

The Preservation of Fallibility in the Household & Contemporary Art

by Edward K. Brown II

Mannerisms—the formulation of *modus operandi* systems (MOS), the reinforcement of expression cast by cognizance, by impressions of knowledge—are manifested synergistically or symbiotically in the shifts in the imitative exchanges between individual behavior-cognition within a peer group. Founded upon laurels (rites of passage) introduced by heritage, mannerisms perpetuate equivocate the surrounding environment and tectonic territories. Heritage controls what is considered to be spiritual and meaningful to an individual and/or peer group, and serve as the rudiment to the standards or attitudes, which predicate the laurels perfection and beauty. Standards and attitudes are set by inciting the individual and/or peer group to compete for laurels. This incitement is a competition for the freedom to act upon heritage. Competition for freedom is the championing of flawlessness which by *de facto* or *de jure* constitution declares a hegemony that determines the manner in which relations are to be conducted, determines what is to be mainstream and marginal behavior-cognition during the time of occupancy in a particular space. While there are ominous conflagrations throughout society concerning the appropriation of perfection and attention given to beauty, there are no more or less mannerist situations than in the household and contemporary art.

II

A household is composed of person(s) in a familial or cordial place of assemblage. The constant is that there is a MOS, either explicit or implicit, that is believed to be perfect or thought to display the qualities of beauty. The household MOS procreates and nurtures indigenous identity into a heritage, into a mannerism that is considered to be human: infallible spirituality and meaning textualized within that particular open space now closed. The procreation and nurturing of space into place is what is at the foundation of a spatio-temporal

flawless inhabitation: the duration of a heritage perpetuated freely by experidylic (an ideal experience) or mythic circumscription. A household, then, is defined as the refinement of time and space into time and place--encased freedom, as one sees infallibility fit.

Familially, the household is parriarchal. A symbiotic order of knowledge—relative hegemonic laurels of cohabitation and perspectives of freedom—is established. In this place, what *can* and *may* be perpetrated in the household are signified. The *can* is typed by behavior-cognition that does not respect the laurels of the relative hegemony; what *can* honors are self-prescribed (free) actions taken. The *may* is qualified as conventional behavior-cognition, that which is permitted by the parriarchy: those acts iterated as prescribed logisms by an impressive authority who designates by example the manner in which to behave and think. The *can* is marginalized intentionally, oppressed so that the *may* becomes the standard of perfection to be observed. As a consequence, spirituality and meaning become institutionalized into an archetype so to initiate control over equivocation between *can* and *may* behavior and cognition. A cognitive growth process, as arranged by the parriarchy, is engaged. Once learning the mannerisms associated with the household as a cultural state of becoming, the familial member is responsible for the maintenance of one's own (MOS) being. If the member submits to and practices the heritage in the familial perspective of *may* (cohabitative, prescriptive rules), then the member will begin to constitute a "flawless" knowledge of free will, of what is humanly infallible in the eyes of the parriarchy.

The member's mannerisms will become routine and will be thought of, by the family, as proper behavior-cognition set in place. With an air of infallibility, the member, proceeding from the territorialized place to the environmental space, will partake in relationships with others. Using the established archetype developed in the familial household, the member seeks to gain relative-like acknowledgment. What the member seeks is likeness from cordial exchanges; however, this seeker of practicality could be greeted by a behavior-cognition that is contrary to the perceived rule of cohabitation. In open space, the possibil-

ity of encountering unfamiliar freedoms is increased. According to the parriarchal hegemony/infallible household, these close encounters are cordial offerings to be greeted warily. These offerings are to be envisioned as conflicting heritages. In comparison to the member's manneristic perspectives, the cordiality, in relation to the familiarity, is considered to be explicitly inappropriate behavior-cognition, and therefore *humanoid*.

In this scene, the malapropos behavior-cognition of the humanoid will be challenged so the familial member is able to discern spirituality and meaning from this paraconscious encounter, so to understand the rudiments of this being's mannerisms. To discern the implicit MOS, cordial meetings begin with a dialectic. By doing so, mannerisms are perceived and observed. From the dialectic, what is illegal or alien conduct is defined: . The illegal-*can* behavior-cognition obstructs the free will of another, that which has been expunged from perspective; the alien-*may* behavior-cognition is foreign to the observer, but does not come into direct conflict with constituted free will. The challenge is to determine parriarchal tendencies, as well as to discover the paradigms of hegemony. Yet within this space in time, what is a familial-*can* has the potential to become assimilated as a cordial-*may*, that is if the bantering members are willing to mentally mature, to transcend their explicit archetypes into a laurel steeped in implicitness. If the cordial conception is aborted, the non-relative scenario is replaced with a familial setting, with what is considered to be proper. From this opposition, competition for laurels would ensue. Notwithstanding, facing the illegal and alien, and having this opportune moment in time and the space in which to roam, the member has the opportunity to search for a perspective of spirituality and meaning that will temporarily marginalize familial-*may*. Taking the opportunity would allow oppressed self-prescribed acts to develop at least a cordial sense of perfection and beauty. The member will conceive of an aesthetic and metaphor specific to the assimilation of *can*, decognifying the parriarchy to produce a homeosis of identity—an assimilation into a cordial household.

Founded upon paraconscious acculturation of dialectic habitation, the cordial household is homearchal. With the combined efforts of its members in a nebulous form of leadership, the differential between the explicit and implicit is given greater behavioral-cognitive latitude than that of a parriarchal hegemony. A comfort level of infallibility is distinguished, developing an atmosphere for grouping. As each member ascertains the peer group's holoneurosis (mindset), the stress brought about by the conditions concerning the replacement of parriarchal spirituality and meaning with aesthetic and metaphor is diffused. In the attempt to circumvent such standards, the homearchy decides how the equivocality between environment and territory (*can* and *may*) will be integrated into the membership's MOS: a contemplation of humanist social or antisocial mannerisms based upon a political state of being. Familial-*can* standards are contrived into cordial-*may* attitudes. Such a decision is based upon the behaviorisms-cognitivity amongst the wills of the membership. If the household wishes to maintain their contrivance of freedom, the homearchy must continuously collaborate to create an influence over its membership, thereby arranging a synergistic network of knowledge. What is popular amongst the membership is given laurels and is perceived to be infallible. As a result, the hegemony allots an environment for each member to develop the paraconsciousness into a self-prescribed archetype. By the group retaining a "*can do*" attitude, the territory will become a more supportive place.

III

Friction between the households develops when there is an encroachment of standards or attitudes into the opposing prescription: the permissive/submissive "*may do*" order versus the collaborative/supportive "*can do*" network. The order and network begin to compete for freedom of expression. This competition for freedom between the famillogist and cordialist is over perceived belonging. The households perceive the other as possessing mannerist idiosyncrasies that restrict the formulation of conventional perfection and beauty.

The patriarchy and homearchy—each stigmatizes the other as incompetent, flawed, and must either prove how their laurels are neither illegal, nor alien, or prove how the other's are, or find the wherewithal in time and place/space to endure the disagreeable spirituality and meaning: i.e. wait for the opposing household to erode culturally, hegemonically phase out.

When a member fluctuates between familiarity and cordiality, there is a variance of perspectives concerning perfection and beauty. The variance is based upon the autonomy of *can* in relation to *may*. Yet beyond this environmental and territorial temperament, spontaneously or intentionally, illegal/alien hegemonies inundate the household through multi-media: television, books, the Internet, the Arts, etc. From the inundation of various (foreign) hegemonies, the member is dumbstruck as to how to comprehend the encroaching humanoid mannerisms. In such fluxing situations, a temporal psychosis transpires. Mannerist idiosyncrasies display to the member the pros and cons of personal MOS pursuits and the heritage that configure infallibility. Such a display reveals flaws, thus leading towards a breakdown, if not a re-evaluation of standards/attitudes and/or laurels.

The member's MOS of cohabitation and popularity is warped. Without a self-controlled referential of environment and territory, the member becomes inhibited by the presence of another's perspective of what a humane household is. Spirituality, meaning and the associated freedoms are stunted; the necessary structure to protect the member's perspectives has proven to be imperfect, fallible in comparison to the "idiosyncratic" stature of the "humanoid's" heritage. The realization of the inability to compete at a knowledgeable level that champions the encroaching hegemony becomes apparent. The fallible member must inquire (or be told) what the *can* and *may* MOS of this household is, and what the mannerisms accustomed to time and space/place (environment/territory) are, recycling spirituality and meaning, stabilizing the aesthetic and metaphor, thus truncating the "oid" from human.

The moral then is that fallibility comes from an imposing impression on knowledge

that leads to a disruption in the expression of behavior-cognizance and the perspective of reality. The member either remains in the newly established structure and accepts the customary explicit and implicit hegemony, or the member moves (or is excommunicated) from the household to re-establish a perfect sensibility elsewhere. In any situation where there is not an appreciation of the new custom, the ex-member conspires (sub)consciously to find others who have similar perspectives so to continue the struggle against and challenge the encroaching impressive freedom. An alternative--the ex-member, on (forced) sabbatical, could find solace and beauty in solitary confinement, a hermitage where one *may* and *can* be as well as become re-established--receive a make over, neo-structuralize one's perspective of self minus contact with oppressive or influential hegemonies.

In any movement for the establishment of a cohabitative or popular household, fallibility is transformed into an archetype that exhibits stature, one of (self)prescribed perfection and beauty. Such exhibitions of fallibility spur movements in contemporary art. These movements are contingent upon the use of historicisms generated by familial hegemony to decrease the transformation of manner, or upon the use of criticisms produced by cordial hegemony to describe the transformations from one manner to the next--each giving credence to a MOS.

IV

When considering contemporary art, the historian is concerned with the ubiquity of impressions and the lineage of those impressions: explicit notions of what and with whom the artist has studied; an event in which mannerism has had dominance over the artist's work; how the artwork incorporates and communicates the content that is exemplary of the public/society during that particular period of time in that place, those perspectives that became a MOS as a result of the changing or static laurels of cohabitation; and how that

same MOS is incorporated and communicated at a similar level of infallibility in the present. The historian's discussion emphasizes familialisms, focussed on the archetypes of perfection designated as heritage: where territory is of greater concern than the environment. The discussion, from a historical perspective, develops linear relationships with the ubiquity of impressions transpired, and the steps (tasks) that were necessary to compete. The discussion moves towards the present universal validation of those occasions that have led to the nurtured freedom, to the cultural state of becoming, to the heritage that beholds the present cohabitative standard of living practiced.

In the cordial approach to contemporary art, the critic advances manner by considering the environment in lieu of the territory. This implicit approach focuses on the quintessence of expressions by revealing the artist's behavior-cognition through the production of a MOS: the context of synthesizing manner from conditions. The critic analyses the manner of the artwork as a manifestation of a political state of being. Learning about the artist and the artwork through permutations of the archetype in apposition with the rest of society, anecdotal relationships with(in) time and space are considered: occurrences before, during, and after the moment. The competition for freedom, the nature of conditions as anticipated and strung to sudden expressions demarcated by the artist/artwork's (anti)social aesthetic is the critic's interpretation of the chaordic. The critic theorizes on the artist/artwork's ability to encapsulate spirituality as it enfolds the ability, to create an expression of quintessence that produces a universal validity which brings about a newfangled level of infallibility. Meaning is given to a heritage that offers a comfort zone for (homeotic) living; serving as an argument for integration into the populous. A statement as to the (un)popularity of the artist's manner, regarding a process of portraying life, is the onus of the critic.

The fluctuation in contemporary art between familiality and cordiality between describing the explicit and implicit is what seals the artist's work in a paradox: a place of mannerist space. Nevertheless, as mannerisms are enclosed and fortified in behaviorisms-

cognitivity, thus making the art less susceptible to temporal psychoses and hypercriticism. As these expressions and impressions are interpreted (transformed) from an indignity into a heritage, behavior and cognitivity are removed from its idiosyncratic inklings and immersed within a contemporary logic: (in)fused (in)fallibility (in)to manner. What results is a curatorium of ubiquitous and of quintessential memory housed in a hermitage of competency: an occupancy that ensures the understanding of "reality."

A curated hermitage, (in this case a museum) filled with newly acquired and well-seasoned artworks, has modified the perspective of transformation to ensure their preservation represents the manner of an imposed hegemony. The importance given to the artwork by the museum and reviewed by the historian/critic affects how apprentices and fledgling viewers circulate the knowledge, the practice and practice of modeling a role of flawlessness. As for the craftsman and connoisseur whose livelihood relies upon the validation of their recycling acts of preservation, an extension of the museum's modes of cohabitation and popularity is presented in a skilled balance between manners of complicity and caprice, in accordance to a historian/critic. However, those who dissent are artists who oppose not only the semiosis of the historian/critic's archetypal structure, but also the imposition of the curator, representing the museo-infallibility.

For artists charge that the revered hegemony and its contingent de facto/de jure constitution of the historian/critic is a dysfunctional declaration whose laurels rest on a MOS that does not allow enough space for at least the competition of freedom. This household, claims the artist, in the present manner in which it is run, is an oppressive facilitator of creativity. The "homeless" artist questions the validity of the museum by contending that there are multiple MOS perspectives that are not recognized, that are ubiquitous and quintessential. At the same time, even if the museum provides an "open" environment, the artist realizes the wait is considerable for the historians and critics to formulate a transformation of space into place within the modes of cohabitation and popularity for an artwork that is presently

considered to be alien and illegal. In the meanwhile, the artist continues to work and argues for the transformative content and context encased in his/her perspective of time/place and space, continuing to build a familial or cordial household in the literal and/or figurative likeness of selfhood.

Conversely, what is in question is the suitability of the literal and/or figurative modifications offered by the artist. The heritage of literalism and/or figuratism, is either fallible or infallible depending on who is doing the interpreting. Thus any knowledge, especially an artistic one, tends to be a paradox: idiosyncratically (in)fallible. Once again, perspective depends upon imposed/established *may* and *can* values/laurels, be the household patriarchal or homearchal, private or public, individual or peer group-based.

With a pluralized diversity of households, it is no wonder that there is a distrust of hegemonic validation as well as that of the artisan who champions (imposes) the knowledge. Such skepticism is prevalent because there is some form of territorial freedom involved; plus, the contingencies that assisted in the construction of the MOS could be misrepresentative, leading one afoul. (In)fallibility is suspect because of its idiosyncratic tendencies. The structure raises issues concerning expression of standards and attitudes in the spatio-temporal continuum. These issues regarding how reality not only affects the hermitage (household,) but also its multiplicity, the vicinage (neighborhood) are scrutinized and processed by relative and social tendencies. As the competition for stature and historical/critical transformation, residential (semiotic) disparity of freedom will serve as the antithesis of perfection and beauty, instituting orders and networks of cognition and behavior, preserving fallibility.

"The Preservation of Fallibility in the Household and Contemporary Art" was presented in the [Social Theory and Semiotics](#) workshop at the Crossroads in Cultural Studies—International Conference held in Tampere, Finland: July 1-4, 1996.

REFERENCES:

1. Boher, Karl Heinz. "Utopia of the Moment and Fictionality: The Subjectivization of Time in Modern Literature," Suddenness: On the Moment of Aesthetic Appearance. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994, pp. 197-245.
2. Bracher, Mark. "Editor's Introduction: Why a Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society?" Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society. Volume 1, Number 1; New York: Critical Press, Spring 1996, pp. 1-13.
3. Donnelly, Jack. "Twentieth-Century Realism," Traditions of International Ethics. Terry Nardin and David R. Mapel eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, pp. 85-111.
4. Evans, T.M.S. Two Kinds of Rationality: Kibbutz Democracy and Generational Conflict. Contradictions of Modernity, Volume 3; Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, 1995.
5. Frankfurt, Harry G. "Freedom of the Will and the Concept of a Person," The Importance of What We Care About. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 11-25.
6. Hock, Dee W. "The Chaordic Organization: Out of Control and into Order," World Business Academy Perspectives, Vol. 9, No. 1. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 1995, pp. 5-18.
7. Vilder, Anthony. The Architectural Uncanny. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.