Marx introduced the Greek word ‘praxis’ in order to avoid confusion surrounding the modern word ‘practice.’ The related terms ‘theory and practice’ are often taken as being fundamental, even when attempts are made to characterize practice as a wider, more comprehensive field. Consequently, human practice — from this point of view — is always theoretical, and human theory is inconceivable without certain “practical” repercussions, i.e. thought tending towards realization within co-ordinates of a particular place and time (D. Grlić). Praxis is a word, like ‘human theory,’ that refers to any social activity (including ‘poiesis’ and theoretical knowledge), which are distinguished by a legitimate process of abstraction from relationships with nature and the material world.

... And it is here that planning and research have lessons to learn from studying it. The question, ‘What does it mean to research?’ remains open.

The analogy to archaeological research is well suited for our praxis, which finds kinship with Foucault’s definition of archaeology as a “discursive formation [of] multiple dissensions [whose] purpose it is to map a particular discursive practice.” Or, Rilke’s vision of space as Weltinnenraum in which everything communicates with everything else.
1. An Objective: the lens bringing the object to a focus. Desire for what is objective, inextricably the direction of historic and contemporary particulars.

It is understood that historic and contemporary particulars may mean a thing or things as well as an event or a chain of events: i.e.

- the shape of oak leaves,
- the performance of Bach's Matthew Passion in Leipzig and the rise of metallurgical plants in Siberia.

Omission of names is prompted by the historical method: ‘Then for [eleven] reigns there was no literary production.’ because there was neither consciousness of the ‘objectively perfect’ nor an interest in clear or vital particulars. Nothing neither a new object nor the stripping of an old to the light — was ‘aimed at.’ Strabismus may be a topic of interest between two strabismics; those who see straight look away.
a) New models / formations

C18th
Complex tonal system (Rameau).
Combinatory model of thought (Leibniz, Condillac, etc.).
Rules for exchanging merchandise and 'fair' contracts, based on equivalences of goods and property.

C20th
The everyday (functionized and structured work — home and private life — leisure).
The 'world of the image' (radio and television; the world as performance.
The 'world of objects':
the perfect system of the modern era.
Technological advancement.

C21st
Virtuosity
Immaterial production / labor;
Lean companies, organized in networks or by projects;
renovation;
Commonplaces
2. SETTINGS

“...the ‘poetics’ of space is either allied with social practice or dissociated from it. Appropriation of palpable reality; in other words, is always a social fact, an aspect of praxis that gets confused with the forms, functions and structures of daily life. The socialization of individual space corresponds to the individualization of social space.”

The [setting] is an appropriated, and thus ‘socialized’ space, within a broader context of open groups and multiple social / aesthetic formations.

‘Settings’ are a way of thinking, where the self opens to the outside, producing a special social space where no single language of truth is prevalent. ‘Settings’ are a sort of dialogue that have their own dynamics, always surprising the participants.... ‘Settings’ succeed as a play-like structure, and involve a certain practice on how to keep yourself in a permanent state of awareness and change (flexibility). There’s nothing specific to be achieved in a setting. A ‘setting’ is a modality of movement. ...The construction and consolidation of the setting supposes: a division of labor corresponding with a practice of analytical reason, self-regulation and information.

SETTINGS
These systems of formation must not be taken as blocks of immobility, static forms that are imposed on discourse from the outside—defining its characteristics and possibilities. They are not constraints, formed at the level of institutions, but a [context] that transcribes itself on the surface of discourse by force in social or economic relations. ... By system of formation, then, I mean a complex group of relations in a particular discursive practice for such and such a concept to be used, for such and such a strategy to be organized. To define a system of formation in its specific individuality is to characterize a discourse or a group of statements that arise from praxis, outlining a system of rules that must be put into operation if such and such an object is to be transformed, for such and such strategy to be modified—-it also outlines a system that puts into operation other discourses, other practices, in institutions, in social relations that constitute a new object.

A discursive formation, then, does not play the role of a figure that arrests time; it determines a regularity proper to temporal processes; it presents the principle of articulation between a series of discursive events and processes. It is not an atemporal form, but a schema of correspondence between several temporal series.
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“Described,” in Das Kapital

The material and spiritual conditions for resolving antagonism,
cannot proceed along
a series of 8 red planes,
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ELEVENTH PRELUDE

To Kostas Axelos

Sometimes the use of discourse to heighten awareness of conflicts does not help to supersede them, but simply makes them worse. The solution is to be found in praxis. If techniques were improved and better adapted to practical use — that is, to praxis — then perhaps the conditions for spontaneous vitality could be reconstituted.

Whatever we can formulate as thought has been made into a reality “for us” by praxis, and it is therefore not the action of some kind of independent and externalized consciousness which internalizes it; it has been transformed into consciousness by praxis and the movement of praxis.

4. FIGURES

The provisional event is treated as a step in an unbroken horizontal process; in the figural system, the interpretation is always sought from elsewhere; events are concealed, not in their unbroken relation to one another, but premised by an event not yet present.

...The figure is the unrealized condition that limits and completes an event.

It is this [relation] that forms the outline of praxis.
AN APPROACH TO CULTURE AND LANGUAGE

Fig. 1a  Synchronic model of structure

Fig. 1b  Discourse-centered model of cultural whole