

In the present flyer-series, clarification is a term used to determine a selforganising 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.
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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 $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B} ; \mathbf{2}$ ) the consequence of the two-way implication of the terms $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ is established: asserting a unity that really is experimental in nature.
In other words, something hits back as soon as the unity between two nonreductive entities as $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, is established. Let us call this "something" $\mathbf{X}$. If $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ are considered in relation, then the $\mathbf{X}$-factors generated from sustaining their relationship should be understood as field-data.
In practice, the $\mathbf{X}$-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 $\mathbf{X}$ 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 $\mathbf{X}$-factor, brings it beyond the precincts of language and within the precincts of action. This is a key to how we understand precisation.

