Here is my Literature/Media rubric that I designed.

Total Points: 100
3 Main Facets for Quality: I. Breadth, II. Depth, III. Consistency
1 Facet for Valence: Grimness

Conglomerate Facets:
  I.   Breadth and Depth combine to make the Ideas superfactor
  II.   Breadth and Consistency combine to make the Enjoyability
        superfactor
  III. Depth and Consistency combine to make the Refinement
        superfactor
  IV.   Depth and Grimness combine to make the Conceptual Maturity
        superfactor

8 Octants:
B+ D+ C+ = Masterpiece
B+ D+ C- = Experimental Work
B+ D- C+ = Blockbuster/Bestseller
B+ D- C- = Amateur Work
B- D+ C+ = Classic
B- D+ C- = Esoterica
B- D- C+ = Comfort Media
B- D- C- = Factory-produced slop

Examples of Works in each octant:
Masterpiece (B+ D+ C+): Dream of Red Chambers
Experimental Work (B+ D+ C-): House of Leaves
Blockbuster/Bestseller (B+ D- C+): Jurassic Park
Amateur Work (B+ D- C-): Tomorrowland
Classic (B- D+ C+): Of Mice and Men
Esoterica (B- D+ C-): Angel Egg (1985)

Comfort Media (B- D- C+): New Girl (2011)
Slop (B- D- C-): Emoji Movie

Shorthand notation of each Octant in this literature/media typology:
Masterpiece: BDC
Experimental Work: BD
Bestseller: BC
Classic: DC
Amateur Work: B
Esoterica: D
Comfort Media: C
Slop: *

Alternate shorthand notation uses two different letters to represent each pole on each dimension:
Breadth: Broad (B) vs. Narrow (N)
Depth: Deep (D) vs. Shallow (S)
Consistency: Consistent (C) vs. Messy (M)

Hence, the eight distinct octants can be also notated as:
Masterpiece: BDC
Experimental Work: BDM
Bestseller: BSC
Amateur Work: BSM
Classic: NDC
Esoterica: NDM
Comfort Media: NSC
Slop: NSM

If we're including the affective valence/happiness dimension, which won't be included in the overall rubric/scoring system itself because, unlike Breadth, Depth, and Consistency, it doesn't objectively affect

quality of the media, the two poles for this fourth valence dimension could be represented by these shorthands:

Happiness: Happy (H) vs. Grim (G)

Then, simply append -H or -G with a dash to the end of the "quality octant" the work/media/literature sits in to represent this fourth, purely valence, dimension.

For instance, "New Girl" (2011) is the quintessential NSC-H (happy Comfort Media). Angel's Egg or Erik Satie's Vexations on the other hand both fall solidly into NDM-G (grim Esoterica).

If we were to come up with an archetypal example for each sedecimant (16-ant) based on these four dimensions (3 of them describing objective quality, the 4th describing valence), we have:

BDC-H (Happy Masterpiece): The Truman Show
BDC-G (Grim Masterpiece): Dream of Red Chambers or Dante's Divine Comedy

BDM-H (Happy Experimental Work): Lord of the Rings
BDM-G (Grim Experimental Work): Donnie Darko

BSC-H (Happy Bestseller/Spectacle): Frozen
BSC-G (Grim Bestseller/Thriller): Hunger Games

BSM-H (Happy Amateur Work): Tomorrowland
BSM-G (Grim Amateur Work): Countdown (2019)

NDC-H (Happy Classic): Pride and Prejudice
NDC-G (Grim Classic): The Man Who Knew Infinity, Your Lie In April, and Wuthering Heights

NDM-H (Happy Esoterica): extremely rare and elusive
NDM-G (Grim Esoterica): Angel's Egg, My Dinner with Andre, or Erik Satie's Vexations, Golden Brown (The Stranglers)

NSC-H (Happy Comfort Media): New Girl (2011)
NSC-G (Grim Comfort Media): The Fault in Our Stars and Class of '09

NSM-H (Happy Slop): Emoji Movie
NSM-G (Grim Slop): The Room

Facet I: Breadth (30 points total)

Subfacet 1-A: Premise (10 points)
Negative Traits: Flawed or hackneyed premise/central concepts, or no rich theoretical premise at all
Positive Traits: Inventive/riveting concepts and brainstorming

Subfacet 1-B: Worldbuilding (10 points)
Negative Traits: Unremarkable setting/exposition, lack of diversity in cast
Positive Traits: Rich and well-defined worldbuilding and setting

Subfacet 1-C: Plot (10 points)
Negative Traits: Predictable events, linear plot
Positive Traits: Original plot devices and twists, rich arcs, branching plot

Facet II: Depth (40 points total)

Subfacet II-A: Characters (10 points total)

Negative Traits: 1-dimensional caricatures, cardboard-thin tropes, hackneyed character dynamics without adding anything new (e.g. black cat and golden retriever couple)
Positive Traits: characters are well distinguished from each other and given well-defined identities via voice/internal monologues, they have complex arcs and develop nontrivially throughout the story, their motivations, personalities, and neuroses are nuanced

Note: Character sub-rubric should be divided into 3 tertiary-level subfacets: (1) Neuroses (4 points), (2) Relationships (3 points), (3) Obfuscation (3 points), for a total of 10 points

Subfacet II-B: Themes (10 points total)
Negative Traits: Paper thin or shoehorned themes, shallow tropes
Positive Traits: Philosophical depth, multilayered and full of gray areas, enhances the audience's worldview

Subfacet II-C: Subtlety (10 points total)
Negative Traits: Too much concrete narration, obviously forced symbolism or metaphors or none at all.
Positive Traits: Follows the "show don't tell" axiom of writing, layered and effective symbolism/metaphors

Subfacet II-D: Social Commentary (10 points total)
Negative Traits: Self-contained and lacks broader political or cultural commentary, or the points made aren't original or are shoehorned in
Positive Traits: Comments on or makes a thoughtful point about the current or past state of the world (in social or political terms)

Facet III: Consistency (30 points total)

Subfacet III-A: Logic (10 points total)

Negative Traits: plotholes, weak suspension of disbelief, continuity errors

Positive Traits: does well at suspending disbelief, characters' actions and events/cause and effect chain makes sense

Subfacet III-B: Chekhov's Gun (5 points total)

Negative Traits: Irrelevant filler padding, arcs that are left unresolved

Positive Traits: Ties up loose ends, no irrelevant/one-time characters or plot points

Subfacet III-C: Pacing (5 points total)

Negative Traits: Plot moves either too fast or too slow, or inconsistent speed

Positive Traits: Well structured narrative, good demarcation into character arcs/timeline of narrative makes sense.

Subfacet-III-D: Execution (10 points total)

Negative Traits: Low-budget, full of/easily noticeable errors/bugs/glitches, jarring to watch

Positive Traits: High quality, high effort, smooth, decently polished

----

Note on Breadth vs. Depth:

In my typology rubric, Breadth is essentially a measure of originality and variety the work offers outwardly, while Depth is a measure of intellectual engagement needed to properly appreciate the work. A work can very much be high Breadth but low Depth - imaginative/inventive premises that lean on the hypothetical or unexplored, rich and well developed worldbuilding and character cast (very detailed and immersive), a variety of plot and character arcs, but ultimately lacking thoughtful development of the characters

themselves or having only paper-thin themes. (e.g. Harry Potter, The Fifth Element, Da Vinci Code, Inside Out). On the other hand, a work can be low Breadth but high Depth - they could be retellings of things that exist or have already happened (a big category is documentaries like The Man who Knew Infinity), and/or have focused scope and a remarkably simple plotline or worldbuilding only containing a few characters (e.g. like Nightcrawler or Of Mice and Men), but require a good amount of intellectual or philosophical reflection to truly appreciate.

In general, in this rubric, Breadth is about the variety and novelty of ideas that are brought to the table, and Depth is about how intellectually and thoughtfully these ideas are explored.

Another notion that I would like to expound on is the notion of Conceptual Maturity (CM), which can range from age 3 to age 21, inclusive, in terms of minimum recommended age to read or consume the media in question. This is much different, and can operate quasi-independently, of conventional Content Maturity (what MPAA uses). Unlike Content Maturity though (which does not relate to any of the 4 dimensions - Breadth, Depth, Consistency, and Happiness in this typology whatsoever), Conceptual Maturity primarily is a function of high Depth and low Happiness (specifically when combined). In my typology notation, this is particularly "xDx-G" (which subsumes BDC-G, BDM-G, NDC-G, and especially NDM-G).

The argument for the espousal of Conceptual Maturity rather than Content Maturity as a framework is that
(1) it humanizes art/media as they deserve, since Conceptual Maturity directly relates to the Depth and Grimness polar ends (which is what

some media try to portray in an artistic way - social commentary of the corrupt and desolate world we live in), while Content Maturity is arbitrary and operates wholly independently of art/media quality and valence.

(2) It can be argued that sometimes, Conceptual Maturity is what makes a piece of literature or media "adult" rather than Content Maturity, at least if we think more long term. Sex, drugs, or concrete violence are all much easier for young people to understand/process than layered satire, political/social commentary, weighty philosophical themes, or character/emotional nuance (especially if paired with neurosis or mental illness). The harm in someone with an underdeveloped cerebral cortex (which implies immature and less abstract/farsighted thinking) either misconstruing the intentions of the work (for example, by kinning or identifying with a protagonist or character that's not meant to be idolized due to the Halo Effect - examples: Lou Bloom or Patrick Bateman) or developing distorted and unhealthy worldviews due to not understanding the notion of unreliable narrators or layered satire/political commentary far outweighs the harm in a teen hearing some dirty joke or a use of the F-word.

To give an example of this framework in action:
Nightcrawler (2014) arguably has much higher conceptual maturity than content maturity, and is rated R despite not having sex scenes or overt violence at all. Indeed, I would categorize Nightcrawler as NDC-G (Grim Classic). The same goes for Wuthering Heights, as yet another NDC-G/BDC-G.
On the other hand, New Girl (2011), the epitome of the NSC-H (Happy Comfort Media) sedecimant, has much lower conceptual maturity than content maturity. The only reason it's rated TV-14 is because of occasional innuendos.

Films with CM = 16-18 should require the viewer to be at least 18 years old to watch or accompanied by a parent or guardian 21 years of age or older (even when accompanied, the minimum age should be 16). films with CM > 18 (19-21) should require the viewer to be at least 21 years old to watch or accompanied by a parent or guardian 25 years of age or older (even if accompanied, the minimum age should be 18) Valid proof of ID should be required.

However, a potential problem with this system if implemented legally is that it might penalize actual young and curious minds that are very mature for their age, and also art might get reduced to cultural capital/proof of prestige and become assimilated indirectly because teens will watch CM21 films anyways without permissions and this will develop into forbidden fruit syndrome. Hence, it is best for the conceptual maturity (CM) framework to stay merely theoretical/as a tool for critique/analysis.

But, as Adorno said, art could be dangerous/harmful to undeveloped and uninitiated minds due to its alienation, dissonance, and inherent grimness/exposure of flaws, hence CM could still be useful that way to be implemented.

Note that again, only the three original dimensions, Breadth, Depth, and Consistency, objectively affect the quality of the media/literature.

Perhaps the scoring system could be made slightly different to align with how the general public or IMDb usually rates films and TV. Instead of a composite score out of 100 for all 3 quality facets (although this will still be used to determine overall broad quality), the score could just be simply the percentage the dimension that the work scores the highest on among all 3 quality dimensions (breadth, depth,

consistency). To distinguish this new metric from the composite score, we will call this the "signature score" of the work.

Example (applied to Donnie Darko):

Movie Review #1 (Donnie Darko)

1. Breadth - 8/10
Although this movie uses several common plot devices/concepts, such as time travel, doomed love, and multiverses, it blends them together in an imaginative and compelling way. A riveting mix of horror and sci-fi, and plot twists such as Gretchen's death and the dance team's final flight are well thought out especially near the climax and ending (the last few hours before the tangent universe ends). Worldbuilding isn't as rich as Lord of the Rings, but key lore/story elements (such as Grandma Death's book) are unique and well-defined for the purpose of this story (e.g. chapter excerpts of her book are actually written out)

2. Depth - 10/10
This is the facet where this movie stands out. Philosophical themes such as free will vs. determinism are deeply woven into the central plot of the movie - Donnie Darko paradoxically has a choice to save the rest of the world from the tangent universe, yet the tangent universe itself is deterministic. A scathing but layered social commentary/critique particularly about the influence of authority figures and the hypocrisy of organized religion, particularly as a copout/way some of the characters cope with fear. Biblical allusions, such as Jim Cunningham representing Satan and Donnie Darko representing Jesus' necessary death (but ironically in the alternate, normal universe, Donnie Darko gets forgotten), are also present. Quite the epitome of "show don't tell" subtlety. This movie also intertwines sci-fi/philosophical elements with realistic neuroses or mental illnesses

which is illustrated through Donnie Darko's therapy visits. Due to this, this movie also is very open to interpretation (a hallmark of depth) - one could choose to interpret the whole timeline as Donnie's schizophrenic thoughts as well.

3. Consistency - 4/10
Does decently in Chekhov's Gun (new leads tend to all be all related back to the main plot in some way), particularly the initially seemingly irrelevant subplot of Donnie's sister's dance team. However, pacing is the main weakness of this movie - particularly, the romance subplot between Donnie and Gretchen seems forced/rushed in some way and could be stretched out/defined more clearly. Some parts of the movie's logic are not clear at first (why did the jet engine itself accidentally open a wormhole into a tangent dimension?), a high level of suspension of disbelief is required.

4. Valence/Grimness - 8/10
has a happy ending (or maybe not depending on your interpretation, because the world is reduced to a mundane average once again with its flaws, such as Cunningham's presence and influence, intact), but inherently is dark and disturbing in its themes and Donnie Darko's core character.

Octant - BDM (broad, deep, messy) otherwise known as Experimental Work.
Subtype - BDM-G (broad, deep, messy, grim)

Remark: this movie is pretty much the complete opposite of the sitcom New Girl (2011) on these 4 dimensions, which is instead NSC-H (narrow, shallow, consistent, happy).

Also, a good litmus test for evaluating how well developed or well written characters are is to put them into a boilerplate scenario like a zombie apocalypse and see if their interactions and personalities can still make the story interesting. It basically is squeezing out all the Breadth (especially any original premise or world building) from the story to isolate and stress test the facet of Depth.

Also, this rubric shows how even if the premise/plot/concepts aren't anything new, even if the work is derivative/unoriginal in that area (low Breadth), it can still be a high quality/revered work due to high Depth or high Consistency.

Refinement of this typology system (3 factor model -> 4 factor model):

Previously, the typology had Breadth as a singular axis and three total quality axes: Breadth, Depth, and Consistency. Now, we should split Breadth up into two independent dimensions: (1) Conceptual Breadth (subsumes the subfacet of Premise) and (2) Physical Breadth (subsumes subfacets Worldbuilding and Plot Complexity).

Conceptual Breadth itself should have the following subfacets (it could also be named Inventiveness):
- Originality
    Positive Traits: Compelling/original/unique concepts/ideas that haven't been explored or done before. Could also combine multiple previous eclectic ideas in original ways (the whole is larger than the sum of its parts).
    Negative Traits: Derivative concepts (for instance, Lycoris Recoil is largely derivative of 1984), story retellings without new concepts or

elements, hackneyed or tropey premise/ideas. One-trick ponies/gimmicks that don't really offer anything else.
- Theoretical Richness

Positive Traits: "what-if scenarios", hypothetical, imaginative, extrapolates from reality rather than staying anchored in it.

Negative Traits: Stays mostly grounded in existing "real" ideas and concepts rather than hypotheticals.

Physical Breadth has the same two subfacets (Worldbuilding and Plot Complexity/Unpredictability) as discussed earlier in this document. It could also be named "Scope" or "Unpredictability". Together, Scope/Unpredictability (Physical) and Inventiveness (Conceptual) make the conglomerate facet of Breadth.

We will notate the Conceptual Breadth dichotomy as Inventive (I, high scorers) vs. Quotidian (Q, low scorers). Similarly, the Physical Breadth dichotomy will be notated as Rich (R, high scorers) vs. Undeveloped (U, low scorers). Depth (Deep (D) vs Shallow (S)) and Consistency (Consistent (C) vs Messy (M)) will remain the same.

This is to account for literature/media that are neutral in Breadth as a whole depending on the aspect surveyed - For instance movies like Meshes of the Afternoon and Angel's Egg could have very inventive premises/concepts but very simple plots or minimal worldbuilding (Inventive but Undeveloped - IUxx). On the other hand, books like Dream of Red Chambers don't do much with strictly conceptual invention (other than an imaginative tie-in to mythology at the beginning), but are sprawling in its plot and worldbuilding (over 400 characters, many arcs that intricately tie together, branching storytelling) (Quotidian but Rich - QRxx)

Now, there are 4 quality factors/dimensions: Conceptual Breadth (Inventive vs. Quotidian), Physical Breadth (Rich vs. Undeveloped), Depth (Deep vs. Shallow), and Consistency (Consistent vs. Messy) and 1 valence dimension (Happy vs. Grim) which makes this rubric/typology now have 16 quality sedecimant categories (rather than just the original 8 octants), with 2 subtypes based on valence per sedecimant (making for 32 types of media in total), which will be notated -H or -G as previously described.

Here are all 16 quality sedecimants, their names/summaries, and archetypal examples for each:

Masterpiece/Classic family:
IRDC (Inventive, Rich, Deep, Consistent) - "Masterwork"
Example: Lord of the Rings, Dante's Divine Comedy
IUDC (Inventive, Undeveloped, Deep, Consistent) - "Journey"
Example: Wuthering Heights
QRDC (Quotidian, Rich, Deep, Consistent) - "Saga"
Example: Dream of Red Chambers
QUDC (Quotidian, Undeveloped, Deep, Consistent) - "Classic"
Example: Nightcrawler, Of Mice and Men, or Your Lie In April

Experimental/Esoterica family:
IRDM (Inventive, Rich, Deep, Messy) - "Curiosity"
Example: Donnie Darko, Everything Everywhere All At Once, Mulholland Drive
IUDM (Inventive, Undeveloped, Deep, Messy) - "Esoterica"
Example: Coherence, Angel's Egg, DDLC
QRDM (Quotidian, Rich, Deep, Messy) - "Morass"
Example: As I Lay Dying
QUDM (Quotidian, Undeveloped, Deep, Messy) - "Reflection"
Example: Golden Brown (The Stranglers)

Bestseller/Comfort Media family:
IRSC (Inventive, Rich, Shallow, Consistent) - "Spectacle"
Example: The Da Vinci Code
IUSC (Inventive, Undeveloped, Shallow, Consistent) - "Excursion"
Example: Megamind
QRSC (Quotidian, Rich, Shallow, Consistent) - "Community"
Example: Lucky Star
QUSC (Quotidian, Undeveloped, Shallow, Consistent) - "Relax"
Example: New Girl

Amateur/Slop family:
IRSM (Inventive, Rich, Shallow, Messy) - "Anticipation"
Example: The Amazing World of Gumball
IUSM (Inventive, Undeveloped, Shallow, Messy) - "Shower Thought"
Example: Sausage Party
QRSM (Quotidian, Rich, Shallow, Messy) - "Fraternity"
Example: Lycoris Recoil
QUSM (Quotidian, Undeveloped, Shallow, Messy) - "Slop"
Example: Emoji Movie

Refined/complete 4-factor rubric:

Dimension I: Creativity (20 points)
Subfacet I-A: Ingenuity (10 points)
    Positive Traits: Compelling/original/unique concepts/ideas that haven't been explored or done before. Could also combine multiple previous eclectic ideas in original ways (the whole is larger than the sum of its parts).
    Negative Traits: Derivative concepts (for instance, Lycoris Recoil is largely derivative of 1984), story retellings without new concepts or

elements, hackneyed or tropey premise/ideas. One-trick ponies/gimmicks that don't really offer anything else.

Subfacet I-B: Theoretical Richness
Positive Traits: "what-if scenarios", hypothetical, imaginative, extrapolates from reality rather than staying anchored in it.
Negative Traits: Stays mostly grounded in existing "real" ideas and concepts rather than hypotheticals.

Positive Pole: Inventive (I)
Negative Pole: Quotidian (Q)

Dimension II: Variety (20 points)
Subfacet II-A: Worldbuilding (10 points)
Negative Traits: Unremarkable setting/exposition, lack of diversity in cast
Positive Traits: Rich, immersive and well-defined worldbuilding and setting

Subfacet II-B: Plot Complexity (10 points)
Negative Traits: Predictable events, linear, bland, or repetitive plot
Positive Traits: Original plot devices and twists, rich and intricate arcs, branching plot

Positive Pole: Rich (R)
Negative Pole: Focused (U)

Dimension III: Depth (40 points)
Subfacet III-A: Character Complexity (15 points) (will expounded on in a tertiary level rubric)

Negative Traits: 1-dimensional caricatures, cardboard-thin tropes, hackneyed character dynamics without adding anything new (e.g. black cat and golden retriever couple)

Positive Traits: characters are well distinguished from each other and given well-defined identities via voice/internal monologues, they have complex arcs and develop nontrivially throughout the story, their motivations, personalities, psychology, and neuroses are nuanced. They also have complex relationships with other characters in the story and are not just shallow "hero/villain" archetypes.

Subfacet III-B: Commentary (15 points) - The heavy weighting and definition of this facet is based on the philosophical thesis "all art is political".

Negative Traits: Paper-thin themes, generic or black and white view on morality (e.g. good vs. evil), either does not attempt to comment on societal or human condition or commentary is overt/shoehorned/too didactic rather than revealed through form.

Positive Traits: Philosophically reflective, layered themes that are open to interpretation, embraces gray areas particularly in knowledge and ethics, makes profound points about humanity, history, society, culture, or political ideologies, alludes to religion or other cultural movements.

Subfacet III-C: Subtlety (10 points)

Negative Traits: Too much concrete narration, obviously forced symbolism or metaphors or none at all. Elements/devices in the story mostly serve to advance the plot rather than for artistic intent.

Positive Traits: Follows the "show don't tell" axiom of writing, has layered and effective symbolism/metaphors.

Positive Pole: Deep (D)
Negative Pole: Shallow (S)

Dimension IV: Consistency (20 points)

Subfacet IV-A: Internal Logic (5 points total)
Negative Traits: plotholes, weak suspension of disbelief, continuity errors
Positive Traits: does well at suspending disbelief, characters' actions and events/cause and effect chain makes sense

Subfacet IV-B: Chekhov's Gun (5 points total)
Negative Traits: Irrelevant filler padding, arcs that are left unresolved
Positive Traits: Ties up loose ends, no irrelevant/one-time characters or plot points

Subfacet IV-C: Pacing (5 points total)
Negative Traits: Plot moves either too fast or too slow, or inconsistent speed
Positive Traits: Well structured narrative, good demarcation into character arcs/timeline of narrative makes sense.

Subfacet IV-D: Execution Quality (5 points total)
Negative Traits: Low-budget, full of/easily noticeable errors/bugs/glitches, jarring to watch
Positive Traits: High quality, high effort, smooth, decently polished

Positive Pole: Consistent (C)
Negative Pole: Messy (M)

Tertiary-level rubric for the Character Complexity subfacet of Depth (15 points total):

For each major character, they should be scored on the Individual Character rubric (10 points total) (Subfacet III-A-I):

Subfacet III-A-I-1: Neuroses (4 points total) - The inclusion of this subfacet is based on the Enneagram theoretical framework.
Negative Traits: Caricatures that are myopic stereotypes rather than archetypes/blueprints. Their motivations are simple and without subtlety, e.g. "to get the girl" or "to be the evil villain". The character is dependent on the plot.
Positive Traits: Well-defined and nuanced motivations and beliefs for either taking certain actions or espousing certain belief systems. The character feels human, and their mental/emotional struggles are layered and authentic rather than shallow or artificial. Characters are complex rather than portrayed as just "good or evil". The plot is dependent on the character.
Negative Pole: Hackneyed (H)
Positive Pole: Inspired (I)

Subfacet III-A-I-2: Individuation (3 points total):
Negative Traits: A redundant or shallow/low-fidelity personality that can be easily replaced by another character. Speaks and thinks the same as other characters in the story.
Positive Traits: A distinguishing voice, whether it be style of speech/patterns of thought, or internal monologue. A unique personality with well-defined strengths, weaknesses, behaviors, and character traits. Their physical design and involvement in the plot is not an accidental property.
Negative Pole: Redundant (R)
Positive Pole: Unique (U)

Subfacet III-A-I-3: Development (3 points total):
Negative Traits: A character that remains static/flat throughout the story, or a character whose change in personality only comes from events in the plot rather than through their own internal reflections or decision making.
Positive Traits: A character who is constantly reflecting or thinking about their motivations or beliefs, and/or whose beliefs change due to their own volition or underlying neuroses. The setting and plot points serve as the environment that shapes the character rather than some drug or medicine that forces a personality change.
Negative Pole: Static (S)
Positive Pole: Dynamic (D)

Then, their scores should be averaged (out of 10) for each character, but with the average weighted on how much each character is involved in the story.

For the set of characters in general, they should be scored on the Character Interactions rubric (5 points total) (Subfacet III-A-II)
Positive Traits: The characters' relationships feel organic, authentic, and have complexity, nuance, and developing variance. Romantic relationships that are more based on the compatibility (and incompatibility) between the characters' beliefs and motivations than their outward behaviors. Dialogue between characters is natural and cohesive, and reflects their personalities either clashing or harmonizing.
Negative Traits: Not thematically cohesive/the interaction feels shoehorned in to advance the plot. Relationships are overdone cliches such as the Golden Retriever x Black Cat couple trope. Each character fulfills an archetypal/generic role (e.g. "the bubbly manic pixie dream girl", "the comic relief") within the cast. Dialogue between characters is inane or exaggerated.

Positive Pole: Organic (O)
Negative Pole: Artificial (A)

NOTE: in stories with only one main character, an interaction between a character with another character doesn't have to be between physically distinct characters, it can be between the different personas of the sole character.
In total, this makes Character Complexity worth 4+3+3+5 = 10+5 = 15 points.

Additionally, what might the analogy of "Duo types" (from the AB5C version of the Big 5) look like for this similar Big 5-esque framework? Use the original dichotomy letters for the trait codes.

Creativity: Inventive/Quotidian

Scope: Rich/Undeveloped

Depth: Deep/Shallow

Consistency: Consistent/Messy

Valence: Happy/Grim

Including valence there would actually be 40 duo types (5 choose 2 ways to select two dimensions; and 2^2 ways to select the poles for those two dimensions)

Also, Creativity, Variety, Depth, and Consistency cutoffs (for the dichotomy codings) should each be higher than 50% of the total possible points. My suggestions for the cutoffs are Creativity: 13+/20, Variety: 12+/20, Depth: 27+/40, and Consistency: 15+/20.

QUDC examples: of mice and men, the old man and the sea, the man who knew infinity, the pianist, whiplash, Zodiac, Your Lie In April. For some reason, QUDC examples are much easier to name and much more common than QUDM examples. In general, QUDM ("Reflection") is probably the rarest sedecimant on my typology. All sedecimants one Hamming distance away from QUDM, which includes QUDC, QUSM, QRDM, and IUDM, are much more common than true QUDM works, at least when it comes to released works.

Another note:

Art films tend to be almost exclusively IxDM-x, often IxDM-G. IxDx-x is non-negotiable for art films.

Documentaries tend to be almost exclusively QxxC-x, often QUxC-x. True crime tends to be QUSC-G or QUDC-G.

Sitcoms tend to be QxSC-H.

Theoretical basis (Adorno):

According to the philosopher Adorno, what delineates art from non-art is its autonomy, non-identity, and subtlety/difficulty yet openness of interpretation. In my rubric, the ideal representing his concept of the purest form of art would be IxDM-G (inventive, deep, messy, grim). However, I slightly widen the delineation from pure art to pure non-art to the dichotomy between IxDM-x vs. QxSC-x.

High conceptual breadth/inventiveness makes the artwork explore novel forms and have autonomy rather than regurgitate existing tropes of our culture. Art or media that is quotidian or of lower conceptual breadth fails to satisfy the non-identity axiom of art, since ideas, tropes, and structure/form are inherently products of the zeitgeist culture.

The next facet that's absolutely non-negotiable in art is its difficulty/subtlety (which is subsumed as the facet Depth in my rubric). If the amount of intellectual reflection required to understand such media is not high enough, it will inevitably get normalized into the current culture and contribute to the shifting of cultural values, defeating the purpose of art as knowledge of the universal human condition, outside of current societal boundaries. Depth also crucially is the vehicle for the truth content itself of the work. A piece of media with high conceptual breadth but low depth, in other words art that scores IxSx-x on my rubric (such as The Fifth Element or Jurassic Park), attempts to subvert existing boundaries but in a way that's too immediate and on the nose, resulting in eventual assimilation of the media into mainstream society and an inevitable shift (if the inventiveness + shallowness contrast is large enough).

The third facet that's also, according to Adorno, vital for art's authenticity is a (lack of) Consistency. Art should question existing systems of order and transcend interpretability by logical frameworks in general, or else it doesn't become art, it becomes formal science, philosophy, or math. Systems of axioms and rules (what people "view" as rational) is inherently bound to current society and culture, so a lack of consistency, combined with high conceptual breadth/inventiveness and high depth contributes to the work of art being non-identical and expressing universal truth via the negation current truths.

The variety (unpredictability, scope, expansiveness) of a work might be an accidental/non-essential property in Adorno's framework of art rather an essential one - it affects delivery/form but not the truth content intrinsically. I agree, and perhaps on this basis we could question including Variety as a quality dimension at all and move it in the category of Valence as an irrelevant modifier. However, this should be done later after more reflection.

Adorno sees art as inherently expressing its truth through suffering (that is repressed by social norms) hence Adorno's ideal of art would also be usually Grim > Happy on the valence scale by embodying alienation and marginalization. However, I impugn this claim and think Valence is an irrelevant dimension for delineating art vs. non-art. This is because emotional valence, behaviors, and attitudes is also a contingent product of current societal values - for instance it could be community or harmony as in organized religion, or it could also be skepticism or cynicism as in atheism or Social Darwinism.

It is worthy to point out that Consistency among the 3 critical dimensions is in my opinion the least important relative to Depth and Inventiveness, because an art piece could still have its own internal consistency/have its structure/form be self-dictated, even though Adornian ideal of art is almost always Messy (M) > Consistent (C). Low consistency is only a "symptom" of pure art rather than an inherent quality of it. Depth on the other hand is the most important dimension in my opinion if we were to subscribe to an Adornian framework. It is what drives the truth-content and makes art universal but only accessible to the initiated and resisting assimilation by the masses.

In general: purest art = IxDM-x (inventive, deep, messy)

Purest non-art = QxSC-x (quotidian, shallow, consistent)

Another crucial sidenote: the scores and classification on this very rubric are contingent on time period and culture from which we view the artwork or media.

An alternative splitting of my media framework into "Quadras" is this classification (each quadra contains four sedecimants and 8 sedecimant-valence combinations, for example Compromised Art subsumes QUDC, QUDM, QRDC, QRDM):

Pure Art: IxDx-x

Compromised Art: QxDx-x

Pretentious Art: IxSx-x

Non-Art: QxSx-x

Here are alternate (Adornian) labels for each pole:

Inventiveness: Autonomous.

Quotidian: Heteronomous.

Rich: Maximalist.

Undeveloped: Minimalist.

Deep: Knowledge.

Shallow: Pleasure.

Consistency: Closure.

Messy: Fragmented.

Grim: Alienating.

Happy: Reconciling.

In general, QUDC art/media/literature is the embodiment/category of the most accessible "higher art" - often a good entry point for people graduating to more sophisticated/intellectual tastes.

Categories ranked from highest to lowest openness (in my opinion):

IUDM > IRDM > IRDC > IUDC > QRDM > QUDM > QRDC > QUDC > IRSM > IRSC > IUSC > IUSM > QRSM > QUSM > QRSC > QUSC

While Creativity (Q/I) in my rubric is form, Depth (S/D) in my rubric is content.

More about "Compromised Art" quadra (QxDx-x):

Art that still manages to infuse truth-content (Wahrheitsgehalt) but in a more conventional form or structure makes up the QxDx-x quadra. It is the quadra most laypeople think of when they hear the word "cultured". "Oh, you're cultured? You must be reading the timeless classics like Of Mice and Men or 1984. (note that even though 1984 during the time it was written (early 1900s) would score IxDx-x, nowadays it would score QxDx-x due to the oversaturation of the dystopian genre with the proliferation of tropes like authoritarianism and forbidden love) You must have great knowledge of Mozart, Beethoven, Chopin's work!" QxDx-x, especially QUDC, tends to make up the most accessible "higher art" due to it having structure that is familiar and well-known. It resists complete assimilation by the laypeople due to its critique and truthful meaning in its content, and even if that depth has a lower barrier to entry due to the quotidian form it is presented in, there can still be effectively endless ways to interpret and intellectualize the work. The fruit is lower hanging but still rich in nutrients and intellectual nourishment. However, the avenue where it doesn't as much resist the "predator-prey" cycle of ideology-art is not necessarily the cultural industry but zeitgeist academia, which is still part of current society and culture. Due to their conventional form, QxDx works tend to be very well-studied and make their way into academic canons, which makes them gradually become compromised art rather than pure art. A lot of QxDx literature like As I Lay Dying (QRDM) or The Old Man and the Sea (QUDC) are staples in high school curricula in Western countries. Other QxDx works become revered classics and essentially a cultural rite of passage towards maturity - for example the movie "The Man Who Knew Infinity" (QUDC-G) is viewed this way in the math community. QxDx art is

compromised in that they still do not serve art's purpose of autonomy/questioning the status quo as well as IxDx art even if they still contain the required truth-content - they instead often serve as markers of cultural prestige/cultural capital - reinforcing mainstream elitism. This makes for the paradox that even elitism can become common.

More about "Pretentious Art" quadra (IxSx-x):

IxSx quadra represents the assertion/movement "art for art's sake" - forced innovation and complexity without meaning, critique, or truth content. It is art that has the appearance of autonomy in form but in a merely performative way - it is in a more meta way heteronomous to society's constant demands for innovation and new forms, and it satisfies this by delivering original concepts or structures without ample critique or substance.

Cryptography analogy:

QxSx (quotidian-shallow Quadra) media: leaving the plaintext as just plaintext without any cryptosystem

IxSx (inventive-shallow Quadra) media: cryptosystems that either aren't secure/are easily decrypted by amateurs, or don't follow Kerckhoff's principle at all. In other words, secrecy only by obscurity/novelty (e.g. the Caesar cipher). The actual knowledge/data (plaintext) is easily and predictably derived from the cipher text (the cipher text is what the art is on the surface - taking current social values) hence it doesn't really critique current values at all.

QxDx Quadra (quotidian-deep Quadra) compromised art: crypto systems that are genuinely hard to decrypt but only because they rely on conventional problems that are "hard" to solve with traditional tools (lack of autonomy). RSA (factoring problem) and Diffie Hellman key exchange (discrete log problem) are examples - the knowledge

(plaintext encrypted by ciphertext) will easily get decrypted and disseminated by society because these hard problems they rely on are so commonly studied and quantum computing is on the rise.

IxDx Quadra (incentive-deep Quadra) pure art: crypto systems that are both state of the art (use novel one way functions or pseudorandomness) in methodology and extremely hard to decrypt. Often resists quantum computing. Knowledge of the plaintext (repressed values) is only available for the initiated to prevent its misappropriation by unauthorized users.

In the Adornian Ideal of art, low Consistency (messiness, M > C) is more prevalent and more effective than high Consistency to serve art's required social function. However, Adornian art need not be low Consistency (even though it often is low Consistency - IxDM), it could be IxDC as well if it operates within its own idiosyncratic logical framework that is autonomous from conventional narrative pacing or structure (which themselves are often imposed by the zeitgeist - for example see the often taught-in-schools exposition -> rising action -> climax -> resolution structure). This is what Adorno calls "immanent structure" in art. However, in my stance, the most effective art, however, is in fact low Consistency, not even possessing internal idiosyncratic logic, because the mere inclusion of rules (even if internal ones) in an artwork or piece of media moves the artwork closer to conceptual knowledge rather than non-conceptual, intuitive knowledge, the latter which art is supposed to embody (to understand the knowledge in the world that cannot be explained merely discursively).

I'm thinking of dropping the variety dimension (R/U) from my rubric entirely since it doesn't seem to matter that much in Adornian terms and return to the original 3 factor model but now, Breadth is stripped

away from Plot Complexity and Worldbuilding and only Conceptual Breadth (Premise Originality and Theoretical Richness) matters.

Also, I think we should rename the poles of breadth to Inventive (I) vs. Quotidian (Q) and rename Breadth as a facet to Inventiveness.

So now, we have:

IDC = masterpiece

IDM = experimental (adornian ideal)

ISC = bestseller

ISM = amateur

QDC = classic

QDM = esoterica

QSC = comfort

QSM = slop

These are the core dimensions that determine and shape an artwork's Adornian truth content.

Variety (Rich/Undeveloped) and Valence (Grim/Happy) become accidental/modifier dimensions that do not matter towards the core quality of an artwork and are only included as extra descriptors. (We separate the 3 immanent and the 2 contingent qualities with a dash, as usual)

An informal quadra system for contingent dimensions only:

xxx-GR (grim, rich): battleground

xxx-GU (grim, undeveloped): constriction

xxx-HR (happy, rich): fantasy

xxx-HU (happy, undeveloped): idyll

For example, now IUDM-G (now labeled as IDM-GU) would be named a "constrictive experimental" and QUDC-H (now labeled as QDC-HU) would be named an "idyllic classic"

Idea for a Novella (title it "Intoxication" - not only referencing the legal age of 21 to drink but also the initial intoxicating, dissonant, and alienating feeling of Adornian art):

It is 2037, where MPA's rating system was changed from Content Maturity to Conceptual Maturity (in my Adornian framework). Donnie Darko (a re-screening from 2001) is rated CM-21. These rules apply and are legally enforced: Films with CM = 16-18 should require the viewer to be at least 18 years old to watch or accompanied by a parent or guardian 21 years of age or older (even when accompanied, the minimum age should be 16). films with CM > 18 (19-21) should require the viewer to be at least 21 years old to watch or accompanied by a parent or guardian 25 years of age or older (even if accompanied, the minimum age should be 18) Valid proof of ID should be required.

Yvonne, who is 18 years old, is extremely agreeable but of rather low openness on Big 5 (Openness 15%, Conscientiousness 50%, Extraversion 75%, Agreeableness 100%, Neuroticism 83%). She has a crush on the pretentious and pseudointellectual Andre (Openness 50% (intellectual but is pretentious about it), Conscientiousness 20%, Extraversion 30%, Agreeableness 10%, Neuroticism 100%), aged 17, and wants to accompany him to the Donnie Darko viewing partly to

impress him and spend time with him. Andre's best friend is Jackson, aged 18, who is Openness 5% (anti-intellectual), Conscientiousness 0%, Extraversion 100%, Agreeableness, 40%, Neuroticism 40%. Jackson watches the movie out of the intention of a social media trend ("successfully watch a CM21 film while underage")

They all sneak to the theater presenting fake IDs, and each watch the film and react to it themselves. They come out of the theater to reflect on their viewing (but only Andre has substantial reflection, even if pretentious), and the novella ends with showing how the movie has altered each their personalities/worldviews.

Suppose that this novella takes place in Yvonne, Andre, and Jackson's senior year of high school, shortly before final exams in May 2037. Additionally, suppose the crux of the prologue of this novella takes place in AP Literature, where the curriculum is specifically curated based on the Conceptual Maturity construct. The movie screening takes place the weekend before the AP Literature exam in May 2037.

Alternately, to avoid copyright concerns, another CM21 film other than donnie darko could be used for this short story. Or, just invent an in-universe CM21 film.

Let Yvonne be the protagonist/narrator here.

Additionally, let's name the AP Lit teacher Mrs. Lisa Thompson, who personally hates MPA's legal adoption of Conceptual Maturity even though she reasons it as an improvement from Content Maturity, but is forced to teach it to her students (and calibrate her AP Lit curriculum based on Conceptual Maturity) due to Conceptual Maturity extending to educational curriculum as well. Lisa Thompson's husband, Kurt Thompson, works at the movie theater as an easy, mind-numbing job, while he pursues his real passion in science and math but can't find a

job in it. Kurt spots the trio of high school students and recognizes the fake IDs but gets convinced by Andre to let them in.

Also suppose that 1 year later (in 2038), with Andre, Jackson, and Yvonne all in college, Yvonne is dead due to suicide, Andre is a struggling student in philosophy (Andre one year later is a college dropout after failing his philosophy classes), and Jackson is in a coma from too much alcohol intoxication in college. However, the story should be purposefully opaque on how this happened.

In the end of the novella, there is an announcement of a newly released "sanitized"/"less conceptually mature" version of Donnie Darko, or whatever in-universe film this novella uses.

I should write the narrative text in how Yvonne would think - the vocabulary should be simple and to the point. Most of the narrative is supposed to be from Yvonne's simplistic and emotional perspective.

Character full names:

Yvonne Chen
Andre Dubois
Jackson Walker

Yvonne should have a crush on Andre, mistaking the latters' intellectual pretentiousness for true insight that she lacks.

The entire novella should use no more than 5th grade level vocabulary because it's written from Yvonne's perspective (maybe even after she kills herself, it could retain her own perspective)

The invented/in-world CM21 film (equivalent to Donnie Darko) should be called "Intoxication".

Andre uses development in that he's the embodiment of the Dunning Kruger curve.

Yvonne Chen could have a best friend named Kayla Peters whom she invites to the movie as well but for some unknown and only inferred reason, Kayla declines saying she's uncomfortable with the idea.

Yvonne could be an "artist" herself but her passion is simple pastel drawings and crafts (including miniatures of houses) that evoke immediate emotional pleasure and homeostasis. This way this novella both adopts and critiques Adorno's Aesthetics implicitly. We should also show and communicate that Yvonne's own art is ironically more autonomous then the fictional film "Intoxication" (or the whole conceptual maturity scale) which has become a symbol of intellectual and cultural prestige.

One of Jackson's lines within the story could be a moment of genuine reflection thinking that "maybe art isn't meant for us - maybe we'll too immature to handle it and will ruin art and make it into a shitty tiktok trend or something"

Let's not name Adorno at all in this whole novella, and only hint at the fact that Andre reads aesthetic philosophy (tbh even maybe not hint that the book is about aesthetics, just about some sort of philosophy). If we explicitly mention Adornian aesthetics, this whole novella becomes didactic per Adornian aesthetics and collapses to propaganda or instruction.

Let's also mention Jackson is an underage alcoholic (at age 18), who once says "You don't want me to accidentally spill Jack Daniels all over your book, do you, Andre? Maybe you shouldn't slam your book on the table in front of you like you always do, even when you're not reading it."

The weeks after the watching of the CM21 film Intoxication, Yvonne tries to "detox" by building her miniatures but inadvertently finds that her own art is subconsciously becoming dark and distorted.

Also, the in-universe film "Intoxication" in this novella should actually represent the Adornian ideal of true art. In addition, Yvonne should actually faint for around a few minutes during the screening of the movie "Intoxication". Ironically though, Yvonne is the only person out of the trio engaging in "Intoxication" authentically and with autonomy, feeling the art rather than conceptualizing it via cultural ideology (Jackson's motivation to watch this for the "CM21" social media trend) or pretension (Andre's motivation), even if she doesn't really understand it but is at least smart enough to intuitively know something is very very wrong. In particular, Jackson taunts Yvonne for fainting and brags about how he didn't even feel queasy.

"In the end of the novella, there is an announcement of a newly released "sanitized"/"less conceptually mature" version of Donnie Darko, or whatever in-universe film this novella uses. "

Let's expand on this. Perhaps in the very end despite this relegation, could be a subtle hint of a random person in a vintage DVD store asking for the "uncut"/"original" version - which hints at how in Adornian theory, art doesn't just live and die like humans, it can re-emerge later in history.

What should the fictional film "Intoxication" be about? Could it be a meta recursion that dictates this very novella idea but in a twisted/warped way? Crucial Idea: The movie "intoxication" in my novel idea "intoxication" should literally foreshadow in its own content what might happen next in this very novella called "intoxication" but in a distorted and abstracted way. In the novella itself, what happened to the trio of high schoolers after the viewing of the film is intentionally

left opaque - it is only revealed through very subtle symbolism during the fictional film "intoxication" that demands very careful reading.

Additionally, we do not let Intoxication (the film) contain any actual sexual content, direct gore, drug references, or profanity at all. The film if rated by the original MPA would be G.

Also, suppose Yvonne initially wanted to watch something much lighter, a cutesy aesthetic film that she liked, but was peer pressured by Andre and Jackson into watching Intoxication. (Jackson motivated by the "internet challenge of resisting vomiting or fainting during the movie, or watching the movie while taking a shot every time the screen flickered as some drinking game", and Andre motivated by wantnig intellectual/cultural capital)

What if we make the director of Intoxication the film me (the person writing this novella idea)

To add depth to Yvonne's character, she is simultaneously bored by mundanity (which is why she seeks out Andre and develops a crush on him) but ultimately embraces it as comfort and happiness.

In the novella there should also be ongoing debates and chatter about whether the age restriction is even justified bc the film Intoxication would be rated G otherwise. The republican president of the time, Trinity Staples, is against the new conceptual maturity framework and calls for its abolishment, and she claims that her young children could watch it without any concern at all. Trinity as well as the majority of her republican cabinet argues that sexual innuendo and profanity or overt references to drugs are much worse things to expose kids to and that the MPA should revert to original standards.

Suppose there was considerable tension in the house and senate around spring 2037 since staples's inauguration on whether the conceptual maturity framework should be abolished and in May 2037

the senate was in the process of voting on the bill. Right after the main trio of the novella watches Intoxication, the bill gets passed and MPA reverts to its original criteria on censoring profanity, sex, and drugs.

More: What could a 2036 election season political debate between Trinity Staples (fictional republican candidate) and Hector Field (fictional democratic candidate) look like? Also, have Yvonne back in fall 2036 begrudgingly sit through the televised debates, because her family always played it on TV.

Suppose Hector Field was the fictional democratic president 2032-2036 and is running for reelection in 2036.

Let's make Hector Field born in 1953 and Trinity Staples born in 1992.

Yvonne should canonically have rather poor grades. In her senior year of high school, she could have around a 1.79 GPA.

The recursion here (Intoxication film containing basically an abstracted and muddled version of this very novella's plot) could potentially be infinite. (Think in terms of the joke "The B in Benoit B Mandelbrot stands for Benoit B Mandelbrot")

It should also be implied, although not overtly stated, that Yvonne Chen has a mild to moderate intellectual disability.

How would I explain Yvonne Chen being in AP Literature her senior year despite her intellectual disability? Perhaps this could be due to Yvonne's own drive and secret admiration of creativity and symbolic thinking, and her agreeable parents welcoming her stance on self improvement. Or perhaps, have some new law or rule passed by Field's administration in 2032-2036 that implements something similar to the "no child left behind" policy in schools. Have it be a combination of these two reasons. It could also be implied that Yvonne had to have an IEP meeting at her high school back in her freshman year, in 2033.

Also, this scene could also include a psychometric evaluation (IQ test, Rorschach Creativity test, Alternative Uses test, and/or Big 5 test). It would be intriguing that Yvonne scores decently on the Rorschach Inkblot Creativity Test but very low on the Alternative Uses test.

Let's also make both Trinity Staples and Hector Field canonically Christians, but of different sects - Staples being Baptist and Hector being non-denominational.

Let's flesh out some characters more.
Yvonne Chen's parents (Let's call them Haoran Chen (father) and Rebecca Chen (mother) for now):

Haoran Chen: Judging from his refusal to fully assimilate into American culture when he immigrated from China (this is subtly implied through his name still being a Chinese name), he naturally holds more traditionalist and conservative views from his Chinese upbringing. However, Haoran ends up paradoxically supporting the democratic candidate Hector Field despite his ingrained conservatism, due to being convinced by Hector's academic ethos and rationality/science/psychometrics studies. His stance is also motivated out of fear - he is constantly afraid that one day, Yvonne's low intellect and low tolerance of abstraction is what will cause her demise (in which he was ironically correct), and she wasn't built to tolerate meatier ideas. Maybe Haoran's less fluent English could also be a marker of his resistance to assimilation to American culture

Rebecca Chen: functionally apolitical, but in 2036, she supports Trinity Staples's populist republicanism over Field's democratic elitism only because she believes Yvonne isn't inherently intellectually disabled and she has great creativity in her miniatures and pastel drawings that she makes. Rebecca has repressed the horrifying memory of seeing

her daughter's near-drown and suffer an anoxic brain injury back in the year 2024, and wants to believe her daughter can really succeed and start her own art studio in the future.

Also, perhaps Yvonne's implied intellectual disability could also be subtly referenced by a vague memory of a "drowning in a pool" when she was 5 (back in the year 2024 in this worldbuilding). (Realistically, drowning triggers v-fib and with slightly delayed CPR, neurological functioning quickly and irreversibly plummets.) The drowning could dually also serve as a symbol of "drowning" in sensory overload of the film "Intoxication" and of political and intellectual abstraction around her.

To develop more: what might be Yvonne's parents' opinions on the movie Intoxication in 2037, both before its release date in theaters on May 16, 2037 (the date when Yvonne, Jackson, and Andre go see it and have their lives radically changed) and after? Also suppose that Yvonne's 18th birthday was on May 9, 2037 (she was born May 9, 2019).

Let's set this story in the fictional town of Eigen, California. (population of 59049 in 2037)

During the screening of the film Intoxication on May 16, 2037, Yvonne should have a latent subconscious realization (that she doesn't consciously realize) that the female protagonist in Intoxication (the film) is actually her and predicts her fate, which causes her to faint in the middle of it. Andre and Jackson on the other hand are not as perturbed or even aware that the film also encodes their own fates (negative truth-content that hasn't happened yet but is inevitable) but in a more abstract manner.

The tagline for the movie "Intoxication" could be "a poison much stronger than alcohol".

Let the AP Lit exam take place the week after the Intoxication screening. Let Yvonne really struggle on the exam and not articulate at all on her essays, but somehow suppose that she actually gets a 4 on the exam, a noticeable improvement from a mock AP Lit exam done before the Intoxication screening.

maybe Andre Dubois could be a 2nd generation french immigrant. During a particular lesson in AP Lit about the actual philosopher W.E.B. Du Bois, Andre Dubois tries to "correct" Mrs. Thompson that "his name was actually pronounced DOO-BWA! Show some cultural refinement please!" This could be a comedic relief in this overall unequivocally grim novel outline.

Field's stance could also be protecting art from misinterpretation from teens as much as it is protecting teens from alienation the art provides. Field is correct conceptually but the moment he tries to implement theory into law it invites catastrophe and collapses the very point of the theory, due to law now generating a new form of cultural virtue signaling and commodification.

To show palpable contrast yet similarity I think it should be shown that before the CM framework teens were just as rowdy about watching R rated movies. Maybe include in dialogue?

The intoxication movie poster should be just black all over except a single fuzzy white dot somewhere near the lower right corner. On the fateful night of the screening, Andre walking in the movie theater overanalyzes just the poster while Jackson scoffs and says "that white dot is clearly just the ink peeling off at the edge due to the weather

getting hotter. It ain't that deep." It's not revealed whether Andre or Jackson is correct.

Also, have there be a different film contrasting from "Intoxication" that also makes its way to the cultural zeitgeist of 2037 America - this film is named "Danger Danny 4", the 4th installment in the series "Danger Danny", released in August 2036. Unlike Intoxication, Danger Danny would be unambiguously rated R (or even NC-17) by original MPA standards but has little to no conceptual maturity - it is crude, straightforward, and any attempts at subtlety just reduce to just gratuitous graphic imagery and shock value. "Danger Danny" is a generic spy film about an assassin named Danny who violently murders any enemy spies and along in the process has graphic sexual relations with quite a few women. Danger Danny hence is rated CM-10 and in 2036-2037, due to the still pending recall of Field's Conceptual Maturity framework, the age required to watch Danger Danny, despite its R rated material, is only 10. This becomes a heated point of contention during the Field vs. Staples 2036 fictional presidential debates, particularly after a televised incident of a 14-year-old boy watching it and being inspired by Danger Danny (at least reported to have been inspired by Danger Danny) to wield a knife at school and stabbing random people for what the boy calls "[his] sadistic pleasures" (this happened September 2036, around the beginning of the 2036-2037 academic year). However, have it be intentionally ambiguous whether the 14-year-old boy, who ended up causing 1 death and 5 injuries, was even "inspired by Danger Danny" to begin with, even if the media reports (particularly conservative/republican ones that Staples condones) say it. Suppose that the boy was named Daniel so people, particularly the conservative Staples and her supporters, quickly drew connections/conclusions that Daniel saw the fictional "Danger Danny" as an idealized version of him. Staples uses the "Danger Danny" incident as leverage to back up her political campaign in the Fall of

2036. Staples uses it to impugn the practicality of the Conceptual Maturity (CM) framework because Danger Danny was rated only CM-10 due to its remarkably straightforward messages and delivery (no political commentary, no subtlety at all, just gratuitous shock content) but would've been easily NC-17 on the original MPA framework.

Actually, you know what, have the real Daniel be in the same high school Yvonne, Kayla, Andre, and Jackson are in. Suppose this happens in that very high school.

Jackson relishes the Danger Danny films (1st through 4th installations) and brags about handling the graphic gore without any trouble at all.

Suppose the original intoxication screening in May 2037 was in a small art theater where the main trio of students were the only people in the theater, and it was a very late night screening. This subtly provides more interpretive opacity - maybe the film could affect different people who watch it uniquely, either it latently could actually have supernatural capabilities for predicting fate or the subject watching the film intoxication is just projecting themselves in the film. It should be unclear whether the film actually does have supernatural or shapeshifting powers. It should never be confirmed nor denied in the story.

The actual writing of this novel should show equally plausible signs that the film Intoxication indeed does have supernatural predictive power, and that it doesn't inherently have such power and projection is instead the culprit for self fulfilling prophecy.

Suppose that since Yvonne was at the time of the screening 18 but under 21, she had the option to view Intoxication with parent guardianship but for some unknown reason both her parents refused to watch it with her and her mom only wanted Yvonne to watch it on her own. The exact reason for this is left unclear just like the exact reason Kayla declined the film viewing.

Jackson should at the fateful movie screening after discovering Yvonne has fainted attempt to film her fainting and waking up for views on social media. Andre reacts to this in a subtly performative manner but on the surface appearing to chastise Jackson.

Jackson could be a more nuanced character - reflecting Staple's populism but actually treating everyone equally deep down (even if he is crude and trend following). It is Andre who actually should have latent and subtle misogyny and more in the intellectual rather than physical manner.

I should never state outright which fictional president is conservative and which is liberal.

Also, for scaffolding purposes, what if in December 2036 for the final essay for fall semester Mrs Thompson have her kids an assignment to write an essay reflecting on the danger Danny incident while citing literary theory.

After yvonne's implied suicide, it should be implied that the sanitization of Intoxication's abstraction as a film was pushed by yvonne's parents through petitioning. (or purposely leave this completely opaque). However, of course the epilogue scene shows another completely random guy in the future at a vintage niche DVD shop rediscovering the original cut while asking an employee for it.

It should also be subtly and symbolically implied that Yvonne's suicide method was drowning herself again.

Jackson could often be seen wearing Danger Danny merch T-shirts

Yvonne on the other hand could also wear graphic tees but those with cute comforting pastel pictures

This novel actually also critiques Adornian philosophy as well mainly by Yvonne's own art and stylistic choices - specifically the claim that art must be difficult and dissonant.

Along with Field's CM framework he adopts and implements, he also should support equality as with most liberals, applying his CM framework in his "no child left behind" policy in schools - making sure everyone has the same progression of "intellectual training" before moving on to more conceptually mature and philosophically dense works as they move on, standardizing the CM framework in school curricula.

Also, let's canonically stylize the fictional film "Danger Danny 4" as "D4ng3r D4nny 4". Let's place Jack Daniels extensively within Danger Danny, and canonically let this be Danny's favorite drink. In-universe in this novella in 2036, Jack Daniel's advertisers could partner with the Danger Danny franchise and often deliver ads that crossover or amalgamate the two franchises.

Danger Danny 4 is a critique that grimness without depth is empty, despite grim valence being valued by Adorno. This fictional film is meant to be a satire on the real life thriller series James Bond.

Andre should canonically pretend to be a Gershwin connoisseur as well.

Andre could vociferously deny ever having seen Danger Danny 4 with his friend Jackson despite Jackson exposing him for it. Or, he pretends his outing with Jackson was only for the purpose of "sociological analysis of the zeitgeist cultural phenomenon".