

Salvation of the Saviors (series 116-369)

Project 369 – Non-Articles: Beyond the Text: State, Religion, Faith – The Human Control Code...

*People are convinced that they see the world as it truly is.
Yet they see only what they are capable of perceiving.
And the boundaries of that perception are defined not
by knowledge — rather by the very structure of their thinking.*

People have grown accustomed to believing that they perceive reality directly. That they see the world as it truly is and draw conclusions from that. However, this sensation is deceptive. We are dealing not with reality itself, rather with its interpretation — the version that our own instrument of thought is **CAPABLE OF PERCEIVING**. And here the key question emerges: if the boundaries of perception are determined by the very structure of thinking itself, then the differences between people are defined not so much by the amount of knowledge they possess, rather by the way their very mode of perception is constructed. The same fact may be accepted, rejected, or not even noticed at all — not because it is complex, rather because it falls outside the permissible range of perception.

In the previous articles, we came to the understanding that religion and state **DO NOT EXIST** separately from this process. They do not merely shape behavior — they reinforce specific models of perception within which that behavior becomes natural. Now we take the next step. We will examine concrete structures: how states were built, how religious systems were formed, and in what way they corresponded to the level of brain genotype development. Not as separate phenomena, rather as interconnected elements of a single process. Because faith, power, and thinking **DO NOT EXIST** in isolation. They form a system in which each element supports the other. And if this system is viewed as a whole, it becomes possible to see not only how it functions, but also why it functions exactly the way it does.

Rome represented a rigidly centralized, authoritarian structure in which all elements were subordinated to a single node. This system resembled a tree: as long as the trunk exists, everything else exists with it. The weakening of the trunk inevitably leads to the weakening of the entire structure, and its disappearance leads to collapse, regardless of the strength of the individual branches. The trunk of this system was the ruler. His authority was not a personal characteristic, rather a **SYSTEMIC ELEMENT** upon which the stability of the entire structure depended. Under both the Republic and the Empire, this was fixed by the law “On Injury to Majesty,” where “majesty” referred to authority itself: first state authority, and later authority personified in the emperor. Any attack against it was equated with undermining the system and punished with maximum severity. The entire structure of Rome was oriented toward the elevation of the center. This principle was later **REPEATEDLY REPRODUCED** in different forms, yet its essence remained unchanged: a single center of control to which the entire

system is bound. And this is not merely a political model — it is a model corresponding to a certain level of brain genotypes, in which governance is built through rigid hierarchy and external authority.

Within this system, the emperor could not be merely a man. He had to exist above the level of everyone else. Therefore, he was endowed with the status of a deity — not symbolically, rather as an integral part of the structure itself. He was simultaneously ruler and high priest — Pontifex Maximus, uniting within himself both political and religious authority. Today this title belongs to the Pope of Rome — Pontifex Maximus of Christ. This created a **CLOSED SYSTEM** in which power and faith reinforced one another. Such an approach was not an abstract idea — it was embedded at the level of perception itself. People were expected not merely to obey, rather to perceive this structure as natural. It is precisely here that the connection with brain genotypes becomes visible: at a certain level of cognitive development, such a model is perceived not as something imposed, rather as the only possible reality.



The maintenance of the authority of the center in Rome was carried out with the same precision by which discipline is maintained in an army. An army is a mechanism assembled from people. Its effectiveness is determined by the degree of coordination between actions. Any deviation is **NOT MERELY** a violation; it is a destabilization of the structure itself. Military regulations are not a formality; they are the operational algorithm of the system. Violating those regulations reduces the precision of interaction between the elements. Once a critical threshold is reached, the system loses controllability and turns into an unstructured mass. Precisely the same principle lies at the foundation of the state. If the elements cease to correspond to the prescribed model of behavior, if the perception of authority is destroyed, **THE SYSTEM LOSES ITS INTEGRITY**. And if there is no force capable of restoring that alignment, it inevitably collapses. That is why governance in Rome was built not only through

force, rather also through the formation of proper perception. Because without that, no structure can continue to exist.

The same principle operates within an imperial structure. If the elements of the system cease to recognize and support the central node, the system begins to disintegrate. At first this appears as weakening. Then external pressure emerges. And this pressure is not the result of someone's will — it is a systemic inevitability, an inherent pattern. Any system exists within an environment of other systems. And if one of them loses its internal density, neighboring systems begin to fill the newly opened space. This can be imagined as a closed space filled with spheres: if the pressure within one sphere drops, the others begin compressing it until they fully occupy its volume. The same occurs with states. The weakening of the center **INEVITABLY TRIGGERS** external influence. If the system does not demonstrate the ability to defend itself, the pressure intensifies. This, in turn, launches internal processes of disintegration — growing instability, conflicts, even civil confrontations. External aggression then becomes only a matter of time. The outcome is always the same — the destruction of the structure and

losses perceived as tragedy, though in essence they are the consequence of the system failing to correspond to its own nature.

The only way to avoid this is to **PRESERVE INTEGRITY**. And this means not merely being strong, rather corresponding to the type of one's own structure. If a system is built according to the principle of a "tree," its stability depends on the condition of the center. All elements must remain aligned with it. The loss of the center leads to immediate collapse, because the structure is held together by a vertical axis. If, however, the system is built according to the principle of a "basket," where the elements are equal and interconnected, it is far more resistant to the loss of individual parts. Destruction becomes possible only when a critical mass of elements is lost. From this emerges the logic of security itself. Every system protects not abstract stability, rather **ITS OWN FORM**. In a "basket," the equality of the elements must be preserved. Therefore, any attempt to strengthen one of them is perceived as a threat to the entire structure. The transformation of a "twig" into a "trunk" means a change in the very nature of the system.

At first glance, this may appear to be evolution. However, the problem is that a change in form requires a different mechanism of functioning. Without it, the system loses stability. And here arises the **KEY MOMENT** directly connected to brain genotypes. Different types of structures correspond to different levels of perception and organization of thinking. What is natural for one system becomes destructive for another. That is precisely why transitions between models are never smooth. They are accompanied by tension, because they require changes not only in the external structure, rather also in the internal instrument of perception itself.

Within an originally well-constructed system, there exists a mechanism of succession that allows its integrity to be preserved when the center changes. This mechanism ensures continuity **WITHOUT DESTROYING** the structure itself. Without it, any attempt at transformation leads not to development, rather to disintegration. If a "basket" mutates into a "tree," it loses its natural capacity for reproduction. A person who comes to power within a horizontal system and then concentrates authority in his own hands enters into contradiction with the very nature of that structure. He already performs the function of a "trunk," yet by form he is still forced to remain a "twig." **THIS ELIMINATES** the natural mechanism of succession. In a "tree," the transfer of power can be fixed — through inheritance or appointment. In a "basket," such a mechanism does not function. An appointed successor is not perceived by the system as a legitimate center. After the departure of such a ruler, a classic situation emerges: multiple claimants, the formation of factions, and conflict over the center. A system deprived of a stable mechanism for the transfer of power enters a phase of disintegration. Even if a dictator attempts to designate a successor in advance, this **DOES NOT SOLVE** the problem. Formally, an appointment may be made, yet it is not embedded within the structure itself. Therefore, after the disappearance of the center, the system returns to its original state — the struggle of equal elements.

Here a deeper principle reveals itself. A social system behaves like a living structure. It strives to preserve its own form. And the methods of that preservation are determined by its nature. What strengthens a "tree"



destroys a “basket.” And vice versa. In a “tree,” stability is achieved **THROUGH THE NARROWING** of the freedom of its elements and the strengthening of the center. In a “basket,” stability is achieved through the expansion of freedom and balance between the elements. This difference is directly connected to brain genotypes. Different levels of perception require different forms of organization. Where thinking is oriented toward an external center, hierarchy becomes natural. Where distributed perception becomes activated, a demand for equality emerges.

The Roman Empire, as a “tree,” acted in complete accordance with its nature. The system maintained the center through control of perception. Any manifestation of disrespect toward the emperor was regarded not as private behavior, rather **AS A THREAT** to the integrity of the whole. Control was exercised harshly. Violations were punished publicly, forming within society a stable model of perception. At the same time, errors were inevitable. Not only the guilty fell under punishment, but also innocent bystanders. There were denunciations, there were miscalculations, there was injustice.

From the point of view of the individual, this is a tragedy. However, from the point of view of the system, a different parameter is decisive — **THE PRESERVATION OF THE STRUCTURE**. The attempt to build governance upon the principle of absolute humaneness appears attractive, yet it fails to take into account the nature of the system itself. Weakening the mechanisms of protection for the sake of isolated cases creates the conditions for the destruction of the entire structure. And then the consequences become incomparably larger in scale.

By its nature, a system **CANNOT** be perfect. Just as ideal geometry does not exist in reality, neither do flawless courts or flawless mechanisms of control. Any structure claiming stability inevitably contains an element of error. The punishment of the innocent is not the goal; it is a side effect of the system’s operation. A price that must be paid for the preservation of integrity. Without this, the system either loses the ability to defend itself or collapses altogether.

Even the most “just” war claims incomparably more lives than the harshest internal mechanism of control. To avoid war, a system **MUST BE** strong. And strength in this case means corresponding to its own nature, not following abstract notions of humaneness. Here arises the fundamental choice that lies at the foundation of any form of power: either minimize local losses while accepting the risk of destroying the entire system, or permit limited sacrifices in order to preserve the integrity of the structure. Within the framework of reality, no third option exists. This is the burden of governance itself — the choice of the lesser evil. Not because it is morally right, rather because otherwise the system does not survive. Within this logic, Rome constructed its model. The law demanded from every inhabitant recognition of the supreme authority of the emperor — both in the secular and in the spiritual sphere. In politics, this was expressed through recognition of **HIS DECISIONS** as final. In the spiritual sphere — through recognition of his divine nature. The emperor did not merely occupy the highest position — he was placed beyond the human level itself. Through the mythology of his origin, the perception was formed that he was the son of higher powers. This was not decoration — it was an element of the structure.

Such a model solved several tasks at once. It explained the origin of power, reinforced its legitimacy, and formed the **CORRESPONDING PERCEPTION** within the population. Even a man rising from the lowest ranks, upon becoming emperor, had to be reinterpreted. He could no longer remain merely human. He became the bearer of a different nature — a demigod, the center through which governance was carried out. This is directly connected to the development of a particular brain genotype. At a certain level of perception, authority cannot exist without sacralization. For the system to remain stable, the center must be perceived not as one of the elements, rather as a qualitatively

DIFFERENT LEVEL. The divine nature of the emperor granted him the right to determine not only the political order, but also the religious one. He could alter cults, prohibit them, or support them — not as a private individual, rather as the bearer of supreme authority. And although Rome rarely interfered directly in religious processes, the very right to such interference was firmly established. It was part of the system itself.

Recognition of this right was expressed through ritual. Just as a soldier confirms obedience through adherence to military regulations, so a subject confirmed recognition of the center through sacrifice. This was **NOT MERELY** a ritual — it was an act of reinforcing perception. The formula spoken at that moment fixed the essential principle: the emperor is the source of truth in both earthly and spiritual matters.

For conquered peoples, such a model did not appear foreign. Victory was perceived as proof of strength. And strength — as a sign of truth. If one system proved stronger than another, then its center was deemed worthy of recognition. In precisely this way, a stable chain was formed: **strength → authority → faith → governance.**

Moreover, the issue concerns not only outsiders — one is instructed to reject and even destroy those closest to them if they violate this principle. This means the complete and unconditional denial of any other forms of sacred authority. The worship of Mars, Jupiter, or any other deities, including a deified ruler, becomes impossible within this logic. The prohibition is **NOT SYMBOLIC**, rather absolute. And here a direct collision between two systems emerges. Rome demands recognition of the emperor as the supreme authority, including in the spiritual sphere. This is reinforced through the ritual of sacrifice. For the Roman system, this is an act of loyalty, a confirmation of inclusion within the structure. For a Jew, however, that same act **MEANS A VIOLATION** of the fundamental principle — the rejection of the one God. Thus, a situation arises in which it is impossible to simultaneously conform to both systems. The fulfillment of one law automatically means the violation of the other.

Every Jew living within the boundaries of the Roman Empire found himself before a rigid choice:



either remain faithful to the Law and enter into conflict with authority, or preserve personal safety and abandon the foundation of his own system. This conflict **IS NOT** accidental. It reflects a difference in types of perception — that is, in brain genotypes. The Roman model presupposes recognition of an external center as the source of truth. The Jewish model establishes an internal, indivisible center that does not permit substitution. These are two fundamentally different levels of the organization of thinking. In the first case, a person is integrated into the system through recognition of hierarchy. In the second — through the rigid fixation of a single foundation **NOT SUBJECT** to revision. That is precisely why compromise becomes impossible.

In choosing between these models, the Jews rejected the Roman demand. They accepted external obligations — taxes, duties — yet refused to recognize the spiritual authority of the emperor. By

doing so, they effectively placed themselves outside the system's full controllability. And it is precisely this that made them a unique element within the imperial structure.

Rome tested the steadfastness of the Jews not through words, rather through pressure. Once it became clear that the refusal was not a pose, rather a **WILLINGNESS TO GO** to the very end, the system found itself before a choice: either enforce compliance through force, expending resources, or permit an exception and preserve governability through taxation. Rome chose the latter. The reason was simple — Judaism did not represent a strategic threat. It was a local system, enclosed within the framework of a single people. It did not seek expansion and therefore could not alter the overall structure of the empire.

Christianity in the time of Christ was the religion of one particular Jewish sect. Its founder recognized the Law. His followers also recognized the Law: "Do we then make void the Law through faith? Certainly not! On the contrary, we establish the Law" (Romans 3:31). Formally, there was no contradiction. However, the difference appeared at the level of interpretation. The Jews denied the pagan gods by simply **NOT RECOGNIZING** them. Christians went further — they declared them to be demons. This was a fundamentally different level of rigidity. Participation in the Roman ritual became not merely a violation, rather a crossing over to the opposite side. A rejection of the very foundation. Thus, for Christians, the act of sacrifice to the emperor meant not formal submission, rather **INNER BETRAYAL**.

Christians proclaimed: "You shall worship the Lord your God, and Him only shall you serve" (Matthew 4:10). The claims of the Roman pagan emperor — who was simultaneously the supreme pagan priest — to the status of the highest spiritual authority appeared simply absurd to them. At the same time, they did not reject the state as such. They paid taxes, fulfilled obligations, and recognized secular authority. However, they refused to acknowledge its spiritual supremacy. It is precisely here that the point of conflict emerges. The Roman system demands complete inclusion — both external and internal. The Christian one permits external submission, yet blocks the internal dimension. This makes **IT INCOMPATIBLE** with the imperial model.

At first, Rome paid little attention to this, perceiving Christians as merely a variety of Judaism. However, the situation changed rapidly. Refusals to participate in the imperial cult began to be recorded not locally, rather throughout the entire empire. This was no longer an isolated case; it was a systemic phenomenon. From its geographic spread, it became clear that this was not a closed group, rather a structure capable of expansion — and expansion beyond ethnic boundaries. It was precisely this that transformed Christianity from a local deviation into a factor requiring analysis. Rome began to investigate. It became evident that this was a new branch that had emerged within Judaism yet had moved beyond its limits — a structure forming itself into an independent system and demonstrating a high rate of growth. This did not suit many people. During the struggle between competing forces, the founder was executed.

During his lifetime, the founder of this group repeatedly declared his connection with God and asserted that he would confirm it through an unprecedented event — resurrection on the third day after his execution. According to the Christian account, **THIS IS EXACTLY** what happened: he was executed, then appeared alive to his disciples, after which he disappeared. This event became the point of a sharp transformation. Before the execution, the movement had national boundaries and was oriented toward

the “lost sheep of Israel.”¹ Afterward, a transition occurred toward an international model.

It is precisely here that the key difference becomes visible. Judaism remained bound to bloodline and **COULD NOT** move beyond the boundaries of the tribe. Christianity removed this limitation. People began to be drawn into it regardless of origin. And above all, those who occupied the lower levels of the social structure: slaves, the poor, the rejected. According to historians, Christianity was especially popular among the despised and humiliated layers of society — thieves, prostitutes, slaves, and others. And something occurred that, from the standpoint of ordinary logic, appears paradoxical. People possessing neither knowledge nor status **DEMONSTRATED THE ABILITY** to go to their deaths for a conviction they often could not even formulate clearly. This cannot be explained through the content of the teaching alone. However, it becomes understandable if viewed through the concept of brain genotypes. What occurs is the activation of a different level of perception — not rational, rather internally integral. A person operating on this level does not require complete understanding. Inclusion itself is enough. And that inclusion gives them a sense of meaning that transcends their former condition.

That is why people who had previously been despised suddenly began to feel an **INNER SUPERIORITY** over those who once despised them. This was not a social transition, rather an internal one. And this transition released an energy that was perceived as miraculous. Christianity destroyed the key limitation of the previous system — attachment to bloodline. It created a model in which anyone could be included within the structure on equal terms. This sharply increased its potential for expansion.

In effect, a system emerged that was capable of encompassing every layer of society. And it was here that Rome first encountered a genuine threat. Because within the logic of the imperial structure, what is dangerous is not the idea itself, rather its capacity to reach critical mass. If the number of elements refusing to recognize the center exceeds the permissible level, **THE SYSTEM LOSES** controllability. It becomes analogous to an army in which discipline has fallen below the critical threshold. And then disintegration becomes inevitable.

Rome evaluates what is happening precisely from this position. Christianity is perceived as a harmful phenomenon, undermining the very foundation of governance. The response of the system is predictable. Just as a commander confronted with refusal to obey resorts to extreme measures, so the authorities begin to act through public punishment. Executions become an instrument for restoring the structure. However, here an unexpected effect emerges. Instead of suppression, the system produces reinforcement.

When people voluntarily go to their deaths, it creates an impulse that **CANNOT BE**



¹ **The phrase of Jesus Christ**, “I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matthew 15:24), means that his earthly ministry was directed primarily toward the Jews — the chosen people who were awaiting the Messiah.

EXTINGUISHED by force. Those watching begin to enter into the same process. New individuals step out from the crowd, declare their allegiance, and repeat the same refusal. They are immediately executed. And the process repeats itself again. Indicative is the case of Boniface² — a man far removed from the teaching, living an ordinary life. Witnessing the behavior of the Christians, he entered into their state and made the same choice. He did not know the doctrine. Yet he sensed the level. And he preferred to die together with those who possessed that inner condition rather than remain among those who did not.

It is precisely here that it **BECOMES CLEAR** that what is spreading is not merely an idea. What is spreading is a state of perception. And this is already a different level of process — one that cannot be stopped through external pressure. It is difficult to determine with certainty what exactly motivated people like Boniface. Most likely, a simple yet powerful logic was at work: if people voluntarily give their lives for something, then that something must possess a value greater than life itself. Added to this was the energy of what was taking place — the condition of people going to death without hesitation. This acted not upon reason, rather **UPON THE LEVEL** of perception itself.

Rome quickly understood that direct suppression produced no result. The system shifted to a combined strategy. On one side — pressure: deprivation of rights, confiscations, torture, executions. On the other — attempts at integration: permission of rituals, support, even financing. The condition remained unchanged — recognition of the spiritual authority of the emperor. Even if only formal rather than genuine. Yet even this **DID NOT WORK**. The reason was that the conflict existed not on the level of behavior, rather on the level of inner foundation. Where perception had already been transformed, compromise became impossible.

Rome found itself confronted with a phenomenon that did not fit within its familiar model of governance. It could not ignore it, yet neither could it suppress it through customary means. The system's reaction became situational, yet at the same time a pattern emerged. The higher the level of thinking possessed by a ruler, the more clearly he perceived the threat. Emperors with broad strategic thinking regarded Christianity as a **STRATEGIC FACTOR** and intensified pressure against it. Less far-sighted rulers perceived it merely as another religious form and relaxed control. Yet in both cases, the process continued. This points to an important reality: what was taking place was not simply a reaction to authority, it was a process possessing its own internal dynamic. If viewed through the lens of brain genotypes, what is happening becomes clearer. **A LAYER OF PEOPLE** was forming in whom a different type of perception had been activated. For them, external coercion ceased to be the determining force. They were no longer governed exclusively through fear or advantage.

That is why the standard mechanisms — *the carrot and the stick* — lose their effectiveness. In this situation, each person is left with a choice corresponding to their inner condition. Those whose level of inclusion is greatest go all the way to the end. Those in whom it is weaker avoid direct confrontation — and thus withdrawal into isolation emerges, including in the form of monasticism. Those whose inclusion is insufficient seek ways to circumvent the demands placed upon them. This is **NOT MERELY** a behavioral difference. It is the manifestation of different levels of brain genotypes. And it is precisely through this difference that it becomes visible that the system is beginning to encounter a transition to another level of the organization of perception.

² **Boniface of Rome** (Boniface of Tarsus; also, Bonifacius; 3rd century — 19 December 290) was an early Christian martyr. He is venerated as a saint in the Orthodox, Catholic, and Armenian Churches.



As in any bureaucratic system, there were plenty of opportunities to circumvent the law. One could purchase confirmation of compliance, arrange formal observance, or shift the performance of the ritual onto someone else. Outwardly, this preserved conformity to the requirements. However, the Christian position excluded such solutions. The foundation **WAS THE UNDERSTANDING** that if the highest level of perception sees and records everything, then external form has no meaning. Either a person stands firmly within their own foundation, or merely creates an appearance. Therefore, any evasions or workarounds — within the Christian environment were regarded as a rejection of the essence itself. Not as weakness, rather as betrayal. Because the principle of “one God” allowed no duality. A person who simultaneously recognized two centers — Christ and the deified ruler — fell outside the

logic of this system. A transitional type emerged: formally included, yet internally divided. **IT IS PRECISELY HERE** that internal stratification begins. Christianity gradually divides into two directions. The first consists of people for whom the rejection of duality is absolute. They permit no compromise under any conditions. Some move into direct confrontation and accept martyrdom. Others withdraw from the system of interaction entirely, forming isolated modes of existence. Thus, practices emerge aimed at complete separation from external pressure. The second consists of people not prepared for extreme forms. They seek to preserve their belonging, yet adapt it to existing conditions. **A MODEL EMERGES** of dual conformity: outwardly — fulfillment of the system’s demands; inwardly — preservation of one’s own identity.

In practice, this leads to a binary mode of perception. One and the same person begins living simultaneously within two systems. From the standpoint of the original logic, this is no longer a unified state, it is a divided one. And here the distinction between brain genotypes becomes visible. For some, internal duality is impossible — they require integrity and are prepared to pay any price for it. For others, the coexistence of contradictions is permissible — **THEY ARE CAPABLE** of holding different levels simultaneously. This is not a question of strength or weakness. It is a question of the type of perception itself.

That is why a system cannot remain homogeneous. It inevitably stratifies in accordance with the inner capacities of its elements. Within this stratification, a new structure begins to form, one that will later determine further development.

If everything examined is brought together, it becomes obvious: this was not merely about religion, nor about isolated historical events. Before us **UNFOLDS A PROCESS** of forming structures through which the governance of people is constructed. Religion in this process is not a random phenomenon. It arises and becomes established as a form corresponding to a particular level of perception — as a mechanism through which a person’s inner agreement with the external system is formed.

The state, in turn, **DOES NOT EXIST** separately from this process. It rests upon the same foundations; however, implements them already at the level of social organization, reinforcing behavior, structure, and interaction. If expressed with complete clarity, a chain becomes visible that runs through

all the material examined: ***the structure of the state → the structure of religion → brain genotypes → Systemic Governance***. It is precisely this sequence that determines how society is formed, what forms it takes, and why some systems remain stable while others collapse. Try to transform this formula into the realities of today, and much will become understandable in the actions of the **SO-CALLED** “ruling elites,” not only in Russia, but in nearly every state in the world. And the result of these actions is something you, above all, experience directly in your own life.

However, something more important must be understood. We have only approached the beginning. Because everything examined so far is merely the first layer. The history of the formation of religion and state **IS NOT LIMITED** to isolated episodes or specific figures. It is a long, multi-layered process in which the forms change, yet the underlying logic remains the same — the logic of governance through perception.

And in order to understand it fully, it is necessary to trace exactly how these structures were created, how they were transformed, and in what way the development of brain genotypes occurred through them. It is precisely to this that the following articles will be devoted. Because beyond what has already been seen lies the most important thing — not only how all of this was structured, rather why it was structured in exactly this way. And from what it continues to operate today.

To be continued....

Feodor Shkrudnev

11 May 2026