

A Levels-of-Narrowness Existentialism

By Arthur Shevenyonov

Abstract¹

Evil is about excessive specificity (which is another way of saying where the devil is). The narrowing of the complete (denial of Orduality and Gradiency) amounts to Azimuthality. Peace is attained via completeness, and pacification is none other than simplicity where loving is too advance to espouse. Much like per-element comparison or one-to-one (bijective) functionality is futile, so too is direct reconciliation of narratives narrowed-down.

Evil Comes One: No House Divided

The nature of evil could be seen as multiple, even though this perceived multiplicity might be one action or emanation of that evil nature: reducing stories to their irrecoverably special cases. By showing up as multiplicity, evil may seek to claim a creative faculty; and if you detect its singular nature, it will condescend to faring as just that—divine simplicity. It will furthermore keep telling you that it is embedded in the very design, as the polarity of conjugates, the right and the left, or even as the freedom and variety to choose from. In essence, though, it amounts to sheer and tasteless reduction—be it phenomenological or even logical, as when the otherwise elegant account is taken too many steps further thus collapsing to absurdity; or an otherwise elegant theory comes to dominate to an extent unparalleled in religious fanaticism, thus crashing its own gate of sacrosanct claim to beauty. In fact, this is what has arguably befallen entire paradigms—democracy and post-modernity coming to deny their every alternative (and hence their own natures, too).

Evil may not amount to minor or *local* narrowing—which might be referred to as “necessary evil,” or one way the lazy mind has grown accustomed to advancing its span—reluctant to see things directly and immediately. At this stage, Azimuthality may still not be at loggerheads with Gradiency. But then evil mounts amid the same local narrowing taken all-out, with a global or higher-order reduction resulting in largely the same as unbounded syllogistic exercise does—falsity, absurdity, contradiction. In other words, utter negation could be an asymptote for mere specificity, even though this convergence occurs very fast.

¹ The present paper is dedicated to Yury Maximovich, Ida Fedorovna, and Alla Alexandrovna, my highschool teachers of the Russian philology; their poetry is still within me. I also owe a very special debt of gratitude to Polina Yakovlevna, my English teacher and someone who so confided in me as to make me feel ashamed now that the belated publishing efforts belittle the early start. The careful reader may have noted that these early publications, though Anglophone, see their promptness come at a cost (indeed themselves are “narrowed down”). Whereas the Russian originals (yet to be published) sin a lesser loss of continuity or depth, separating them meaningfully could be a challenge in its own right. Hopefully their convergence is neither a far cry nor a long shot.

One starts with a minor compromising of completeness, soon ending up with a host of disparate and incomparable special cases or phenomenologies (possibly of varying orders) on hand—only to proclaim a grand denial of ontology as such.

Some of the religions' behaviors prove to be concerted with that of “positive” science, or its method. Some creeds maintain the Complete as too unbounded (e.g. rho not taking any particular values) for it to amount to anything—which point is about as ridiculous as, yet more intricate than the “non-existence” of homogeneity. Others may wag the dog's remaining [imaginary] tails, like arguing that, since only the narrowest possible (empirical) representation is “observable,” there again is nothing to observe. In fact, there is no chance of refuting this, partially true (as will be shown), absurdity being assumed from the outset, as one is narrowing down the observable domain to an extent denying any recovery of the big picture (or the broader data sample) in question.

Yes, evil is more traditionally seen as *imperfection* or *deviation* from truth—but what else can generalize as well as simplify these perspectives other than showing how extreme deviance or narrowing defects on the complete?

More specific to the Ordinal exposition, evil could act to deny a relational nature of reality—e.g. either force the rho parameter into assuming a particular value (which is still legitimate and could even be an objective prerogative of the Creator *ex ante* or the nature *ex post* as it interacts across its each and every layer in ways shaping the relational “resultant”). Worse yet, evil may take this value to the extreme—e.g. zero, thus imposing cardinality or functionality which, alongside maintaining all *a*'s in place of *A*'s would further collapse the setup to near-nothingness (arguably still a partially structured version thereof).

Evil can bound the very nature of the Floating Basis (or “third object” *X*) in a manner that increasingly denies its most variable or endogenous nature—indeed transforming it into a conventional variable, or even a constant and a zero in the end. In the interim, though, the FB will be rendered X_n , which denotes a “level of variableness” or even a layer of functionality—still enough to claim an extension over the cardinal case (e.g. of functional analysis). The *n*-levels need not denote the particular stretchings as in a functional space, or “functions of a line.” Rather, these refer to a cut-off threshold beyond which completion (i.e. undoing of specificity, or unnarrowing) is impossible.

Amnesty for Mnemonics to Salvage Mimesis

Negation in its strong form is therefore, not identical to narrowing or specificity per se, but rather could be its asymptote. Conversely, narrowing could amount to the weaker form of negation—be it objective or “anthropic.”

Phenomenological encounter can be extended to further reveal a spectacular failure of positivism. Apart from juxtaposing irreconcilable special cases, likewise a theory can be confronted with empirics (or completeness with its phenomenological collapses or caustics),

or empirics with empirics, etc. Arguably, only ontologies (or complete accounts) can readily be compared.

Suppose theory is a higher level of representation as compared with empirics, which can be denoted as induction, or potential for higher-level recovery or adjacency²:

$$(\overline{X_E}, \overline{X_E}) < \overline{X_T}$$

$$(\overline{X_T}, \overline{X_T}) < X$$

More generally, with the power of the L or *delta* operator interchangeably denoting the narrowing depth:

$$(L^{-n}X, L^{-n}X) < L^{-n+k}X \quad \forall k \in (1, n)$$

$$(\Delta^n X, \Delta^n X) < \Delta^{n-k}X \quad \forall k \in (1, n)$$

Specificity taken to its extreme, e.g. k running in excess of n all the way *ad infinitum* will likely yield nothingness or anything near that. This may pertain to extreme phenomenologies akin to agnosticism or atheism (embarking on strong causality and determinism at best amid vanishing origins) or Satanism. The latter may deny any gap between the good and ill, or the superior versus inferior, which is only possible for large enough n 's for them to be indistinguishable from $(n-k)$. In essence, this could be seen as a naïve crushing of the Buddhist legacy, too. Even as per the more settled versions, whereas one may deny the buildings height or have sheer contempt for its walls thickness, why overlook the thoroughfares and the stairway?

However, the eerier part of this grand indifference is that, while largely true in the most complete case (referring to Orduality and Gradiency positing the representative special as congruent to the complete), its abject emulations tend to claim sole merit.

Anti-Racism is no Racism

Not all cultures are equally good—and there is no racism in so claiming. On the contrary, a globalist agenda denying the variety of developmental paths for the sake of singular convergence (not necessarily to the superior special case) could qualify as racist and fascist alike (cf. Gregor, 2006). Convergence can only be superior with respect to a complete option as recovery which, if absent or unattainable, would tolerate its imperfect proxies, e.g. a benevolent diversity. Whereas evil cannot stand perfection, God may tolerate imperfection.

In this light, in no manner can evil stand for a source of freedom, nor vice versa, if only because evil is about suppression, narrowing, and inferior convergence. All people(s) can count on mutual respect—though only on the upside, insofar as they self-actualize in

² The “>” sign really refers to a more intricate comparison operand of superiority, which is broader than mere inclusion or implication. It can alternatively read as “narrowable to,” with its “<” conjugate standing for, “recoverable to.”

good faith. No one's nature is to be taken as evil *a priori* (which is at odds with the *image*); at the end of the day, it is *posterior* materialization (*likeness*) that counts. That said, should there be institutional paradigms inseparable from their extreme reductions (i.e. willingly and knowingly evil), this modality of freedom may neither be appreciated nor acknowledged on par with goodwill.

One grand-though-trite corollary for all of us is just love and respect and appreciation³.

References

Gregor, James A. (2006). *The search for Neofascism: The use and abuse of social science*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

³ And patience with yours truly's opinionated mediocrity.