

In the present flyer-series, *clarification* is a term used to determine a *self-organising process* in which the *triangle research*, *teaching and dissemination* constitutes the *driving*/dynamic factor. The aim is to explore this possibility as an *alternative* to the managerial concept of organisation.

The objective of the series is to explore *mediations* within the *triangle* at an *art-school*—or, a creative education—and its potential as a framework to a practice of *life-long learning*. That is, an attempt to move *within* and *beyond* the institutional framework in search of organisational *alternatives*.

Concomitantly, the attempt is to explore the potential of Arne Næss ideas of precisation—in the relation between the terms  $T_0$ ,  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ —in establishing the notion of complexity in a *field*-based idea of learning, in which *thought* and *extension* (Spinoza) are conceived vectorially *in-one* as *fieldwork*.



Clarifications—in plural. Starting with Arne Næss: Norwegian philosopher who started out with a philosophical position tangential to the Vienna circle, and analytical philosophy in the US, but had a penchant for *experiments* and *statistics* in his question of criteria of *precision* in human exchange.

In this *earlier* phase of his work the focus is on *language*, however. Then, with the launching of the *ecosophy*—which had a world-wide impact on the ecological movement—he expanded his scope to include his relational approach beyond balanced statements, to include *environmental activism*.

In short, he not only moves from linguistic statements to activism, but action as 'language in the expanded field'. He thereby made a sensational break with the common sense assumption that words and deeds are either competing or aligned. As is a frequent assumption on theory and practice.

According to this broadly defined common sense, theory and practice are either *competing* or successfully *aligned*. Whereas in Arne Næss' philosophy they are substantially *one*. Like Spinoza, whom he admired, positing a vectorial, or *orthogonal*, relationship between word and deed.

They are *neither* facing and confronted, *nor* parallel and aligned. Word and deed, language and action, theory and practice are non-reductive in their relation, even as they are substantially one. To go beyond this esoteric understanding (please bear with me) we need to understand 'expand'.

How should we determine the 'expanded field' save as a way of actually expanding our *minds*—or, notion of mind—to include the *field*. Not content with becoming experts on *thought*, and thinking, we are also concerned with *extension*. How do we *expand* thinking to become a kind of *fieldwork*?

Essentially, the notion that if you say **A** (thought) you must say **B** (extension), while heeding the shift engages: 1) the mindful consistency between the terms **A** and **B**; 2) the consequence of the two-way implication of the terms **A** and **B** is established: asserting a unity that really is experimental in nature.

In other words, something *hits back* as soon as the unity between two non-reductive entities as **A** and **B**, is established. Let us call this "something" **X**. If **A** and **B** are considered in relation, then the **X**-factors generated from sustaining their relationship should be understood as *field-data*.

In practice, the **X**-factors generated by expanding thought *to* extension, are the ones that make thought applicable to extension, thereby making them inherent. Arne Næss' notion of '*intrinsic value*' is precisely that. Between what we *say* and what we *do* there are special entities **X** at work.

One of them is *writing*: a vehicle of vectorial interception of *word* and *deed* in their *critical* relationship, as *information*. The categorisation of writing as an **X**-factor, brings it *beyond* the precincts of language and *within* the precincts of action. This is a key to how we understand *precisation*.