

Thomas Crowther

The Asperian Design

Received December 20, 2016

Revised January 9, 2017

Accepted January 9, 2017

Key words

Liberty, perfection, genesis,
universal, omniversal

Reality is two-fold, composed of the lighted world as revealed in Genesis, and the darker primordality which preceded it. The illuminated represents that which the human mind can comprehend, manipulate and re-order to its will: a “designed” and mechanical universe of parts. But behind it, in the backspace of reality, remains the darkness. A formless state of pre-creation, the darkness exists as an endless series of intertwining “signatures” – single possibilities waiting to be created in the illuminated forefront of reality. Permitting each and every part of the lighted world to be connected to the rest, it possesses a “design” all of its own. The question is, if we are blind in the dark, how could we ever come to know it?

1 Introduction: Genesis before the Dawn

“Creation” is the watchword of life, conjuring images of light triumphantly breaking forth out of darkness. But though the power to draw the non-existent into reality lies at the heart of all things, it is the human mind’s capacity to comprehend this power that doubtless makes it one of the most brilliant things our universe can boast of. As a product of that universe however – imprisoned to the body, to time, and to all the limitations of mortality – the mind is also inclined to take a restrictive view on creation.

Drawing upon the promethean tale of Eve, this article explores this relationship between human perception and creation, arguing that two distinguishable truths (or “designs”) potentially underlie it: the *Universal* and the *Asperian*. Both seek absolute states: the former, “perfection”; the latter, “liberty”. Both seek a complete understanding of the universe. And both vie for the redundancy of the other. But before exploring these two “designs”, we need to first enquire into their source. In other words, we need to begin by asking a fundamental question: what (if anything) is the precondition of creation?

The familiar creation tale of the Old Testament provides us with an answer in its very first verse – “*In the Beginning, God created the Heavens and the Earth*” (Genesis 1: 1). Of course, one then inevitably asks, what is the precondition of God? As a child, I asked the same, and querying upon a potential back-story, I envisioned a solitary, male figure alone in a great expanse of nothingness. I thus assumed God had created *his* universe as a kind of leisurely distraction, as a bored child might. But aside from the obvious paradox behind a creator’s origins, I found the nature of God’s initial universe fearful indeed. For as is stated in the Bible, the earth which was first formed was “without form and void; [with] darkness [being] upon the face of the deep” (Genesis 1: 2; see also Job 26: 10; 38: 9; Campbell 1973, 297; Chupungco 1977, 82; May 1939; Niditch 1985, 72).

This is an inherently unsettling image, presenting us with a nightmarish vision of pre-existence, depicting a dark, formless and somewhat anarchic primordality preceding the ap-



About the author

Thomas Crowther (1986) holds a PhD from Durham University, UK. An archaeologist by profession, he also writes in philosophy, anthropology and spirituality and has previously had work published with the American Humanist Association. His email contact is tgw.crowther@gmail.com.

pearance of the illuminated, ordered and organised cosmos. But what I find interesting is that the story uses both water and darkness as the metaphorical precondition of creation; a common theme in creation myths around the globe (see Cameron 1992; Helms 2004; Knipe 1989; Van Over 1980; Wakeman 1973, 86). This is hardly surprising, because preceding and sustaining all life on the planet, water acts as the universal in-between – between that which is solid and vapourous – within which we are suspended, as in the womb, where we await our emergence into the world. But perhaps more important still is the disturbing image of the deep darkness which also precedes the emergence of the lighted cosmos.

The darkness before the dawn can often seem disquieting, as it is within the dark that we can slip into the “Other”; the unconscious; the “unsure”, where the laws of the lighted world are equally suspended (Heijnen 2005; Morris 2011).

This makes the dark an intimidating, but at the same time, liberating “otherworld”; a state of unsettling chaos for some and uplifting liberation for others, in which we await the solidness of the real world (i.e. the conscious universe) which light heralds in.

Both water and darkness are thus elements in which we await creation, and as such, I cannot imagine the Old Testament’s dark and watery precondition as a kind of void of nothingness or as a state of pure darkness and absolute absence. Such a void alludes to the impossibility of creation, for something cannot spring into existence from nothing. So instead, I would present this dark and watery primordiality as a condition of pure expectation before creation – of pure possibility. Rather than a blank slate of nothingness, I imagine this as a slate upon which all possibilities exist, but where no one possibility has yet been created. A place (if you can call it such) where a “signature” of every possibility exists prior to creation, and where no one possibility dominates another; a theme I have previously touched upon (Crowther 2014). This is what I identify as the “Omniversal Potential”, and putting the concept of “God as creator” aside for a moment, it is this which acts as the precondition of all creation. The act of creation is when a possibility is removed from the Omniversal Potential – from this dark and watery void of infinite possibility – and becomes something apart from it: a “creation”; that is, a possibility created.

In the Genesis narrative, the “Spirit of God” moves across the dark and watery void of the Omniversal Potential, and, guided by a vision of what his universe will consist of, he removes a single possibility so as to construct that universe, uttering those immortal, albeit now hackneyed words, “let there be light”. In so doing, the ordered solidness of his new creation (i.e. the original universe as stated in the bible) is revealed. Light thus represents the act of creation here; that is, a possibility previously in the dark, previously only a possibility in the Omniversal Potential, being formed and revealed. The creation of light does not eliminate the darkness which preceded it however, but separates a world apart from it. Likewise, the creation of the lighted universe does not eliminate the Omniversal Potential which lies behind it, and from which it was essentially sourced.

Significantly, the Genesis tale suggests that the possibility which is separated from the Omniversal Potential (i.e. the universe which was formed and revealed) is one that is designed and therefore, limited. And in Eden, the heart of this new creation, God resolves to craft a species that will dwell within and eventually dominate this new world: humanity. But the greed inherent within the human design becomes clear early on, as is hinted in the actions of Eve; the intriguing and tragic antagonist who unwittingly triggers the fall of the human race. It is perhaps unsurprising then that she is now regarded by her descendants as the original sinner, the heretic, and the weaker twin of God’s last creation, man. But I’ve always pictured her in a rather different light: flawed, yes, but also as a bold firebrand who personifies some of our most cherished values. It is this version of Eve which I wish to share.

2 The Torch Bearer: Eden and the Fall

“And the Lord God planted a garden in Eden, in the east, and there he put the man whom he had formed.⁹ And out of the ground the Lord God made to spring up every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food. The tree of life was in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.” (Genesis 2: 9–10).

Between the lines, one can sense the Garden of Eden to be the embodiment of abundance, harmony and most of all, *perfection*. Indeed, when we imagine Eden, we often think of a place where the material and spiritual aspects of life have been harmonised; a Utopia if you will – that grand idea of perfection we dream of (re)gaining. In the Genesis narrative, perfection is embodied in one element: the Tree of Life, which is in reality and in legend the source of eternal life, guarding Eden against the “evils of fear, decay and corruption; a warden of the garden’s imperishable state.

However, as Genesis clarifies, the *Tree of Life* has a counterpart; an element of the garden I believe to be one of the most resonant symbols in human history. Hanging over the very edge of creation, over the edge of Eden, stands the *Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil*. With its roots extending into

the watery darkness of the Omniversal Potential which lies beyond Eden, I imagine this as the only place in the garden where the laws of this universe can be bent and where perfection can be challenged. And it is here, with Eve standing beneath its branches, that I imagine her story beginning. But I don't want to present Eve as the simplistic woman tempted into eating the tree's fruit by the devil, as is suggested in Genesis. There is no snake, no Lucifer in this version. In fact, there is no source of temptation outside the mind of Eve herself. That mind is an intelligent and enquiring one too. But it is also not quite as we would know it.

Formed from the elements of the garden itself, Eve is not human per se, at least not yet. Though like us, she is a sentient being, I also imagine her as someone who is intimately connected to all other elements of creation, unlike us. This is possible in Eden because here, creations – that is, those possibilities which have emerged from the Omniversal Potential – are not distinctly separated from one another, for this is a false impression of our own universe, as I shall discuss below. Instead, each and every element in Eden is connected to the rest and their experiences shared. This union allows all the different elements of the garden, such as the Tree of Life, to also be constituents of Eve herself, meaning Eve *is* Eden and Eden *is* Eve – they are embodiments of one another. The Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil however, though sharing a union with Eve, also extends beyond Eden, and so is at the same time also connected to all the uncreated possibilities (i.e. “signatures”) of the Omniversal Potential beyond.

Now, though the Tree of Life permits immortality in a limited, albeit Utopian universe, Eve realises that its counterpart is of far greater significance because it allows *all* other possibilities (i.e. possibilities currently impossible in Eden) to be created. This is part of a certain type of liberty I imagine Eve reaching for in the garden; a liberty of perpetual, eternal and unbounded creation which is also in union with herself. This is what I define as “Omniversal Liberty” (Crowther 2014); a somewhat unimaginable condition where every possible creation actually becomes possible, and with the Tree of Knowledge acting as a bridge for Eve; a doorway to other understandings, to other possibilities and to other creations.

Knowing that she is connected to the rest of Eden, Eve understands that if she were to eat from this tree, possibilities previously in the Omniversal Potential would be able to flood into creation *through* her. But what she neglects to comprehend is that these created possibilities would not be those selected by any divine creator, and as such, would include elements which had hitherto been excluded from the original design of the universe. The tree's forbidden fruit, with their blackened and crumpled skins, hint at these excluded possibilities, and I imagine Eve gathering the courage required so that she can stretch out her hand to grasp one. She does of course, and bringing the fruit to her lips, she sinks her teeth into its skin.

But instead of Omniversal Liberty (where all worlds, all cultures, and all visions become possible), Eve is immediately presented with time, with its deadly inclination for linear decay. I thus imagine Eve clutching at her chest as her heart takes its first beat. Falling to the ground, newly created mortality crashes down upon her, and it takes mere seconds for her flawless skin to blemish, and for the golden glint of divinity, which moments ago shimmered across her eyes, to fade and dull. Her once ubiquitous mind is then imprisoned to the body and is opened up to all the limitations which result from this confinement. With her connection to the Tree of Life now severed, she begins to comprehend what humanity will mean to her; that from now on, she will be a subject to all the indescribable terrors (and pleasures) that the term ‘mortality’ only tentatively implies. And as Eden fades away around her, it reveals an entirely new universe behind it – the wilderness of our own.

3 The Universal Design

In opening a doorway onto the Omniversal Potential, Eve had intended to create a universe where possibilities, previously only “signatures”, are able to continually flood into creation. But breaking the protection and equilibrium of Eden's “perfect” state (granted by the Tree of Life) had unforeseen consequences. Emerging from the Omniversal Potential, each new creation now had the capacity to create, dominate, eliminate, and prevent the existence of others, meaning all creations make countless others redundant. This ability is what I define

as the “Universal Design”, necessitating every creation to inevitably struggle against creation.

By stepping out of Eden, Eve thus finds herself in a universe of *seemingly* separate entities; something strongly alluded to in Genesis as she becomes aware of her nakedness. This, the awakening of her human-self, symbolises the moment she comprehends her mind as a separate entity from the rest of creation – her connection to Eden has been cut. I thus imagine her impending shame not as a consequence of her nakedness, but instead deriving from her comprehension of this “Universal Design”; fostering a modular mindset and making Omniversal Liberty a practical impossibility. Therefore, Eve’s transformation from a spiritual entity into a mortal woman signifies much more than humanity simply becoming a hostage to death, for it represents a metamorphosis of understanding; from an interconnected universe to an irrevocable dislocation of parts.

This is not what Eve had envisioned – of unbounded, connected creation – but is instead a wholly modular reality, with the human mind seemingly predisposed to make likewise modular judgements upon it. Indeed, when we observe any creation, we make a modular judgement, whether consciously or unconsciously, as to what that creation may constitute; i.e. that a particular object has a certain shape or possesses a particular style, etc. In so doing, we work to define it; to separate the creation from the rest and place a boundary around it. This method of separating creation into criteria and categories represents “modular thought”; an example of which is that of names. So in stating my name is “Tom” for instance, I inform you that I am something, and around that I create a mental boundary that others cannot enter unless they share it. Thus, in my mind, and in yours, a module is formed into which I place myself (and into which I am placed at birth) – I am something and you are not.

This is the “Universal Design” within us, as this created possibility, this creation that I be named “Tom”, works to include some creations and exclude others, while also preventing other names (that is, other creations), from being formed around me. This is the nature of modular thought, with every individual being placed, by either him/herself or by others, into an immeasurable number of modules throughout their

lives, though many remain fluid from birth until death. There are huge, sweeping modules of course, such as gender, and there are smaller ones, like names. But we all belong to them (e.g. family, community, nation, etc.), and though each module possesses and creates a countless number of other modules in their own right, each one also imposes their own expectations on the individuals which are judged to belong to it.

This also demonstrates the ways in which modular thoughts can come together to create others. When we bake a cake for instance, we use multiple ingredients, each one being independent at the beginning, and we use these to create something which we regard as new and independent – the cake itself. An original set of creations come together to create something new. However, though multiple modules may not always conflict, they inevitably can. The bringing together of those ingredients may make a good cake, but it could also make something wholly inedible. It is the same with each of us. And though we all remain highly elusive to any kind of genuinely solid categorisation, when we meet people, we inevitably use modular thought to force them into a series of categories we construct in our minds. Some of these may conflict with the modules which we belong to, and some may not. However, it is this collection of thoughts which nevertheless gives us an impression of that person. But we can never truly capture someone through this method, and this demonstrates the futility in attempting to confine reality to category, even though we nevertheless attempt to do so.

This way of thinking is what I imagine Eve fearing most; that humanity would set a congregation of modules upon creation and that we would ultimately place restrictions upon ourselves, on others, and on the entire cosmos that we are each immersed within. Indeed, modular thought is the Universal Design in action within us; seeking to create, control, eliminate and prevent, as possessing of all creations. But there is a crucial difference here, because through us, the Universal Design (that is, this intrinsic power to create, dominate, and prevent) is granted sentience, and can thus be witnessed, embraced, and inevitably for humanity, “perfected”.

The idea of perfection is especially significant for it represents the absolute expression of the Universal Design, requiring all of its powers to be wielded so completely that the

imperfect is not only made non-existent, but remains forever outside the scope of possibility – a “signature” in the Omniversal Potential and never anything more. True perfection – “Edenic Perfection” – thus represents a condition where the Universal Design has been embraced to such an extent that the design itself no longer seems to exist, for there is no more a need to create, control, eliminate, or prevent; the struggle of creation has already been won.

Perfection lies at the heart of the Universal Design. However, as humanity is dependent on modular thought, we are forced to define perfection before we can ultimately work to create it, and to do that we must first forge criteria; that is, we must define what is necessary for perfection’s creation before we can relegate everything outside of our selected criteria (i.e. the imperfect) onto the heap of defective culture. The pursuit of perfection is thereby imbued with a sense of singularity, restriction and power; employing the Universal Design to remove identified “weak links”, and thereby acting as a lime-wash over the greater part of human potential. That said, perfection in its fullest and truest form as described above (Edenic Perfection) has never been accomplished – or even approached – because dissidence against criteria has always remained within the spectrum of human possibility. What I mean is that perfection represents a state of creation that has become unchangeable and equilibrious, whereas society and its individuals have always remained capable of change.

To even conceive of such a state, let alone begin creating it, I can only assume that one would first require an absolute understanding and control of reality so as to be able to funnel its desired elements into a state of said perfection, and then, to forever discard the imperfect. We can perhaps see the conception of such an enterprise in the intensely modular nature of scientific thought, which dogmatically seeks a single objective view of the world and demands of us a full understanding regarding the structure of “reality”. To do that, science necessitates a full acceptance of the Universal Design; utilising it to define the nature of “truth” and force the scope of perceived reality into bounded mental spaces so as to comprehend it. Indeed, it is clear that “science”, as a philosophy of objective reasoning and observation, aims to *attain* a hold on “truth”. It can’t be denied that with its vast catalogue of modular thoughts, it has marched across the

globe with all the arrogance of an imperial goliath, and for centuries now it has preached itself to be truth’s master – its attainer as it were. And as the driving force of modernity, our foremost social ideal has thus come to be that of *attainment*; representing a general move to discard the unobtainable, mistruth, and those who do not (or cannot) attain; to mark them out as weak links in the chains of culture. It is conceivable that through this method of modulating, understanding and *potentially* controlling reality that humanity shall edge closer to perceiving what “perfection” may constitute; that is, closer to creating a kind of “Eden” – a perfect, but selected ideal of independent creations.

But in discarding that which weakens the whole (i.e. the theoretical imperfect), such an aspiration justifies the will to power, and as a result, the control and direction of truth itself. It demonstrates how “perfection” (and the Universal Design behind this goal) seeks to limit the possibility of creation in line with a designed view on the universe. Eve had sought something else however; something which rallies against and even seeks to transcend the Universal Design – Omniversal Liberty; that unimaginable state where every creation becomes possible, where every creation is connected, and where perfection itself has become redundant.

4 The Asperian Design

Through science and through modulation, we divide up the universe. But within us, a remnant of Eden remains aware of union. Opposing the divisive nature of the Universal Design, it intends each element of creation to be linked to the rest. This quality, descended from Eve, is what I define as the “Asperian Design”, and represents nothing less than our instinctual move towards the origin of creation, towards that which lies behind perceived reality, behind our thoughts which attempt to bind it, and most importantly, towards that which transcends that instinctual feature of the Universal Design – our will to power.

Found within the subconscious core of many ideologies, religious and secular, the Asperian Design can seem difficult to grasp. This is not because it is elusive per se, but because the Universal Design is always present in the foreground, mask-

ing the Asperian in its evident realness; that is, in its clear presence. One should thus imagine the Asperian Design as a whisper behind the Universal's obvious clarity; an echoing reminder residing within every creation. The mind however, so inclined towards modulation, naturally seeks to capture this when heard, and it is here where the Asperian Design is elusive, because it cannot be held.

Anything which attempts to hold the Asperian within the confines of the human mind simply represents the structures – products of the Universal Design – which we construct around the Asperian to bind it in place, channel its will, and amplify that whisper. But as the Universal Design remains prominently in the foreground (i.e. as the structure; as a method), the Asperian Design continues as a whisper within, rarely breaking through. Indeed, though many of our ideologies seek a state akin with the will of the Asperian Design – that is, a union with God and creation; a union with one another – they each require their followers to approach that union through the tools of the Universal; e.g. by defining sin and seeking to expel it in oneself and in others. The quest for perfection, and its need to restrict creation, thus always remains present.

Now in presenting an idea, seemingly distinct and separate from my readers, a philosopher's duty is to then call those readers to action, because only through that action can the isolated philosophy become an integral part of one's own being. Only then can the original idea be given life, as it becomes life through us. But the Asperian Design presents us with a paradox, because how do you aspire for the unattainable – that is, how do you structure a philosophy for that which eludes structure itself? I am fully aware that in defining steps of progression and creating such a structure around the Asperian Design, I would be pulling the Universal Design over it. I would be modulating the Asperian, which I inevitably do through these very words. But that said, the key to any Asperian philosophy has to be that which lies at the core of this Design: "transcendence" – transcendence of structure, of modulation, of boundaries (mental and physical), and of our desire for perfection. It is important to clarify this term however, for I don't mean "transcendence" in the breaking of boundaries and the setting up of new ones, only to find that

they too will need to be broken. Transcendence here is meant in the Edenic sense, as alluded to earlier.

Returning to the topic of Eden then, recall how all the elements of the garden are at one with Eve. This means she possesses independent thoughts and actions which are at the same time experienced and shared with *all* other creations, thereby allowing her to comprehend her universe as a unified and sentient entity which *is* also herself. This marks Eve as one of the freest beings in history, mythic or otherwise, because in her reality, ignorance is absent. So Asperian transcendence is not about the destruction of boundaries and thenceforth the destruction of that which was binding, but is instead this capacity to both transcend one's own boundaries and then transcend those which surround others, as in Eden. This is at the heart of Asperian philosophy – *transcendence* of self and the other. In so doing, we seek a (limited) state of reality where the "Other" becomes tangible, connectable.

The key to achieving Asperian transcendence has to lie in the idea of "signatures" as I mentioned earlier. To recap and expand upon this abstract concept, I've already stated that every creation represents a possibility emerging from the Omniversal Potential. Before creation, that possibility only exists as a "signature" (a kind of blueprint of the creation), and when it emerges into reality, the creation retains that signature. With this in mind, think of any creation – a tree for example. The tree is fundamentally made up of many creations of course, which, like waves, overlap and underlie others: from the way it sways in the wind, to the shape of each branch, to the movement of each leaf, and to elements beyond human modulation – to the nature of each atom within. The tree is essentially a web of different possibilities with an innumerable series of signatures attached to it.

Significantly, these signatures are all connected because all the creations which make up the tree are linked in the Omniversal Potential before creation even occurred. To explain, let's say that there's a possibility that a certain wind will brush past a certain leaf at a given time. Before creation, this possibility only exists as a signature in the Omniversal Potential. That possibility then emerges into reality as a "creation", and though the wind may remain physically separate

from the leaf, the signature at the heart of this creation connects the elements (the wind and the leaf) in the backspace of reality. It is the same with us.

When I perceive the tree, a creation is formed in my mind (i.e. my mental/physical perception of the tree). Crucially, like the leaf and the wind, the signature of perception acts as a bridge between the tree and the perceiver, because both the “perceiver” and the “tree” are fundamentally linked in the Omniversal Potential before creation even occurred. That is, a signature existed in which the tree would be perceived by myself, and at the same time, that I would perceive the tree. When that possibility emerges into reality, I remain physically separate from the tree of course, but the signature of that creation (i.e. the possibility of perception between perceiver and tree) connects us behind reality. That signature (i.e. my perception) overlaps and underlies those of the tree and myself, and acts as a bridge between us. Whether I am aware of it or not, the tree – or at least those elements I perceive to be the tree – becomes a part of me, and vice versa.

Every time creations come together like this, every time we experience, affect and perceive something else, a signature entwines those elements together. We thus *collect* them throughout our lives, whether we know it or not; attaching signatures to our being; that is, to our overall possibility. This collection of signatures which gather around us, unseen behind reality and fundamentally linking us to all we perceive, is what I call the “Ribbon”. It is our knowledge of the Ribbon which distinguishes those who adhere to the Universal Design, and those who seek to understand the Asperian. Indeed, the modular mind, perceiving creations as a series of distinguishable units, would see that tree as a modular entity and comprehend it through the senses alone: sight bringing images, hearing bringing sound, contact bringing touch, and so on; unaware that behind it, signatures link the perceiver to the tree. The Asperian likewise understands the tree through the senses, but seeks to go further. Knowing that the signature of perception is a bridge of understanding, the Asperian attempts to discern the signature’s presence, pushing through the limitations of the modular mind and seeking to comprehend the signatures within; those elements which lie beyond words, sounds and images. It is by perceiving the signature that the Asperian comes to understand their connec-

tion to the creation (i.e. the tree) and can thus become aware of all the other signatures which underlie and overlap it. In essence, they seek to gain transcendence of self.

Asperian philosophy is thus one that seeks interaction between self and everything else, aspiring for immersion, clear perception and of course, transcendence. But like the Universal Design, the Asperian Design also has its absolute. This is what Eve had sought in Eden – “Omniversal Liberty”; i.e. a connection to *unbridled* creation. Though this straightforward definition implies its acquisition to be equally straightforward however, the full spectrum of Omniversal Liberty would certainly remain one of the most elusive concepts imaginable, because, like perfection (the Universal Design’s absolute), it also requires a full and complete comprehension of the universe. But rather than the Universal Design’s gradual modulation and control of reality, Omniversal Liberty would first require an Asperian state. That is, it would require our full transcendence of modular thought, with the distinctions between all creations being blurred in our minds, and with our very sense of self becoming entwined with everything else in our universe. Only then, in this limited state of creation of complete connection, could one conceivably reach beyond that reality and into the Omniversal Potential with all of its “impossibilities”. As in Eden, only then can the Asperian state be opened up to those impossibilities.

Of course, one should recall how Eve, who dwelt within said state, reached too far when taking the fruit from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. Much as “perfection” promises much but would deliver an entirely restricted reality, Omniversal Liberty would present us with that which was presented to Eve – a wilderness. The absolutes of the Universal and Asperian Designs are both temptations towards oblivion – the fruit was forbidden for a reason.

5 Conclusion: The Scattered Seeds of Eden

“Power”, defying definition and evoking a complex web of images and ideas, is a key concept of life. I have suggested its root to lie within a Universal Design; the ability for all things to create, dominate, destroy and prevent the existence of other creations. Ushering in a modular state of reality, the human mind is likewise predisposed to make modular judgments upon it. But the mind (the only part of the divine humanity holds onto) is tortured by the prospect that it is a victim of this design – for what deity wouldn’t fear the prospect of its own death?

It is this, that our lives can be created, dominated, destroyed and prevented, which compels us to become masters rather than victims of the Universal Design. This is where the idea of perfection becomes pertinent. A goal uniquely pursued by humanity, perfection is that state where creations no longer need to follow the rules of the Universal Design; where the elements of the universe have been re-ordered in such a way that reality becomes unchangeable, equilibrious and eternal, as in Eden. But one needs to use the tools of the Universal Design to achieve that; to make the imperfect not only non-existent, but to forever remain outside the scope of possibility. That requires the mind’s gradual modulation of the universe so as to be able to construct a criterion of perfection; creating, controlling and enhancing elements we judge shall form it, while eliminating imperfections and preventing their re-emergence into reality.

This remains the driving force of our age – the illumination, modulation and obtainment of “truth” and its employment in attaining perfection. Throughout this article however, I have implied modulation to be a human defect rather an advantage. Our original sin as it were. This is because, whether trivial or mortal, each modular thought is instilled with the intrinsic power of the Universal Design as each one confines reality (or “truth”) into category. Forcing the scope of perceived reality into bounded mental spaces, modular thoughts constrain not only our own minds, but other’s too. As Rousseau so famously declared, man is born free and is everywhere in chains. Made up of the modular thoughts we create from birth until death, we are the ones who place those chains upon ourselves and upon others in the ironic hope of freeing ourselves from the Universal Design.

But as this article has also suggested, there are two layers to reality, and the Universal Design habituates only one of them – the “lighted world” as revealed in Genesis; the reality we manipulate and re-order to our will; the universe of parts which inspires modular thought in the first instance. Behind this, and running parallel to it, I have suggested the existence of a darker reality. Instead of a chaotic primordiality though, I have represented it here as an endless series of intertwining signatures; single possibilities constantly being woven into others in the illuminated forefront of reality. What this shadow “universe” means is that every creation, rather than a distinct unit able to create, dominate, destroy and prevent, is at the same time a “Ribbon” of signatures; a collection of interlinked possibilities linking each creation to all the others it interacts with. We ourselves are Ribbons of these possibilities, created and being created, connecting us to all we perceive and vice versa. Our ability to acknowledge this is what I have defined as the “Asperian Design”. The real question however, is whether we are able to transcend the modular mind and experience the kind of conscious connection with creation which Eve enjoyed – can we ultimately blur our own boundaries and *become* that which we perceive? This requires further discussion and will be examined in a later article. As one may imagine though, this kind of transcendental experience wouldn’t be easy, because much as we are blind in the dark, the modular mind is likewise blind to the darker reality hidden behind the lighted one.

I should point out however, that though I have suggested the human mind to be fallible, as Eve feared and as Genesis implies, it remains one of the most brilliant things our universe can boast of, as I stated at the beginning. This isn’t because it can modulate and manipulate reality effectively, but because it may prove to be the one marvel that can acknowledge both the light and the dark. Indeed, though a product of a limited universe, bound by the Universal Design and inclined towards perfection, the mind also has the capacity to look into the Omniversal Potential, gaze upon possibilities seemingly impossible in our universe, and reach out to create them. This means it can imagine that which lies beyond the lighted world, and as long as it can do that, the mind will rally against universal modulation and will deny it its much desired monopoly on “truth”. So in conclusion, maybe our exploration into the darkness will be more enlightening that we yet realise.

References

- Cameron, Julia. 1992. *The Artist's Way: A Spiritual Path to Higher Creativity*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Campbell, Joseph. 1973. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chupungco, Anscar. 1977. *The Cosmic Elements of Christian Passover*. Rome: Editrice Anselmiana.
- Crowther, Thomas. 2014. "Omniversal Liberty." *Essays in the Philosophy of Humanism* 22 (2): 119–136.
- Helms, Mary. 2004. "Before the Dawn: Monks and the Night in Late Antiquity and Early Medieval Europe." *Anthropos* 99: 177–191.
- Adrienne Heijnen. 2005. "Dreams, Darkness and Hidden Spheres: Exploring the Anthropology of the Night in Icelandic Society." *Paideuma* 51: 193–207.
- Knipe, Rita. 1989. *The Water of Life: A Jungian Journey through Hawaiian Myth*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- May, Herbert. 1939. "The Creation of Light in Genesis 1: 3–5." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 58: 203–211.
- Morris, Nina. 2011. "Night Walking: Darkness and Sensory Perception in a Night-Time Landscape Installation." *Cultural Geographies* 18 (3): 315–342.
- Niditch, Susan. 1985. *Chaos to Cosmos: Studies in Biblical Patterns of Creation*. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Van Over, Raymond. 1980. *Sun Songs: Creation Myths from Around the World*. New York: New American Library.
- Wakeman, Mary. 1973. *God's Battle with the Monster: A Study in Biblical Imagery*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Wilkinson, Richard. 2003. *The Complete Gods and Goddesses of Ancient Egypt*. London: Thames and Hudson.