention; they mustn’t be categorized as series of products, but joined for morphological local and cultural aims.

Here, we remind the ring wrapping up as a spiral, a wheel inside another, an asset within a asset’s configuration still existing and altered but not lost.
In a methodological way, we must have a second thought about systems and process, whose final shape is not pre-determined, or stopped as an hypostasis, alien to physical, material, cultural, local qualities, but able to get close to them. We also talked about transitive properties of available components, that’s the possible move of qualities, within technologic boards, inside and among different categories of technological unities; the problem, is always the same: the receiver is meant to use space and objects, organisms and furniture, forms and techniques: this is the real criticism. Often, the emergency becomes the unacceptable emergency by the receivers’ place; this is the case of the new Gibellina, not accepted by its inhabitants, because it was new. The model is over-structuring the pre-existing and consolidated structure; the criticism, in this sense, becomes infrastructural, invasive, technologically and linguistically pervading the precedent organic asset, even if it’s not excellent or not emerging.

**Temporary and transitory**

In other occasions, some years ago, I talked about the opportunity to insert a category of organisms’ and man habitat assessment, that I liked to define “the programmed decay illustrating a technological prevision of decay — technological forecasting – and showing before the critical situations , compatible with the cultural outlook of places. All this, is referred to the abused definitions, used every time we talk or lie ahead with a ruinous event: is it an event we can use transitory or temporary actions and phenomena? A temporary event, has got inside the concept of “provisory”, of “not fixed”; it’s an event, and the relative actions, having a limited last of time, should be assessed for a turning strongly ascendant and speedily falling. With this image, we can undoubtedly describe the impact an earthquake produces, a tsunami determines, a great sport event signs, but not determining what happens after: often, the remaining signs, are not limited in the time, and their incidence reflects in the configuration of territories, both in towns or landscapes, and even more in uses and habits, in the relationships, in the anthropoid mediations. So, just to equate the ways of re-balance, we must think about a definition of “transitory”: the event and its actions are meant to pass; they rule the stage of transition, from the total condition, to the varied conditions one. The transitory event is the image of a dynamic evolution toward a new balances stage: the actions to make, are provoked by the homeostatic skew of the system, but they must tend to form a composed balance.

We all know the phenomenon of molecular biology,"transpostasis", that’s the transposition of sketch of DNA from a point to another one of the genoma; the action of the intervention in case of disaster, must be like a transpostasis, because this transfer doesn’t involve the loss of gnomic qualities, using operation models, transferring assets without losing specific qualities. This is the demand of people affected by disasters(often unexpected), both natural and civilian (always expected!) . The matter concerning the operations of re-balance- instantaneous or enduring- remains; even such operations, must be laid to incipient reasons and forms of a place and, if so, how they must be laid.

**Reversibility of product and process**

The concept of transitory leads the transforming one: both aren’t a value judgment, but represent the acknowledgement of a stage flouting. No board is vital if it’s not subjected to an evolution, a transformation; the same earthquakes are the evidence of the vitality of our planet. The matter is how to expect them and governing stages, and how to lead the broken balances, stopped by the incipient conditions.
If we accept with no difference the concepts of suitability and activity, it's simple to lead all the instantaneous and spread operations to deconstructing thoughts. Once made this rescue operation, in the critical point, it's always possible to restore the incipient assets and morphologies.

Unfortunately, we know that it's not so, because of physical reasons (the entropy of a system) and for ethnical -anthropologic reasons; the re-integration of an environmental system, altered by an action of a disaster, in all its extended features, doesn't admit the re-introduction of a new cycle, both formal and productive. The falling-out of this process is harmful, both for the cultural status of places, and for the government of handwork process. We cannot conceive to stock continuous re-usage organic forms, without regarding phenomena connected to usage, life rules, transports, old age, the answers discontinuance, in conditions of context's skew.

So, the reversibility must not be the product, not a structural employing process, but the re-usage, in compliance with the local features. The life cycle, Life Cycle Analysis, is connected to the process of a planned pre-production and the pre-planning for the minimum technological unities, with an open employment spectrum, expressed and built for open frontiers, assisted by a passive plant, available to charge itself of adjoined qualities, aleatory, if compared with the incipient programme, and good with the local background.

In this case, the last of the object-organism, whatever the scale is, is finished, while the minimum unities' life cycle has got an appropriate last.

It's not possible to imagine a finished product for every latitude, a “not place for not places”, but a training law of boards, able to recover, even in extreme situations, qualities making a recognisable context to citizens for a continuous meaningful objects system, determined by the same users. We don't need an intervention for organisms, but an open virtual folder law, where to access, according the stage and forms, in compliance with the evolutionary usages and habits, as the following part of memory clarifies.

Emergency Use Design

By Ernesto Maria Giuffrè

Object's employment in situations of rescue
The objects illustrates new usages

The emergency situations, as we outlined before, induce to multiple, sudden changes of context by the user, for imposing of re-environment. The user's memory strongly acts for catching the whole of handworks, to lead the interpretation to the constancy of the personal history.

In substance, during the emergency, objects are used in a wrong way, attributing to them requisites and features, not coherent with the object's genesis, but forced by the arising need...

So, it's important that the object, whatever its complied size is, is available to gather, and opening themselves to a not ordinate and not planned exigencies, to new outlooks, and new usages.

In long times, such opportunities are assessed, even if without great resistance of users and handworks. The phenomenon of the first stage is more complex, above all in the first moments of emergency, when the relationship of subjects with the hard reality is still
difficult and when the sense of extraneity between the situations and the configuration of historicized living it's strong. For this reason, it's not just a matter of flexibility of usage, but also of artefacts planning, of systems and components of the provisory assets, in order to allow and, maybe, force people to find new solutions.

**The importance to define the phase of usage of the object.**
The outlook in condition of disaster, together with the physical collapse of physical structures and infra-structural, personal and collective, is shown by the strong jar among the object’s qualities and the new definition of offered supports: the form of projects' employment, consolidating the continuous and direct relationship between the object and the user, the form and manifestation of a language determining the acknowledgement and the settlement of the single object-artefact- inside a project, the generation of forms of usage and impacts with the daily life, lack. The main drain, in these sad moments, is even represented by the inability to recognize the space and the tactile picture of daily life, represented at the end, by the synergy of objects, users and forms of employment.

**The object’s quality**
There’s a quality developing with a continuous process connected to the different usage of objects, and insists on the modifying process and the consequent evaluation of the spaces, of the different scales where artefacts develop. The definition of the object in the time, involves a different meaning of the same one, because, they define once more their connotative structure just from their usage, and, as consequence, their specific forms and qualitative ways. In substance, they contribute to measure life spaces, measures what the disaster claws back to zero and spread itself, like material and physical values, as cultural virtuosities. The total quality of the artefact, from another hand, comes from the relationship between the relativistic property, not absolute and constitutionally connected to the variability of interpretation and fruition of the same. Such symbiotic elective condition among objects and men, suddenly collapses, broken up in a vision of confused relationships, denying a still rooted civil continuity.

**The plan of artefacts’ usage**
After having realized the loss of simple objects of daily life, we must analyze the determination of boards, composing the house structure on its completeness, just to allow a transitory stage, laid from the moment of highest crisis to the phenomenon's formalization; so, it's fundamental the usage plan of artefacts, of the components of a new and provisory reality, must be carried out through the definition of a series of jurisprudences, tracing their endeavour. This means that an object must not only meet the needs in the planning stage, but having insightful properties, not provided by the project, but coming from its complexion, by all the elements supplying what, (comparing with the man), it's possible to call "identity". It can be changeable and distinctive but, even being so, allowing a subjective identification. It's like objects could be persons, setting aside their conditions of mere materials, like they were physically present. For this reason, the first effort, must be recognizing the qualities and the ability of an object, (whose aim is not the one of the incipient project), to meet the needs through its own features, not to the added ones. Hence, the necessity to detect and trace the element’s constitutive road and discover the not deterministic logic of its usage.
In facts, such qualities, once defined, in need to invent a new object for sudden functions or for incoherent requisites, provide the logic plan to draw important functions, together with the logic of demand, against the language sequence relationship. It’s a logic of spontaneous addition, able to add virtuositites to a defined form; they all measure up the users and his vital space of reference.

**The definition of an object’s endeavour**
To define an artefact, it’s necessary to start from the address rule, an instrument able to trace a guideline, to set the object as an adaptive complex system, able to evolve itself, and able to move in a dynamic way inside environment.

**Usage and recognition: the unsteady identity**
So, artefacts’ own capacity to transform, becomes the basis to recognise them and the necessary condition to state their identity, to formulate different indicators’ classes to certificate the object’s quality. Such quality, seems to be essential to recover a further condition of alienation coming soon after ruinous events and getting worse the dislike situation of single objects, having no spaces, no places, histories and daily lives.

It’s necessary to detect and define jurisprudences as reference outlook, imposing guidelines to the designer, to allow him to plan the artefact endeavour, regarding that the usage stage is not over during the performance stage, but along the time, together with all its changeable quality images, and the virtual reversibility of a process of sudden suitability. The quality of a single technological object, shouldn’t come from its ability to provide different services in the time, but from its real cyclical interactivity, from artefacts take and give qualitative capabilities, for an interactive changeable attitude.

Only through a leading rule, it’s possible to trace a guideline to set the object, as an “adaptive complex system”, able to change its endeavour with the variation of the external inputs, and act modifying what’s is existing, its own relationships, and creating new qualities. The systems of components, available in case of disaster, should be planned, not just as open stocked systems, but as wholes of joinable artefacts and opened to have several meanings, according to the different users and places of impact.

In this sense, the product is a part of the reality, becoming an active and integrant part, an “object-almost subject”, able to fix a point, where to start in the future evolutions, and make the man recovering the new place.

In this outlook, the possibility to communicate outward and the evolution, is just set on its “net” confirmation, allowing to keep in touch with other “complex systems” of environment, even if deformed.

*Image 1: Edda Blu, Design: Ernesto Maria Giuffré*
Un-specificity, contemporaneity, continuity and persistence.
The categories of the here defined rule, are like dimensions of the components elements’ service of the provisional settlement; the main features must have their reference, their modality in them, so every component, even the joined one (coming from assets and assemblies), can relate to people.

The un-specificity is the object’s ability to define its own aim, only inside the usage stage. Consequently, services features, not univocally determined by the not used artefact, represent an “available opening”, to meet the needs of different services demands.

The contemporaneity, is the possibility to use in the same moment, the same artefact for different aims;

The continuity is the artefacts’ insightful ability to pass in a “fluid” way, without any break during the usage stage, from a functional setting to another one, and changing according the kind of service provided;

The persistence is the ability to define artefacts, through a “matching sign” code, producing new meanings, never seen before, and quickly recognising by people.

Image 2: Ita Marghe, design: Ernesto Maria Giuffrè

Conclusion
Even if it’s not coherent, we think the first quality we must give to a meaningful system of actions of interventions in case of disaster, whatever they are, is a sort of personality, able to change according to the different conditions of time, place and space, to the different and changeable questions, and the extemporized users; on the whole, a code of conduct, varying outward and, in the same time, conditioning it