Fig. 1—Bjørn Blikstad, *Selfhood* (N. Selvskap), 2023. Exhibited at the Oslo National Academy of the Arts [KHiO]. The categories **1)** *same*; **2)** *similar*; **3)** *different* and **4)** *other* are inserted by ThB in order to explore the bimodal affordance (which is resident *neither* of the image of the patterns in gesso/gold *nor* in the *text* elements each apart). These categories are Mediaeval, but here considered here as a variation on mathematician Felix Klein's group (a *term*, its *opposite* and their *inversions*). The reconfiguration derives from the question: what happens when we expand from the *ego*—the modern reflective mind—to the *self*, and move from a the transposition of the group according to the modern mind, to its outer edge (unto the self)? In sum: does the reflective capacity of the mind *transpose* unto a new/fresh reflective capacity when projected and expanded by *bimodal* mediation?

§ 0—Media information literacy ([MIL])—according to the UNESCO, one of the major educational targets of our time—constitutes an adequate framework for addressing the new learning repertoires that are likely to hatch with *bimodal* text and image [search]. When addressed at the level of *infrastructure* at the National Library of Norway (NLN), the corollary framework to level with such an infrastructure is *national education*. More precisely the national framework for lifelong learning in **MIL**. *Thesis*: to get somewhere with extending a bimodal search infrastructure to **MIL**—based on big data (NLN)— we need to focus on *editorial learning*.

Editorial learning can be defined as the body of learning generated from editorial practices, extending from prompting [search-apps]. Here, text-and-image *combined* feed the development of complex search-strategy, in the learning-community (hereby defined as the [usership]). Where *writing* fed authorships in modern learning-systems, even high-grade syntheses (e.g. this handout) result from *devised harvesting* (rather than authoring). In the same editorial vein: where, in the past, exhaustive *reading* fed education at all levels of modern education, *predictive mining* swirl in the wake of bimodal search (feeding back *and* forward).

MIL features a new cognitive learning style, in which *compressing* and *computing* relieve writing and reading, in a compound *editorial practice* which is more unified—than writing and reading—because this practice is part of digital usership (it is ubiquitous): it is something that everyone can do, within the reach of general education, and there is not an implicit hierarchy between harvesting and mining, to the same extent as has been the case between writing and reading: the one requiring special/sanctioned talent to be published, the other left to our own means and highly variable talents: as readers we are not expected to excel in the same way as with writing (that is, the writing worthy of publication). While **MIL** is projective.

Fig. 2—Though the *projective* capacity of the embodied mind is well known (from psychoanalysis to airport literature) it is still *hidden in plain sight*. An attempts at materialising them in spatiotemporal relations feature in Bjørn Blikstad's two-tiered installation, resulting from the combination of *two* different works: **1)** *Taweret* to the left; **2)** one of three element in the Selfhood (N. *Selvskap*) series. Taweret (hippo-crocodile-lioness mother hybrid] has no navel. She connects through projection.

We still read and write. And there is nothing indicating that **MIL**—as a new learning repertoire—is better than the progressive modernist model of learning. Rather, it adds a repertoire: it is simply, and in many ways, *different*. And it comes from the editorial practices breaking through and making claims, based on skills that previously were not generally supported, but confined to more modest/invisible professional careers in the publishing business. While what has presently been surfacing for a number of years, is that writing and reading are incorporated into *editorial* practices. What can be achieved by *educating* these? What does education mean in the **MIL** framework? What kind of educational framework would be warranted? What kind of schooling/crowdsourcing practice would be needed if we moved in this direction? Hence the next thesis.

§ 1—The *learning theatre* (LT) constitutes a framework for the development of MIL. It is dedicated to the

development of learning habits based on bimodal *harvesting* and *-mining*. These learning habits are acquired by keeping logbooks that are based on the *equivalence* between images and writing as learning vessels, yet producing a new level of mediation emerging from their *difference* when combined. *Thesis*: this new level of mediation is *indexical*, in the sense of relating predictively to facts and acts: by anticipation that may be either falsified or lead to discovery. The mediation itself is *fictional* (i.e. it is marked by discovery/falsification) in the sense that it is conjured by a *repertoire* of interactive/intra-active mediations.

The present challenge is to bring together *different* audiences into the LT: since as surely as the new gene-rations regularly are considered ignorant by the old-timers, the old-timers do not have impressive **MIL**-repertoires. The latter may have *acquired* fragments of such repertoires, as members of the contemporary society, but have not taken into *possession*: which means that these repertoires are around, and active up to a degree, but not part of public matter (*res publica*)—e.g., by being considered as relevant for publica-tion. The LT features an experimental and conversational arena where bimodal mediations are explored.

But not only explored: they are also published. That is, objects that are caught up in bimodal mediation, are transformed into *media*—on a mundane arena as the learning theatre (LT)—and become public matter after they have been presented and discussed in the LT, and coded experimentally into APA 7th referencing.These are included among the references to books, films, sound-tracks, catalogues, personal communications that already exist in APA 7th referencing. And by doing so establishing a critical practice as something actionable, that intervenes directly with public matter but also bringing media out of the closet of privacy.

In the LT the *quotidian* working-habit of note-taking—and keeping a logbook—meets the *mundane* arena of an *optical projective* device: a goose-neck with an iPAD at one end, a projector and a screen at the other end. Alongside: two facing rows of chairs similar to the British/Canadian parliaments. The combination of the two—the quotidian and the mundane—hosts the *public* and *private* as categories we wish to compre-hend. The mundane, the quotidian, the public and the private. The mundane and and quotidian are thereby brought to hold the private and public: and the private and public, in turn, are held. Thus, another *thesis*:

§ 2—Though the public and private are commonly conceived as holding-categories, they are *not*. The private and public are *held* by the quotidian (day-to-day working habits/tasks) and the mundane (arenas that are occasional, rather than daily, in which encounter may/not occur). The *tasks* and *occasions* featuring the possibility of *encounter* takes place in a particular *time-zone*: between the short- and long-term, the meantime. It is the realm of possibility: for objects to come out as media, caught in the dual mediation of encounters, as happens when tasks and occasions operate according to the bimodal principle.

Hence the bimodal principle can operate between/within text-and-image, but also between/within tasks and occasions. Which means that what we are looking for in the educational framework of **MIL** in the LT, are

"Either-or categories help making choices, but the symbols' lure of true honest representation, can transport You into the dichotomy. Remembering that there always is a Witness (e.g.: You/I) to any choice of any either/or category suddenly makes it dynamic, and the need for overcomplication is not necessary. The witness, which always will be within a different dimension of existence to the symbol, transforms the either/or because the witness itself cannot be transformed and reduced into it. It cannot be represented fully. We cannot live inside our own mediation. The terrible thing is that we already know this." (Bjørn Blikstad 2023, p. 123).

encounters of the kind that scale freely in the whole range between the *earth/nature* (the world in aspects that do not belong to us) and *human relationships* (the social world). Which is why the LT is conjointly pledged/tethered not only to artistic research, but also to environmental humanities. However, even though opaquely attracted to each other—for good reasons, or the world as it is—there is still some distance to cover/articulate between the two.

The success at articulating the distance is more likely than attempting to cover it. It is to the extent that they do different things—like image and text, tasks and occasions—that they are likely to succeed. They will not succeed if they seek con-sensus, which is likely to conceal hierarchical assumptions between the two, tied respectively to university-academic and art-academic arenas. They are likely to succeed only inasmuch as the interactions between them hatches mediations (or, intra-actions). The challenge of designing hosting strategies that will not only be acceptable to both, but to generate such outcomes, is perhaps the most important as we—from the art-school—seek to develop strategic collaborations with other institutions: clearly not for research isolately, but for the mediations that can only hatch if we adjoin *exhibitive* practices to research. We need not only to compare research, but to exploit the differences.