Reading / EN

The sciences need questions that can be translated.

Comparing different selections without dissolving disciplinary methods.

The sciences need questions that can be translated.

A seminar room can be investigated technically, organizationally, and pedagogically. Through an invented example, the reading shows when different statements complement one another and when a real contradiction needs examination.

One room and several questions

An invented educational center wants to know why a seminar room is unpopular. A technical investigation might consider temperature and air exchange. An organizational investigation might examine occupancy and decision-making routes. A pedagogical investigation might ask how the actual work in the room is arranged.

No causes have yet been found. Different research questions have been formulated. Someone expecting an overall answer immediately might mistake one disciplinary perspective for the whole problem. Conversely, simply placing all perspectives alongside one another does not yet produce a justified decision about what should actually be changed.

2026, chapter 2 and chapters 24–25, physical PDF pages 10–11 and 106–109.

Selection makes precision possible

A discipline delimits a subject so that particular relationships can be investigated more precisely. It determines measured quantities, permissible procedures, and criteria for a usable finding. This limitation is a prerequisite of its precision. It does not mean that excluded properties lie outside all reality.

AdL calls the unit selected for a question an element. The room can appear as a thermal environment, an available facility, or a place of learning. The descriptions are not interchangeable. Each opens up particular relationships and initially leaves others aside. The selection should become visible so that its results can later be connected intelligibly.

ADL Die Ordnung der Wissenschaften · Manuskriptfassung 1.0 · 15 July 2026, chapter 2 and chapters 24–25, physical PDF pages 10–11 and 106–109.

Not every tension is a contradiction

One report might find low operating costs while another investigation describes poor usability. The statements need not contradict one another. They can assess the same situation by different standards. A decision would need to clarify whether the favorable

costs are connected precisely to conditions that make use difficult.

If, by contrast, two measurements claim incompatible temperatures for the same place and period, the difference is not merely a matter of different values. Measurement procedures, calibration, and conditions must be examined. A translation framework should make real contradictions discoverable. It must not prematurely declare them equally valid viewpoints.

ADL Die Ordnung der Wissenschaften · Manuskriptfassung 1.0 · 15 July 2026, chapter 2 and chapters 24–25, physical PDF pages 10–11 and 106–109.

Carry along the origin of a statement

For each investigation involved, the subject, level of observation, and period are first noted. The data used, kind of justification, and assessment standard are added. Only then is it asked which part of the statement can be used in a shared decision.

A mathematical relationship can have different prerequisites from a survey or the historical attribution of a source. A shared presentation does not make their justifications the same kind. It shows where additional data or disciplinary checks are required. Translation here means making relationships

between statements understandable while carrying along the limits of their origin.

ADL Die Ordnung der Wissenschaften · Manuskriptfassung 1.0 · 15 July 2026, chapter 2 and chapters 24–25, physical PDF pages 10–11 and 106–109.

Bring two statements back to the same question

For the editorial exercise, choose two fictional reports about the same room. One recommends lower costs, the other greater usability. For each report, formulate what it addresses and what result it calls good. Then write a shared decision question in which both criteria remain recognizable.

Next, examine what information is actually missing for this decision. Perhaps it is unclear which measure would produce which difference. Perhaps costs are known but their distribution is not. The additional question should address a specific uncertainty. A more extensive map is not better simply because it contains more technical terms.

ADL Die Ordnung der Wissenschaften · Manuskriptfassung 1.0 · 15 July 2026, chapter 2 and chapters 24–25, physical PDF pages 10–11 and 106–109.

Communication must make

something possible

The possible benefit of the AdL framework lies in a transparent connection between different investigations. It can make a difference in period, unit, or standard visible. Whether it improves collaboration in a specific undertaking must, however, be tested in that task.

The units used must be preserved, too. A temperature value, a reported experience, and a cost estimate are not three numbers of the same kind. Connecting them to a decision requires explicitly explained transitions. The fact that all three pieces of information appear in the same table does not create a shared measurement scale or disciplinary equivalence of their evidence.

Sometimes a simple shared list is enough. Sometimes a more detailed model is needed. What matters is whether the presentation clarifies the question, preserves important conflicts, and supports the next responsible step. The architecture should make disciplinary precision connectable without replacing it with a general language.

ADL Die Ordnung der Wissenschaften · Manuskriptfassung 1.0 · 15 July 2026, chapter 2 and chapters 24–25, physical PDF pages 10–11 and 106–109.AdL Architektur des Lebens · überarbeitete Gesamtausgabe 2.0 · First work, chapters 3.1–3.5, 32, and 50 on the shared level, modeling, and validity.

Questions

Do the two statements really investigate the same subject over the same period?

Which difference concerns evidence, and which concerns a standard of assessment?

What specific decision becomes better justified through the shared presentation?

About this edition

An independent adaptation of ADL Die Ordnung der Wissenschaften, manuscript version 1.0 of 15 July 2026, chapter 2 on physical pages 10–11 and chapters 24–25 on pages 106–109. The seminar-room example is new and contains no claimed measurement results. Historical figures for degree programs and disciplinary classifications from the source are not adopted as current information.

Explains the shared question of selection through an invented, nonmedical example.

Distinguishes complementary perspectives from actual contradictions.

Develops a translation record covering subject, level, period, evidence, and standard as a practical exercise;

claims no universal effectiveness.

An independent adaptation of selected passages with new examples and context. This is not a complete reprint of the source texts. Examples are fictional; ADL interpretations are editorial applications. External sources do not establish ADL's effectiveness.

Sources

ADL Die Ordnung der Wissenschaften · Manuskriptfassung 1.0
15 July 2026, chapter 2 and chapters 24–25, physical PDF pages 10–11 and 106–109.

AdL Architektur des Lebens · überarbeitete Gesamtausgabe 2.0
First work, chapters 3.1–3.5, 32, and 50 on the shared level, modeling, and validity.