The philosophical mediocrity of IT to date relates to a 'disappearance act': namely the problem of how to square *thought* and *extension* (Spinoza). It re-emerges, however, when we consider the *impact* and *ethics* of video-conferencing in a hybrid *spatial* context, called the *learning theatre*.

That is an arrangement similar to the *floor* and *stage* in a *theatre*, but with video-conferencing as the "floor" (the "stage" being the class-room). Part of the impact/ethics resides in the participants *being heard*, and *hearing* each other. The other part lies in swapping who is "onstage" and the "floor".

The reason that we call this a 'design' is that it is expected to *programme for solutions* (the class-work). It is expected that the *substantial* correspond-ence between thought and extension emerging from the *portfolio* work we do, will *transpose* unto *freedom* as an *attribute* with multiple modes in class.

What would Karl Gerstner's idea of *programming* entail if applied in a *mixed media* design where what can hope for/expect is **a)** a sense of *augmented reality* in the class-room [aspect related to *impact*]; **b)** a sense of being *heard* amongst those in the remote-connect mode [*ethics* related aspect].

This is *where* we want to be, or where we are when we have effectively placed ourselves in the targeted home-area, homing in *what* we want to achieve (cf, *isomorphosis*): not with the media but a *specific* subject/project. In the language of *precisation* these operations from the target area are T_2.

How to move oneself unto an the operational locus, is the subject matter of T_1. What sets T_1 in motion is the *consistency* articulating jointly the content and the container. This consistency is only possible within *specific* settings. It is such a *setting* that we seek to achieve by working with *sound* in Zoom.

That is, not with *Zoom* in and for itself—as an *isolate*—but as *one* mode of convening conjugated with a *different* mode of convening (in *architectural* space). This compound is called a 'learning theatre'. The learning theatre is therefore *neither* a virtual *nor* an actual space. But a space of *programming*.

The learning theatre does *not* solve any problem, but *programmes for solutions*. So, let us call it T_3, which is the specific condition for moving from T_1 to T_2. This third level is defined as a [transposition](). The terms of the transposition T_3—that is, T_1 and T_2—do *not* compare and T_3 is *non*-mimetic.

The compound of T_1, T_2 and T_3 is a hetero-structural *conglomerate* which is *generative*: that is, productive/receptive of the attribute of *freedom*. This attribute is *not* a human given. It is born out of the reality that T_1 and T_2 are one in *substance*. It is achieved in the human realm at the price of *exertion*.

This exertion lies in the triangulation of T_1, T_2 and T_3—a conglomerate of *non*-same elements that are ontologically *discrete*: their unity therefore comes through in the *aesthetico-epistemic operations* of this triangular exertion, where *nothing* can be assumed to be similar between the *three*.

In this Spinozist take on Arne Næss' *precisation*—where 'precisation as programming' is *transposition* (T_3)—freedom is absolutely *necessary*, yet *not* a human given. This is why the present attempt has been proposed as a critique of fascism. That is, critique as the idea *and* event of [criticality]().

If 'freedom' is here defined as being *indigenous on non-mimetic terms*, the human exertion needed for it to emerge in the human realm—as an expanded *natural* affordance—follows the logic of an avalanche, or an earthquake: crossed a critical threshold new *repertoires* will hatch.

This is why the concept of the 'learning theatre' is apt to evoke and hatch the kind of *crowd*-sourcing where *individuals* are *accommodated* in a type of process that is largely *transpersonal*. Of the repertoires they hatch all of them will be *new*, but *none* of them similar. Yet, profoundly *indigenous*.