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Abstract
In order to be in a position to re- and trans-value the current culture of institutionalised knowledge, we must locate the roots of the issues we encounter at the face of the institution. By unearthing the troubles of the institution on the ground and in practice, we can attempt to isolate these problems so as to exorcise them from within. This paper presents a set of propositions that endeavour to counter the issues of institutionalised knowledge, its languages, sites of production and its subsequent mobility within the evolving spaces and dimensions of artistic research. By drawing on the examples of expositionality and contemporary self-organised practice, as such propositions towards moving beyond the limitations of conventional academic and non-academic research, I hope to be able to question the bindings of knowledge to language, the institution (symbolic and physical), to the historical traditions of academic exclusivity and the contemporary issues of institutional horizontality.
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How can we use the language applied to the field of knowledge as a means of elucidating the complexities and issues of knowledge as a subject of inquiry? Can we rethink the complexities of this language as a means of knowledge exposition in the arena of artistic research? How might we begin to move away from the wrought institutional, academic and rhetorical bindings of knowledge as a contemporary subject in order to practice knowledge? And what might this look like and where might this take place?

Within the emergent spaces and theoretical dimensions of artistic research, I wish to consider how we might begin to build our thinking around the potential of language as a vehicle of exposition. By this, what is meant is, how can we use language as both a mode of communication and as a form of practice in itself, to realise how we might begin to understand what knowledge is, where it exists and how it exists in or as artistic research. Which in turn, might lead us to gain a clearer understanding of why placing these types of questions within the emergent arena of artistic research is a valuable move. Particularly as we consider how the type of speculative and transformative thinking offered up by the U-Topos perspective of Transvaluation can challenge and produce new desire lines, modes and means of operating within such a presently indeterminable landscape. By way of attempting to contextualise these questions, I refer to two examples in contemporary artistic research to present a basis to this type of thinking: Michael Schwab's conception of expositionality and Stine Hebert and Anne Szefer Karlsen's thinking around self-organised practice. Through the presentation of these examples, I aim to consider how we might take their cues as means of progressing beyond the limitations imposed by the institutionalisation of knowledge.
As Michael Schwab points towards the concept of expositionality as a means of conceiving artistic practice as research, as a means of foregrounding the notion of artistic practice as a mode of research, through the exposition one simultaneously produces the work and by doing so, places the work into a new, singular epistemic perspective. Therefore practice (or research) is seen to redouble itself, by at once producing and establishing its own knowledge base, or framework, that lays separate to any other given tradition and by the instance of production itself. This notion reflects and builds upon much of the recent thinking around indetermination and self-reflexivity in contemporary artistic practice and theory that dovetails a turn towards self-organisation. A move which now inhabits a more so ubiquitous position than that which it might have in previous times, but non the less, firmly encompasses a mode of existence or production that constantly operates as both the subject and object of its own work, or practice. This is to say, that fundamentally, to self-organise is to simultaneously produce and appraise, by nature of choosing to self-organise. In this sense, the choice to depart from the status quo (being organised by someone else from above) always already others the position of the self.

As with the notion of the exposition, what constitutes self-organisation is an operative doubling; one creates a thing and places it into its own framework. Where the two concepts begin to diverge, is the point where self-organisation presently finds itself as a space of critical contestation. Historically, self-organised practice has been seen to mimic that which it attempts to move away from - i.e., the rigid and bound organisational frameworks, that are traditionally implemented through and by the art academy, academic institution, and governmentality for example - and as such, falls short of inhabiting the types of new, or other epistemic frameworks that Schwab valorises via the process or actions of the exposition. This idea that various practices of self-organisation actively mimic, or borrow from the conventions of those organisations which they attempt to counter, places these practices into a critical space. Notions of agonism, alterity and being of the opposition come into play, which, in contemporary thinking around self-organisation is being overruled, for, as Anne Szefer Karlsen points out, being too conventionally separatist. Additionally, she posits that whilst the traditional principles of self-organisation - networks of individuals, collectives and groups working together to create other, alternative realities and structures to the oppressive, dictatorial hegemony of capitalist organisational configurations - remain, in practice, very much at the heart of this new wave of thinking, this oppositional dichotomy is no longer possible. Owing to the limitations of naming something as being alternative and in opposition to, Karlsen suggests that placing self-organisation into a solely reactionist category is preventative of the honourable execution of integrity of self-organising; that is, of common interest, over obligation. Rather, through acknowledging the complexities (of the choice to self-organise, of responsibility, of common interest) and thus the realities of self-organised practice, Karlsen et al in their critical anthology, Self-Organised, move beyond this historically separatist and oppositional approach, and with this move comes an attitude of potentiality, of possibility. Such notions of potentiality, or possibility refer us back to Schwab's expositionality.

In the edited seminar transcript, Imagined Meetings, Schwab describes the disciplinary instability inherent to contemporary artistic research by detailing what constitutes artistic research, or practice as research, in the first instance - being that which encompasses and presents ‘a multiplicity of local knowledges and local practices which we cannot compare

---

2 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
against a given framework.\textsuperscript{7} In a situation wherein the determination of practice or research is not (yet) constituted, the understanding, coherence or placement of both the subject and object of work inhabits a space of instability. By this what is meant is that the perceived lack of disciplinary grounding, or reference points, often engender the work as objectively indetermined. However, Schwab continues by intimating the necessity of engagement and negotiation through encountering such indetermination. When the exposition of a thing lacks a concrete epistemic reference base, one is still able to engage and negotiate on the basis that the work presents a transformative experience; one which activates the receptor, its environment, and places the entire experience into a new perspective or context. Schwab points out that whilst this instability is synonymous with potentiality or possibility, it too bestows ‘a consequence, a locality of almost autonomous status’\textsuperscript{8} where both self-determination and indetermination\textsuperscript{9} are interdependent agencies that transcend the necessity of convention to be placed or applied within an already existing framework. Self-determination for Schwab is the capacity of the work to be able to essentially place and present itself, and indetermination is the capacity of the work to be able to be anything,\textsuperscript{10} which furthermore rejects the tradition of the omnipotent epistemic reference point and with that, any criteria for inclusion or exclusion.\textsuperscript{11}

Placing the concept of knowledge as a subject of inquiry into this discussion is where we find further resonance between both expositionality and self-organisation. Both perspectives offer other, or alternative spaces to operate from, methods to apply, agencies to inhabit, and draw from numerous academic and non-academic disciplinary- and practice-bases. Knowledge as a subject, is present across these two perspectives as a multiplicity; in the exposition, its subjectivity is precisely incumbent in the premise that the exposition seeks to present it (knowledge) in a way that self-defines and self-produces, in a way that is unique to and separate from any other mode of presentation; in self-organisation, the subject of knowledge is rather more intertwined with the object of knowledge and that is to say that in some cases, particularly in education-based or pedagogic projects that operate via self-organised structures, knowledge is both operative and means of operation and is emergent, in that the constitution of the project is contingent upon both perspectives. As object, knowledge takes form as part of the process of exposition by way of a proposition or action; a practice, a method and through a form of presentation. Where the exposition collides with the object of knowledge, in an academic sense, is the moment where it fails to be (communicable) readily placed within an existing and objective space, i.e., the art academy, or assessed as doctoral research. In self-organisation, the object of knowledge resonates closer as an objective of the project itself. Across both expositionality and self-organisation, if knowledge operates and emerges invariably as both the subject and object of the given project, then how are we to formalise these processes, which categorically sit beyond the academy or institution’s ability to reconcile their new or other values against their own rigid systems or metrics? And, is there a need to do so?

When we encounter a plurality or multiplicity of knowledges - as with expositionality and in self-organised practice - its means of production, its locations and digressions, particularly across the subject/object paradigm, local knowledges, traditions and systems, we need to avoid the types of homogenising devices that conventional knowledge locations - academy, institution - implement. Those which have provoked, in the first instance, the thinking around expositionality and contemporary self-organised practice as means of exit from the perhaps overbearing and stringent norms that pervade their being. This homogenising expels the potentiality, possibility and indetermination that research, work and
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practices inherent to artistic research constitute. At present, it too, has evoked an overhaul and reconsideration amongst agents of artistic practice and research into challenging not only the effects of such homogenisation, but the very organisational, behavioural and spiritual fabric that the institution at large is composed by.

As Pascal Gielen points out in his essay, *Institutional Imagination*, we presently exist in a flat, wet world.\(^\text{12}\) Specifically in the arena of artistic research, this particular world reflects as an 'adage of global late capitalism.'\(^\text{13}\) Such homogeneity and flatness can be attributed, in part, to the networked culture in which we crawl connectedly; the speed at which such a culture has come to override the very basic autonomy of human beings, is one which is both an affect of the neoliberal condition and furthermore sustains it. It gloriously offers up the promise of *more* information, *more* communication, *more* flexibility, *more* mobility, *more* knowledge(s), and yet its glory is no sooner acknowledged before it turns very quickly to mediocrity.\(^\text{14}\) Gielen's flat, wet worlds of "creativity" [...] 'innovation' [and] 'flexibility''\(^\text{15}\) resonate with many critical discussions around the knowledge economy; the subject of knowledge; knowledge management to knowledge exchange; metric-based knowledge culture (these designations are infinite but describe necessarily similar things). It capitalises fundamentally on the types of measurements and mechanisms that are shrouded by the promise of enlightenment, of humanism, philosophy and progressiveness and yet, in practice, corrupt, reduce, reproduce and standardise the concept of knowledge to the point that its language has become so complex and removed from that which it aims to define and encompass. This language pervades ruthlessly through the sites of homogeneity mentioned earlier - the academy, the institution, government - and becomes a complex network of itself; a network that is described using a heavy-handed rhetoric that ceases in any way to honour or celebrate the thing which it supposedly produces and in effect, reduces.

This language appears on the surface to be void of criticality, or potentiality, possibility and of the ruminating indetermination that fuels the two perspectives of the exposition and self-organised practice. This language has become incarcerated by itself and by the institutional and organisational discourses that accelerate and legitimate it and as such have produced a seemingly impenetrable vernacular in which to access and apply. Is there a way in which to think and inhabit this language of knowledge, on the one hand, in a way that derives criticality or at least allows for criticality, and on the other, in a way that can attempt to retrieve or reclaim the language and territory of knowledge from its institutional and rhetorical grips? How might we move beyond these limitations in a way that both Schwab and Hebert and Karlsen do in their respective projects?

Schwab suggests that the exposition affords the individual (both producer and receptor) space for critical transformation, in and by 'situations that change what we think, what we know, and who we are in those situations.'\(^\text{16}\) Similarly, Hebert and Karlsen, in their thinking around progressing the project of self-organisation, allude to the constant and necessary flexibility in approach to the subject, as being one of self and collective transformation. As a political treatment, the spaces within which this type of project can operate are limited, unstable and are not always ethically sound; therefore the need to continuously produce and appraise the project and the spaces it inhabits is necessary. This produce/appraise paradigm is seen ‘as a radical process that continuously challenges the fixed relationships our society is built upon - between the self, the individual and the institution."\(^\text{17}\)

Irit Rogoff too speculates on (a type of) knowledge in a way that resonates the transformative sentiments drawn between these two projects, by way of rejecting the plain
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and obvious questions alluding to the subject/object of knowledge, the what, how, why, where and who and replacing this go to vocabulary with the aspiration of 'how we might know what we don't yet know how to know.' Perhaps suffering as an overly complex in-route on the surface, this shift in focus allows us to access the subject/object from within, from a completely different perspective. And this might be because we are already there unbeknown, but we lack the necessary tools that afford us the ability to acknowledge our position, as it cannot be acquiesced by the criteria of the institution. This position of already being within also dissolves the rhetorical bind of the subject/object paradigm by nature of having entered into something without agency. In line with how one approaches the exposition in artistic research, this consideration is concerned in part with the language, or vocabulary used. If we allow ourselves to consider language as not solely a means of communication, that is, we let go of our dependence on and binding to it as a means solely of interaction by widening our understanding and applying it as method, or as practice, or as research, then we begin to find ourselves in a space that no longer relies on the otherwise necessary epistemological registers of communication-proper.

Rogoff speaks of aspiration and trying as acceptable positions to occupy and operate, from within the subject, or, in her words, 'this not-yet-known-knowledge.' Which furthermore dispels the qualification of convention of being able to place oneself, the work, a practice, some research into an existing, or legitimated framework. This not-yet-known-knowledge, or self-/indetermination, the exposition and models of self-organisation all begin to point towards a newer and serious proposition or call toward other realities in and of artistic research, to new spaces in which to inhabit, not by referring backward, but by entering into what is fundamentally the unknown. Rogoff has described this type of unknown knowledge in her essay, FREE, as 'one that [is] not framed by disciplinary and thematic orders, a knowledge that [is] instead [ ... ] presented in relation to an urgent issue, and not an issue defined by knowledge conventions, but by the pressures and struggles of contemporaneity.

Can we thus refer to the above propositions or aspirations as forms of new knowledge, or rather, as means to new knowledge? Or might this thinking be the shift in vocabulary that Rogoff asserts as being necessary in order to inhabit this new knowledge? How, in reality, can such a shift in vocabulary or perspective of language inform an entirely new way of doing and being? How then, can these methods be applied when considering what knowledge is, where it exists and how it exists in or as artistic research, and in context to our metric-based knowledge culture?

There remain to be several further issues that we come to encounter with the perceived trouble of new knowledge, language-as-practice (-research, -method), expositionality and self-organisation that take place from the position of the institution. The trouble we consequently come up against in the face of these perspectives and propositions is summed up by Schwab; in reference to the proposal of expositionality as a serious progression from and solution to the dilemma of artistic research at the site of the art academy, he posits, 't]his is a very different model of knowledge when compared with written outputs and an idea of academic writing that needs to be fulfilled.' Such concerns are similarly expressed by Geoffrey Crossick in his 2006 paper, Knowledge Transfer Without Widgets, in context to the active institution of mechanisms such as Knowledge Transfer (a precursor to Knowledge Exchange) at the level of arts and humanities higher education at the time,
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[A] great deal of damage is done by trying to understand the ways in which research and knowledge are constituted on the one hand, and how that knowledge becomes available and used [...] by seeking to force it into the knowledge transfer model constructed for science and technology.²⁴

In his paper Crossick attempts to challenge and offer an alternative to the ways that academic institutions are being forced to undermine that which propels them forward, as advanced institutions of higher education. That is, in part, a progressive research culture, by the implementation of models of innovation (and exploitation). As Crossick states that Knowledge Transfer, thus Exchange, is constructed to formulate and assess in the most part, research in the science and technology subjects - disciplines, which in contrast to the arts and humanities are based on a form of evidence that is tested and determined on a scale of success or failure and right or wrong. Crossick anticipated that such a model simply could not be applied to the spaces of what he has called, creativity, and I would argue that this remains to be the case but on a much broader scale, as not only spaces of education are affected by this, but too, the art institution, the museum and so on. Gielen asserts that the pillars of the institution are crumbling²⁵ to flatness; historically, as with the art academy, they operated on the basis of a hierarchy of values²⁶ - albeit verging on an exclusive set of values - pertaining to creativity and production - those which can not be reconciled against calculations of number competencies,²⁷ data, and other quantifiable measurements alluding to its success(es).

However what we encounter now is the complete reversal of this, where successes (of both institution and practitioner) are determined on the basis of a quantifiable hierarchisation of outputs.²⁸ Gielen conclusively reiterates the sentiment of previous propositions mentioned here, that '[t]o create something means to place oneself outside of the measurable measure. Artists must withdraw themselves from the flat plane and, by much trial and error, make themselves stand upright.²⁹ This then would suggest that we are encountering an age where the verticality and horizontality of the institution are locking horns; the work that institutional critique has afforded - (arguably) a mobility and flexibility to practitioners - has crumbled in the very same way that the institution has, in that the horizontality that was previously fought for, presently is the force most desire to expel. What does it mean then to stand upright in the face of these problems with knowledge, with its language and with the forces of the institution?

As the subject of knowledge pervades the academy and the institution, policy and government and becomes the focus of academic symposia, its vocabulary also becomes evermore perfuse, complicated and unclear. What appears to me is that, in the way that the language of knowledge is presently conceived of and used across these configurations, there seems to be a huge discrepancy between what its referees and subjects perceive it to be; what it actually is; and what it could be, were it not bound by such a complex rhetoric. What this means is, when the subject of knowledge is referred to, for instance, in or as Knowledge Exchange, we encounter several problems that in the most part are semantic, both in the sense of terminology and in logic. In plain sight, knowledge exchange intimates the sense of mobility of a thing of epistemology. In terms of subject, it implies the action or process of exchanging knowledge; as object, it describes knowledge having been exchanged. In its original operational and mechanistic sense - research council, policy, university, business - it refers to the successful transaction of some form of knowledge between two or more previously
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unacquainted bodies that intended to generate knowledge-based value through such a successful transaction. Therefore it essentially refers to a predetermined device composed across metrics and protocols, which are in place to ensure that any intended success is met. It becomes increasingly difficult to define exactly what knowledge, in this equation, actually refers to; the inherently economic implication of the exchange is furthermore problematic. In this example we can observe in very straightforward terms, the limitations imposed by this potential misapplication of a bound language that presents a very skewed sense of value via the allusion to an economic value system. Which in turn, fundamentally does not resonate with the foundations of epistemology or the academy. How might we rethink such language in order to affect the coherence and execution of the production or mobility of knowledge that actually performs in the way that it is presented? Rather, in a way that produces effectively what it should; bringing together bodies and minds to create something new, that alone, or apart, they could not have achieved. This point presents a specific example of the trouble we encounter with some of the language of knowledge but to widen the view, we can observe this trouble as being representative of the institution at large; this idea that language is built up around abstracted concepts and values that are presented as vulnerable to the prey of the power of capital.

This idea of new knowledge is met with uncertainty at the point of the art academy, where it is perceived as something which can not be understood, applied or assimilated to the fixity of the institution's criteria for assessment or innovation, or success. For instance, particularly in the academic arena, where anything that does not prescribe to an existing plan is simply not received on equal terms to those projects that do prescribe or walk the tightrope. Schwab continues by saying that if such a disconnect remains, then this failure to communicate must at some point, be reconciled actually into the process of assessment and considered a merit (on behalf of the artistic researcher), which in turn reflects the institution's own failings at being able to accept the range, scope and complexity of artistic research accordingly. In this sense, the exposition becomes a political space wherein it places an onus on the practitioner, or researcher, to be able to critically establish and assess their own conditions, apropos the institution. However, this is not to say that all institutions collide negatively with other, or alternative modes of artistic research; the test-bed of practice-led/based doctoral research programmes present a gradual advancement from the otherwise unyielding status quo. But what still remains is the trouble of assessment; the question of being party to a metric-based culture that is difficult and intolerant, essentially to difference, or verticality, according to Gielen. This is something that Schwab, in his editorial project, the Journal for Artistic Research, attempts to challenge and counter, in context to the case for artistic publishing, where the peer review model is reinterpreted through expositionality as a mode of appraisal.

The trouble with assessment, language and the culture that envelopes the concept of transvaluation with critical urgency, is that the academy or institution remain to be prohibitors of progression, which simply does not correspond to the very foundations or premises of such spaces. Indeed they welcome some difference, some digression and provide a twisted rhetoric in response to the type of aspiration called upon by Rogoff - often under the guise of Knowledge Exchange - and yet why are we brought together under the shared principles of wishing to trans-value?

In order then to move forward, how can we look to language to practice knowledge beyond the rhetorical ties of the institution? By referring to a project developed collaboratively and as part of a residency last year, I hope to present further, some of the thinking drawn across the propositions of expositionality and self-organisation, in linguistic terms. THESAURUS (see excerpt in appendix) begins to articulate a form of evolving response to concepts such as knowledge, exchange and collaboration - notions that presently define the institutional status quo of knowledge. Terms that sit with unease at the points between the institution, its subjects and its knowledges and terms which, in practice, fail to translate that which they attempt to
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encompass. Such a discrepancy marks the conditions we encounter by acknowledging the need to re- and trans-valuate this culture. It also reflects the age-old rift between artistic practice that is based on indetermination, and the systemic rigour of academic assessment. Through the identification of discomfort caused by this discrepancy, this project attempts to (re)claim some of the language and territory that the institutional vocabularies of knowledge, exchange and collaboration in effect delimit. By (re)defining or proposing a new body of references, THESAURUS comes to present a process of working through knowledge; how to act, how to be and how to do. The emphasis placed upon action here, signals a nod to the ways in which Schwab and Hebert and Karlsen work through the issues that they face through their projects. It is with this sense and action of working through that I propose a potential means of moving forward.

As a body of propositions, THESAURUS, expositionality and contemporary self-organised praxes are, in part, reactionary in their first instances, however, what they present and propose are active axioms to the trouble of this/a flattened culture. What they oppose are the bindings to which they are held captive, those which do not allow for the honourable translation and placement of the work, practice, research and too, the acknowledgement of (other) common interest. By doing in addition to contesting (by doing), these projects evolve beyond being caught up within and limited by the reactionary fray, as Karlsen points out. Through actioning beyond solely their own reactions, they begin to outline in very real and possible terms, the potentiality of moving forward and away from the limits imposed by the homogeneity of a choking valuation system.

Michael Schwab and Stine Hebert and Anne Szefer Karlsen appear to be honourably and ethically moving forward and on the right track with their respective, aspirational projects. These perspectives have been brought together because I see their propositions grounded in an integrity; they reflect, in practice, many of the issues we face in artistic research, in context to the academy and institution, as a consequence of accelerated globalisation. These projects disarm their just reactivity by actually commencing forward, into an unknown. They have, I hope, presented a to-date, theoretical context for the questions posited at the beginning and as such have begun to pave a departure route from the bindings that the institutions and languages of knowledge hold over its subjects. The need to re- and trans-valuate is an urgent one; in the exposition and in self-organised praxes we can begin to observe a potential way to exit the captivity that the institutions and languages of knowledge hold, through action and doing.

The future of knowledge is perhaps placed in action. We can think as action. Action might be the new (old) language of knowledge.
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THESAURUS

Preface

[prcfes]

THESAURUS is an indefinite taxonomy for the concepts of knowledge and exchange and collaboration. It takes the form of a list of words in groups of synonyms and related concepts that attempt, and can be used to, delineate a space in which to experiment, explore, process and progress.

THESAURUS has been conceived of as a reflexive and non-exhaustive resource. It is part of a larger body of work and should be read as not only a resource but as an artwork. THESAURUS is an expressive reference point that serves as a departure from the dominant and often complex language and research surrounding ‘Knowledge Exchange’.

THESAURUS is motivated by a concern that the current language of ‘Knowledge Exchange’ is limited and that its limitations impact upon precisely the interactions, relations and ‘exchanges’ it claims to consider and define.

Current conceptions of ‘Knowledge Exchange’, as a relatively new and un-refined critical discourse, stand in the way of creating productive, progressive and non-hierarchical spaces in which rigorous, dialogical and situated explorations of knowing and doing can take place. An attempt to find and realise a space that allows for experimental explorations (or ‘exchanges’) to occur is therefore imperative.

Through destabilising ‘Knowledge Exchange’, in its present unmitigated incarnations, THESAURUS attempts to rupture and extend the space which it inhabits. In so doing THESAURUS constructs spaces for new relational dynamics and meanings to be encountered, and to encounter.

Through a series of progressive synonyms for knowledge and exchange and collaboration, one traverses multitudinous understandings or readings of what it is to be and do and know together.
Use

To realise alternative relational dynamics and synchronicities.
To inform and initiate non-hierarchical working methods or spaces.
To inform an alternative reading of an existing body of work.
To re-think an existing body of work.
To form a commentary to an existing body of work.
To work towards harmony or mutual discordance.

As a score for a performance.
As a film script.
As a statement of intent.
As a provocation.
As a defense.
As a discourse.

For the basis of an invitation.
For exchanging knowledge.
For collaborating.
For forming an us.
For forming a friendship.

*subject to constant revision and extension.
Knowledge [nol-ij]

Progressive Synonyms

Singularity
3. Future. Non-hierarchical composite spaces or ecologies without substrates, layers (eg. of the digital and physical).

Specificity
1. Noun. Subject or object identified as being separate (ie. "it is not that.").
3. Adj. Environmental (eg. the comparative value of a free newspaper prior to 8am and after 11pm).
5. Verb. Immanence.

Subjectivity
1. Noun. That which exists on the basis of the self, otherness or distinctness (as singular or collective) (eg. perspective).

Agency
1. Noun. Affective or embodied critical position.
2. Noun. Potential or capacity for action and or velocity.

Will (to think, do)
1. Verb. Motivation to pursue (eg. experience motivating a will to know) (see Agency).

Object
1. Noun. Already external in relation to the subject (see Subjectivity).
3. Verb. To demarcate.
Objectivity

Understanding
2. *Noun. Conseq.* Notion of subject or object specificity.
5. *Verb. Conseq.* Allocation of value to a subject or object (the creation of a point of reference).

Value
1. *Noun*. Assigned meaning, function, characteristic, significance or importance of an object (e.g. of a thing, action or understanding) by a subjectivity, always in relation to a particular specificity or singularity.

Subjectivities
1. *Noun*. Those which exist on the basis of selves, otherness or distinctness (e.g. perspectives).

Modalities
2. *Verb. Subjectivities*.

Uncertainties

Excerpt taken from THESAURUS and Preface (2014) by Susannah Haslam and Tess Denman-Cleaver as part of a series of ongoing research collaborations.