LIVING WITHIN MULTIMANIFESTATIONS

by

Edward K. Brown II

Today's societies are either a by-product of, or are aspiring towards modern theory and methodology. The societies who are a by-product of modernism have exhausted their intellectual resources; they face the postmodern dilemma of having manipulated every last aspect of life. There are fewer myths from which to draw—fewer truths to conjure. The postmodernist society lives in a continuous series of developed revelations. They have hit a glass ceiling, the present, and are trying to get themselves back to the floor: to the past, or beyond the present.

Those societies who aspire towards modernity desire to eschew this postmodern dilemma: the traits which have stripped their present person-*hood* and fastened their multifaceted intellect to a singular present. However, for these societies, their modern future is dependent upon pomo-surrogacy and support. Today, both kinds of societies wonder what can be done with modern truth and postmodern revelation. What method of thought may or can be utilized to create a paradigm which links the past with the present with the future? The answer lives not in technology; the answer rests in *logisms*.

A logism is a comparative theory, a paradigm which is used to assess society as well as the communities that are a composite thereof. By manipulating the logism, a truth is formulated about a previous theory be the theory traditional, philosophical, democratic, or psychological in nature. Being that every individual in a community is taught a logism, it would follow that in teaching a logism, another must be replaced or manipulated away so to incorporate, develop an accepted "truth."

As mentioned above, intellectual resources have become more scare, have be-come a commodity, so what exists? What exists are evolved logisms that are transformed.

These transformed logisms, *translogisms*, include the initial logism, but through necessity have adopted another logism, in some cases several. Evolving translogisms allows the individual to trek objectively from the past to present to the future. The truth will no longer need to be developed, nor its ramifications revealed because the truth is "upgraded," not hegemonically, but hermeneutically: individually, not collectively.

This essay introduces the translogism *persona art*: the traditional, philosophical, democratic psychology; i.e. the making and maintaining of perception through impressionism and expressionism via mnemonics and intent. *Familiology*, the logism as process and practice, will also be discussed. This essay will map the process and practice indigenous to every individual, and will do so by evolving the protagonist/antagonist construct. The focus of this essay, l*iving within multimanifestations,* is to show how oxymoronic paradoxes are inherent in individuals, communities and societies, and how these composites are derived from similar differences.

PERSONA ART: Differentiating Intellectual Similarities

Persona art is an aesthetic interdisciplinary approach to cultural studies as well as a paradigm for understanding an individual's processes and practices. Persona art delves into intellectual evolutions by arranging perceptions into a flexible archetype(s) as opposed to a rigid stereotype(s). The archetype(s) consists of four aspects: tradition, philosophy, democracy, and psychology. Each aspect is embodied, linked to the other through an a priori/a posteriori (cause and effect/effect to cause) relationship.

The first aspect, tradition, stems from hereditary circumstances be they genetic and/or socio-economic. Tradition is the initial structure of the archetype. Philosophy, the second aspect, pertains to spirituality be it theist, atheist, or agnostic. The philosophical is germane because it shapes the archetype's ethics and mores. From this shaping extends interests and opinions, or beliefs. These beliefs are professed polemically in democracy, the third aspect.

The content of the first three aspects reverberate in the fourth aspect, psychology, which extracts from the catharsis ideas, meaning prompting responses/reactions.

How well the aspects interact affect how the archetype evolves. A singular aspect developed leads to a subjective distortion of a priori and a posteriori relationships. The four aspects, operating evenly, allow for an objective deconstruction and/or reconstruction; however, an external and internal evaluation must be included in order to move beyond basic analysis. This external/internal duplicity appears in traits: the lexical and stipulative (the impressionistic and expressionistic).

Each aspect has two traits. The lexical trait is synonymous with the impressionistic or external. The stipulative trait is synonymous with the expressionistic, or internal. From the lexical stems the a priori--cause and effect. Conversely, a posteriori, effect to cause, stems from the stipulative. Each trait is sublimated by facets: a permutation of mnemonic and intent. For the lexical, the facet prompts the mnemonic before intent. For the stipulative, the facet prompts intent before mnemonic.

The mnemonic, like an icon, is used for recollection. The mnemonic facet dominates the lexical trait, and is, therefore, the cause that initiates an effect, or intent. The mnemonic guides reason, reason being the impression, the reason being an evocation. From this evocation comes a skew of reality. Intent is an explanation, justification, or rationalization. This facet dominates the stipulative trait, and is therefore, the effect that instigates a cause, or the formulation of a mnemonic. Intent guides meaning, meaning being the expression, the meaning becoming a provocation. From this provocation comes a skew of experience.

Within each aspect, the traits conflict symbiotically with the aspiration for synergy. At this juncture, the skew of reality is compared to the skew of experience. While engaged in conflict, the mnemonic will change; so will intent. If the mnemonic or intent dominates the other, the external and internal are no longer maintained, the impressionistic/expressionistic

skew is not synergistic, thus aspects develop into a crisis (temporal psychosis) for the individual. Here the individual must deal with the conflicting aspects, manage the (archetype in) crisis by finding truths that are evident as revealed to the self. Self-evidence occurs from the *fugues of life* which incorporate facts and values: a (sub)conscious polarization, or *paradoxical continuum*.

The four aspects—tradition, philosophy, democracy, and psychology—strive for self-evidence. Only when the four have achieved *holoneurosis* does the archetype become natural to the persona, thus becoming a definitive archetype. Meanwhile, other archetypes within the persona attempt to become definitive. The most resilient archetype(s) compose the persona and are presented to the community. Individuals (personae) confront each other to test resiliency. These confrontations are not of a protagonist versus antagonist construct, but of comparative-competitive-reflective relationships: archetype(s) versus community/society versus persona(e).

On the whole, the paradigm persona art collects the implementation, collects the progression of moments and events so that topical discussions can be anodynamic in edification, transcending time just as water molecules are extracted from the earth developed into clouds, to produce rain, to fertilize the land once more—again, and again.

FAMILIOLOGY: Representing Persona Art

Familiology is the process and practice of identifying logisms. The primary source of identification is language. Language makes the statement. Stylized language is referred to as rhetoric. Rhetoric is form. Form is the semantics (semiotics) for which people can relate and respond. In and of itself, familiology, is an embedded logism composed of stereotype(s). The stereotype is to familiology what the archetype is to the persona. Since the stereotype is parallel to the archetype, then language is parallel to the aspects, and form to the traits. If

persona art is a paradigm of "natural" perspective, what perspective does familiology main-tain?   One of unnaturalness???   As mentioned previously, familiology is the process and practice of logisms. Logisms are linked to a heritage. Hence, familiology is the paradigm of individualized heritage.

The individual uses language in a (rhetorical) form to describe a stereotype, which was derived from the heritage. The individual appropriates what is "familiar", and formulates rhetoric into a language for intrinsic representation to establish identity. Therefore, the self-perpetuation of heritage is the process and practice of familiology. A pitfall is if the individual becomes complacent with language without further perpetuation of rhetoric. This is not condemnable, however, the stereotype of the heritage is unable to be reformulated, to free itself from the rhetoric. The resiliency of the stereotype is tested in a confrontational construct: stereotype versus community/society versus familiology (i.e. what is familiar). If enough people are familiar with the stereotype, then the logism that identifies the stereotype becomes static within a subjective production that is shared by the community. This stasis is nurtured, is passed on, into the fluidity of the next generation. Thus familiology is as tansient as time, but does not transcend time.

Familiology is not an attempt to exceed the fruition of persona art. Familiology is for those who do not appreciate aesthetically, but for those who appreciate a nostalgic enhancement of identity.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of *living within multimanifestations* is to share paradigms that allow for a collective understanding of multicultural issues. Currently, objective critical theory is diminish-ing because of subjective politics and punditry by discriminating artists/theorists who are grasping/holding dearly onto their opinions and beliefs, onto interpretations concerning the

environment and territory, of space in relation to place. This fear is based on the idea that their processes and practices are in jeopardy of being lost. Thus, it is imperative for paradigms to meld objective and subjective viewpoints. In doing so, neither will be diminished, but sent on their way towards their respective future.