

Salvation of the Saviors

(series 80-369)

Project 369 – The Alchemy of Writing...

Words — are not a form of thought, rather its transformation.

*Writing — is to become a vessel of the alchemy of meaning,
where you — are the conduit, not the creator.*

In the previous article, we began to explore where a true text comes from. We approached writing not as a craft, rather as a form of alignment, with the Idea, with Reality, with the void from which awareness is drawn. We came to understand that a text is not “created in the head,” it passes through it like a current through a conductor, like an impulse through a neural network. The person who writes is not an author in the everyday sense of the word, rather a node of conjunction, a focal point through which Space condenses meaning. Now, we move further.

This article — is a **CONTINUATION OF THE PATH ALREADY BEGUN**. However, now our focus is not only on the source of the text, rather on its transformation — the alchemy that makes the raw word fit for perception, for transmission, for creation. Writing is not merely the expression of thoughts; it is a way of interacting with what lies deeper than thought. True writing is a **FORM OF TRANSMUTATION**: the sensory — into the clear, the inner — into the outer, the indefinite — into the comprehensible. In other words, writing is the alchemy of consciousness, the production line of truth. And if writing is one of the practices of tracking and knowing, then to learn to write means to learn how to **HOLD ATTENTION**, to discern essence from husk, to separate a thought from its shadow. It means becoming responsible for every letter, as for every action. It means learning to see — how thought moves, how thought hides, how it longs to be spoken yet cannot — and how you can help it. I write this not for those who simply wish to “write well.” I write for those **WHO ARE READY** to lay out, piece by piece, the very structure of their thought — their effort, their illusions, and their strength. This is an article about writing as a path, and about the path as writing. And if we truly aim to grasp the greatest of all Ideas — the Idea of Victory over Death — then learning to write is not secondary, rather it is essential. For we must learn to formulate not only our confusion, but also **OUR INSIGHT**. For the overcoming of aging — as part of this Great Idea — begins with overcoming distraction, carelessness, and obscurity. And thus — it begins with the labor over the Word.

Each of us, most of the time, expresses not what we truly feel. Simply because there is no **PRECISE CORRESPONDENCE** between word and feeling. We assume we are writing or speaking clearly, yet in truth, we are voicing something only half-understood, half-lived, never brought to its essence. It’s like stopping a river in the middle of its flow — what results is neither a source, nor an estuary, rather a **MUDDY BACKWATER**. Everything must be carried through to completion: energy — through meaning, thought — through form, feeling — through a clear image. Otherwise, it’s a defect, a half-finished product served under the guise of meaning. That is how texts are born that **DO NOT MOVE** anyone. Or videos that convey nothing.



At first, yes — for an ordinary person, it seems difficult to bring a work to its complete form — whether as a writer, a video creator, or a diarist. However, for someone **WHO MASTERS** the craft, it becomes impossible to do otherwise. The issue here is not talent, rather honesty and discipline: either you truly intend to express, or you merely imitate the process. And if it's the latter — why write at all? Why speak to the camera? Why step out before people? Sometimes it's even worse. Sometimes a person's entire inner workshop simply **DOESN'T WORK**: the system of thoughts and feelings is broken, logic destroyed, memory full of holes, the sense of self — lost in fog. Where, then, would the text come from? How could a clear word arise if there is no clarity **WITHIN YOU**? Such a person has no one to turn to — after all, a screwdriver cannot twist itself. However, if your thoughts and feelings still work, if something inside you aches, disturbs, or stirs — you are already

ahead. Everything else is a matter of labor and intention.

A writer, an author, a creator of any meaning must regularly confirm their own adequacy. The world will not do it for them. Some won't tell the truth — they don't want to spoil relationships. Others will say too much — just to assert themselves. That's why the **MAIN TEST** is the one you conduct yourself: before the mirror, before the screen, before a blank page. There you see how honest you are, how whole, how sane. And once you become an observer of yourself — you **STOP BEING** a thoughtless source of opinions. That is the first step toward becoming an author — not by title, rather by essence.

Writing is stalking.¹ It's not just capturing — it's tracking every nuance, every reaction, every emotion that slips past. It's the same with video: you don't just speak; you experience it out loud. A true stalker feels **NOT ONLY** what they themselves feel, but also how their words affect others. This is called being engaged. It seems impossible — that is only if you don't know where you're going. And if you do, it couldn't be any other way. There must be one goal. And it must be eternal. Because without an eternal goal, **NO ACTION** is flawless. Flawlessness is not a beautiful style. It is when you do your work today, remembering the Eternal. That's how texts are created that **WILL REMAIN RELEVANT** even a hundred years from now. That's how videos are made that become milestones. Without this, everything else gets replaced: effort turns into fuss, sincerity into narcissism, work into simulation. That's why you **MUST KNOW HOW** to rewrite — to return to the text, to the video, to yourself. Not because you were wrong, rather because you've grown. Iteration is not correction, it is development. And what is development? It's when you don't just write who you are today, you create who **YOU WANT TO BE** tomorrow. You must write not yourself, rather from yourself. Not from the first person, rather from depth. And this can be done — in text, in image, and in voice.

¹ **Stalking** — the tracking of oneself as a working system with the purpose of improving that system. Self-awareness. It is also the art of how to interact with yourself, with other people, with beings, and with Higher Forces in order to achieve the intended goal.

You know how much self-reflection you have. Hardly anyone on the Internet needs another confession. However, if you **CAN TRANSFORM** it into something of value — write. Record. Film. Not for approval, rather for those who will come later and say — **THIS IS WHERE THE REAL THING BEGAN**.

When writing a book — just as when creating a video — you are not so much conveying something already known to the world as you are learning. Learning what within you is still **UNFORMED**, learning not to the point of the illusion of “I understand,” rather to the point where you can be understood by another. Because until you are able to teach something to someone else, you have not truly mastered it yourself. Therefore, whenever you notice something important in life — think about how you might express it: in words or in images, on paper or on video. Such an approach **NOT ONLY** disciplines thought, it also allows you to grasp the most subtle, fleeting, nearly **IMPERCEPTIBLE SETTINGS** of reality, fixing them in a form that can be passed on to others.

The problem is that almost **EVERYONE IS CONVINCED** they know what a “book” or a “video” is — and therefore believe they know how to create them. However, if you have **NEVER BEEN** behind the scenes, then you are merely a consumer, **NOT A CREATOR**. And not just a consumer — rather a consumer convinced they are creating. Between consumption and creation lies not simply a difference — rather an antipode. A difference is a matter of quantity, nuance, degree. Antipode is a **IS A GAP** between qualities, states, and worlds. Imagine this: the reader or viewer takes from your work only a fragment. They will never take it all, because **PERCEPTION IS LIMITED**. Yet they tend to believe that what they have perceived is all there is in the work. They see the parallelepiped yet not what lies beyond its edges. They do not feel the inner motion, the deep shifts from which the text or imagery was born. They don’t realize that the very formulation of the question lies **BEYOND THE SYSTEM**, beyond the first attention. They live within the illuminated zone — and think that beyond its borders, there is nothing. However, you, as the author, as the creator — work from the other side. You do not “retell what you’ve seen,” you **EXTRACT FROM THE UNILLUMINATED**. Your attention must be directed toward where it seems that **“NOTHING EXISTS.”** You appeal to the second attention — to that void which, as it turns out, is not void at all. That is the zone from which insight, images, and meanings arrive — if only you know how to look there. And from that zone, you can capture not only words, also frames. Not only paragraphs, also scenes. Not only lines, also meanings.

That is why the creation of any **REAL TEXT** — or video — begins not with technique, not with form, rather with an idea. With an impulse, a question, a pain, a necessity to express something, to convey something. And most people are **INCAPABLE** of generating an idea. They can circle around the ideas of others, admire them, repost them, make videos based on them — however, they cannot give birth to one. Because every true beginning always lies **OUTSIDE THE SYSTEM**.

The choice always comes down to four strategies:



1. Accept only what is visible and provable — first attention, the circle of dim light.
2. Believe in the existence of what is not yet visible — second attention, the horizon of search.
3. Deny the existence of the incomprehensible — classical atheism, the rejection of mystery.
4. Deny even the obvious — nihilism, the rejection of the world.

A creator, whether he is a writer or a video author, is one who **NOT ONLY** chooses the second path, he is able to see all four at once. And only in this understanding can there exist the **TRUE POSITION** of an author — as a stalker, a seeker of meanings, a collector of insights.

When you record something — in text or through imagery — you **CREATE AN ARTIFACT**; however, it is not important in itself. It is a fragment of light directed into the very darkness from which the impulse arose. The task of the author is not to demonstrate, rather to transmit. To convey not merely a fact, rather the **VERY POSSIBILITY** of perception. Not just a feeling, rather the system of perspectives, the inner optics, through which that feeling became understood and embodied.

An idea never arrives at a strictly scheduled time. It **DOES NOT OBEY** any timetable. It emerges between the lines, between actions. The author merely creates the **INNER CONDITIONS** for its appearance. And when it comes — whether for a text or a video — they must know how to catch it, develop it, hold it, and transmit it. This is where true craftsmanship — true art — is present.

The desire to remain within established boundaries — penetrates a person so deeply that they even manage to squeeze the very notion of the boundless into the frame of their own model. You tell them this directly, they nod in agreement — and yet, at **THAT VERY MOMENT**, they stop understanding. They fall into the illusion of understanding — which is far worse than ignorance itself, because it leaves no emptiness into which a new thought could enter.

Learning to perceive from the outside — **DOES NOT MEAN** learning to see what belongs to others. It means learning to see outside yourself, and outside the image of yourself. This is an art that takes, if not eternity, then at least **A FEW LIFETIMES**. Here, neither the refined manners of Turgenev's heroines nor a "sensitive nature" or a "creative soul" will save you. What's required is not a pose, rather a connection — a direct junction between feeling and thought. Feeling and thought are not opposites, as is commonly believed — **THEY ARE THE REVERSE SIDES** of the same fabric. Feeling is the reverse side of thought, and thought is the reverse side of feeling. And feeling itself arises as the reverse side of sensation — the bodily, pre-verbal contact with reality. Thus, the **BASIC TRINITY** is formed: **sensation – feeling – thought**. However, in the practice of writing, or when creating a video, this triad becomes a quartet — because the word is the fourth element. It is the entry point of thought into the field of another's perception, the boundary where the invisible becomes shared.

A word is not a thought. True thought is beyond (or before) words. A word is only a projection, a surface. Yet just as the surface of water **CAN REFLECT** the sky, so can a word carry the imprint of a deep thought — if it is chosen correctly. To write, then, is not to speak, rather to translate — from the multidimensional into the flat, from the silent into the audible. It is real labor: the projection of intricate inner structures onto the surface in such a way that **THEY RETAIN** their form. And more than that, so that this invisible form begins to take root within the reader, as a structure, as an image, as a way of feeling and thinking.

If you are writing a book — or creating a video — you are always standing **AT THE CROSSROADS** of these dimensions. You speak in simple words about complex things, and therefore must be **IMPECCABLY ATTENTIVE**. Not every word will do; not every synonym conveys the same. What matters is not only meaning, it is also sound — and even **STATISTICAL PREVALENCE**. Sometimes it's better to say it in a way no one else would — as long as it aligns precisely with your inner image. At other times, the

opposite: express the complex through the ordinary, the familiar, to break down the resistance of perception.

If you use terms — always define them. Don't be lazy, don't rely on "everyone will understand anyway." Terms are **ANCHORS OF MEANING**, and every reader will attach their own. Therefore, you must provide your own anchor — not once, every time, because **EACH TIME** the context changes. To love a term doesn't mean to worship it; it means to unfold it differently each time, from a new angle, from another side. Only then does it gain depth. That's why, when you write — or film — you **MUST LEARN** to work with multidimensionality. Reality is never confined to a single meaning; it always has a range of aspects. Whoever doesn't see this is blind in one plane. Whoever tries to force everything into the unambiguous commit's profanation. However, to speak of multidimensionality, you must **NOT SIMPLY** know about it, you must also be able to build verbal or visual structures in which it can be felt. And you must also place emphasis correctly — knowing what is key. The ability to highlight what's essential **WITHOUT DISSOLVING** it in detail is not merely a skill — it is an act of respect toward attention. The essential must stand out, **THE REST — MUST BE SUPPORTED**. Like shadow beneath light. Like background behind form.

A text, like a building, begins not with its façade, rather with its foundation. Everything that



appears "natural," "beautifully flowing," and "easy to perceive" usually rests on a rigid yet **INVISIBLE CONSTRUCT**. Without a framework, there can be neither lightness nor depth, because everything falls apart into phrases that resemble decorative tinsel without meaning: dressed up, hung, adorned — yet held by nothing. That's why the first step in any work with text — whether a book, an article, a diary, or even a video — **IS A SCHEME**. It may be rough, unclear, or known only to you, yet it must exist. Even if no one notices it in the final version — just as one cannot see the skeleton of a living person — it is still there. Without it — you are **NOT A HUMAN**, rather a bag

of bones and desires.

A scheme — is what you return to each time you lose your way. It keeps the idea in focus, provides internal logic, and **CREATES A SENSE** of completeness. Today, most who write do so without it, believing that the form will "emerge on its own." Alas — what's born most often is chaos. Or, at best, a verbal half-finished product. And a half-finished product sold as a complete one — **THAT IS ALREADY A DECEPTION**. Of the reader, and of yourself.

Just as in life one cannot walk with both feet at once — one must stay grounded while the other steps forward — so too in writing one must maintain balance between what is already solid and what one is still reaching toward. Writing is **NOT MERELY** the description of what has been experienced. It is also the formulation of what one wishes to experience. It is the **ASPECT OF INTENTION** — a way to direct the vector of being toward what has not yet occurred. You describe not only a fact, but a

possibility. And possibility — that is already magic. Of course, fantasies **MUST BE** viable. That doesn't mean they should be dull — it means you **MUST JUSTIFY** to yourself why they are possible. First to yourself, then to the reader. That is true logic, living meaning, organic reality. Not everything in a text **MUST BE** provable — however, everything must be plausible within its own logic.

A shift in perception begins with **INNER DISCIPLINE**. You can play with words, use artistic forms, parables, allegories — however, only when you have a refined inner structure. Until then, **NO** ornamentation will **SAVE YOU**. Just as perfume cannot save someone who hasn't bathed in three months. This is what stalking truly means — the ability to maintain the assembly of your system. Feelings separately, thinking separately. Video separately, text separately — until each element becomes perfected. **ONLY THEN** may they be joined. Mixing the imperfect doesn't create a new synthesis — it creates a foul mixture. The universe is built upon triunity. This applies to reality, to text, to video, to a book, and even to your **INNER PERCEPTION**. Question — resolution — conclusion. Problem — search — result. The form doesn't matter — whether artistic, scientific, or visual — however, this internal skeleton must exist. Otherwise, what you have is not a story, rather a **STREAM OF CONSCIOUSNESS**. Not a thought, rather babble. It's not bad — it simply doesn't work. You may choose any form of expression: artistic, philosophical, anecdotal, aphoristic, or visual — whether in a metaphorical video or **A KIND OF CHAIN** of Telegram posts — however, you must remember: meaning cannot be replaced by form. Without meaning, even a perfectly executed piece remains empty. And it's equally important to remember that you can learn from the mistakes of others — if you **DO NOT PRETEND** to be doing so. Truth is not necessarily personal experience. With enough sensitivity, empathy, and inner honesty, you can absorb truth without falling. However, only if your mind is sharp enough to experience another's truth as your own. It's a rare gift — yet **IT IS TRAINABLE**. Through writing. And through filmmaking too. Even in artistic expression, one can maintain precision, logic, and clarity. Even in philosophical writing, one **CAN BE** human. Yet both require a framework. And when it is there, the reader (or viewer) feels it — they sense that before them stands not a stream of words, rather a cohesive field of attention. Not only engaging — but honest.

It so happens that from a writer — as from anyone who undertakes to create meaning — people **EXPECT TO BE RIGHT**. Not just logical, not just engaging, but right. Everything should make sense, fit into a coherent picture, so that the reader, upon hearing it, can say: "Yes, that's true." However, here arises a paradox. Because the reader, too, **WANTS TO BE RIGHT**. They come not so much for truth, as for confirmation of their own. And this is where the subtle game begins. If you want to engage the reader — you may sometimes play along, and at other times, you must challenge them. You must throw out provocative statements — **NOT FOR THE SAKE** of shock, rather to expose the mechanisms of understanding. True writing is not the path of avoiding conflict, rather it is the art of choosing the right moment and the right point of tension — the very point at which **A PERSON CHANGES**.

The desire to be right is a symptom of our constant uncertainty. We seek support because we have none. And if you truly work with text (or with video, which, in essence, is the same work with attention), sooner or later you will grow tired of being right. **A MOMENT COMES** when you want someone else to be right. And then you begin to write not to confirm your own picture of the world, rather to help another build theirs. That is the moment you cease to be merely an author — and become a teacher, an engineer, a magician.

Whom you write for matters. It matters **VERY MUCH**. Because everything depends on it — from intonation to the complexity of structure. The common mistake is to write "for people like me" or "for those who have read what I've read." Such people, as a rule, don't read to understand — they read to

join a club, to affirm their belonging, to express themselves. They **DO NOT LISTEN** — they only wait for their turn to speak. These are not readers. These are mirrors. And most people — sadly — are exactly that.

Over the past few years online, I've become convinced of this: communities of the "well-read" are no different from ordinary society. The same hierarchy, the same blindness, the same **THIRST FOR RECOGNITION**. The only difference is that they know the name of their pride — and that gives them a sense of enlightenment. Yet the essence is the same. That's why your audience is not those who are already "in the know," rather those who are still searching — those who are **READY TO LISTEN**. Those capable of trusting — not blindly, but wisely.

If you refer to other authorities — first become an authority yourself. Otherwise, the reference turns into a book of quotations. Only by earning your own right to be heard can you **INVITE OTHERS TO THE CONVERSATION**. Authority is not a loud name; it is what the reader (or viewer) is willing to take from you on faith — because you have already proven your honesty and depth.



NEVER MAKE baseless statements. Not because it's "scientific," rather because it destroys the power of your speech. If your claim cannot be supported, it is most likely either false or premature. Argumentation is not a form of defense — it is a **FORM OF ADDRESS** to your interlocutor. Write so that even the most hardened troll is forced to admit: "yes, there is a system here."

Every statement you make is a brick in a building. And if the building **DOES NOT CONVINCE**, someone else will build theirs right next to it — through their videos, books, or posts. And you'll be left with a half-wall and a lingering sense of incompleteness. Therefore, you must carry a thought all the way through — **DO NOT LET** it wander, rather drag it to meaning. Like a hand reaching the doorknob. Not merely hint — persuade. And not just anyone, but the one who doesn't yet know you.

All authors always write to someone. Otherwise, how would we even know of their existence? We feel their address — even if they are long gone. Therefore, **DO NOT DELUDE** yourself into thinking that you write "just for yourself" or "from yourself." True writing, like true filmmaking, is always directed toward the other, toward one who is **CAPABLE OF PERCEIVING**, or at times — toward the Higher, if you don't know who is capable. To write for yourself means to write for your higher authority, not for the habits of your ego. To write is to pray — to fall silent before what is above you. And then the responsibility for each word **INCREASES MULTIPLE-TIMES**: for if the light of awareness has been given to you, it cannot go unshared. Otherwise, it becomes waste — an indulgence you'll have to pay for, because you're using a resource that is **NOT YOUR OWN**. You are accountable not only for what you have said, but also for what you could have said, and didn't.

Many people want to write “deeply.” And that’s good — **DEPTH IS NECESSARY**. But even more important is alignment. It’s not enough to dig deep — you must dig deep where there has already been experience, where there is already a question posed by life and an answer found not in theory, rather in practice. Writing, filming, expressing — these are not abstract acrobatics of concepts. They are a balancing act between the theoretical and the practical, between knowledge and being. If you dig without grounding, you end up with an **AVALANCHE OF WORDS**, and even the author no longer understands what they truly grasped and what they only thought they did. The habit of taking things on faith (including one’s own words!) breeds confusion, anxiety, and chronic uncertainty. We **LOSE OUR VECTOR** — and can no longer distinguish what is alive from what is imaginary.

Many people now need to roll back — not backward, rather to their point of balance. To return to a foundation, temper empty theorizing, and make a practical leap. This **DOESN'T HAVE** to be all at once — a book, a video clip, or a treatise. It can be a single thought carried through to the end, a single video in which you **DID NOT HIDE**, rather stepped into direct transmission. That’s the essence — balance isn’t static, it must grow. Balance isn’t 50/50, as many think, nor 60/60. It is a **DYNAMIC EQUILIBRIUM** where both sides — inner and outer — strengthen simultaneously. Writing develops the autonomy of consciousness: you learn to ask yourself questions and to answer them. You learn to stir the void — and from it, like from darkness **EXTRACT MEANING**. A text is a challenge to the void. A video is a cry into the abyss. And if you are honest, the answer comes. To awaken that abyss, you will **NEED IMAGINATION**: to foresee possible objections, misunderstandings, and delusions, even if you haven’t witnessed them directly. You know yourself well enough to know where you can err, and that knowledge is already the beginning of dialogue. In every video, on every page, in every journal entry, there **MUST BE** that honesty: I write because I must, not because I can. And if I can, it means someone needs it now. A text, like an image, **MUST CARRY** the energy of necessity — otherwise, it will not come alive, will not enter another, will not resonate.

To notice your own flaws, sometimes it’s enough just to change the font or adjust the page scale — and suddenly you see what you **FAILED TO NOTICE** countless times before. Because perception, like any tool, gets dulled. A text read from within the process of writing almost always slips past close scrutiny — because you already “know what’s written there,” and the brain fills in the gaps for you. This is one of the **SUBTLEST** traps: identifying yourself with the text, losing the ability to step into a meta-position. Yet that ability is essential if you want not just to create, but to refine. This applies to everything — a book, a video, even a simple blog post: changing perspective, changing the viewing angle, restores your adequacy. You see the text as someone else would — and **ONLY THEN** do you truly begin to see.

Then the question arises: **DO WE EVEN NEED** to follow the rules? Suppose you’re a deeply spiritual author, full of sacred meanings — why should you care about spelling? Think about it: if you **CANNOT** notice an error in a single letter, what makes you believe you can avoid an error in thought? If you can’t hold grammar in focus, how will you hold ontology? The question of attention is the question of the Path. And **ATTENTION IS THE FOUNDATION**. Carelessness, even in small things, always leads to collapse in greater ones. Writing with mistakes means laying a crack in the foundation — one that will later open into ideological and existential fractures. Of course, **THERE ARE EXCEPTIONS**; however, the general rule is worth remembering. And here we can distinguish four types of authors, based on the relationship between attention to form and attention to content:

1. Makes grammatical mistakes and commits ideological ones — a typical case: weak attention produces a weak text in every sense.

2. Makes no grammatical mistakes yet allows semantic ones — a technically trained author, yet not mature in essence. He masters form but has not yet awakened to content.
3. Makes grammatical mistakes yet preserves meaning — a natural talent, expressing something important yet losing part of the audience because of form. That's a risk.
4. Makes no mistakes in either language or meaning — a rare level of impeccability, when form aligns with content and both serve a common Purpose.

Think about it: which of these types are you closer to? And which one will the reader automatically assign you to upon seeing a **SPELLING ERROR** in the title of your “enlightening treatise?” Yes, perhaps you’ll want to “lower the tone” — to play with sarcasm, distorted speech, deliberate illiteracy. The effect of “Albanian language,” as in old internet jokes. However, over time, it no longer looks like irony, it looks **LIKE AWKWARDNESS**, betraying a lack of depth. And even if you do it consciously — know this: you are discrediting yourself.

To find pleasure in grammar is a challenge. It’s a training in **INNER STALKING** — attention to the smallest details through which the whole begins to reveal itself. And if you can learn to love even this part of the work, then you can truly love your craft — both textual and visual. For the visual sequence, like the written word, must be refined to its limit in order to serve as a **CARRIER OF TRUTH**, not just another shell of illusion.

The laws of grammar are not merely social conventions — they are reflections of the laws of Being, distilled to the level of symbol. To neglect them is to forget how the world itself is built.

Do not invoke what you are **NOT READY** to comprehend. This rule applies not only to the sacred but to any significant term, image, or category. If you are not going to reveal it — do not name it. It is better to leave space empty than to fill it with half-thoughts. **DO NOT CASUALLY** throw around words of high energy without clarifying their structure. This is especially true for themes beyond the “human” — consciousness, music, spirit, death, God, illusion... If you merely pronounce them as passwords and not as essences, you destroy the very fabric of meaning. For example, if you mention music yet do not speak of at least one formula, one resonance, one principle — beyond “we all know music is important” — then you are **SAYING NOTHING**. Your thought has not made the leap. Everything remains within the confines of its starting point. It's spinning in circles instead of moving into a new dimension.

Discovery is when **A** justifiably transforms into **B** — or when **A + B** give birth to **C**. Discovery is a



change of form and meaning, not an amplification of repetition. **THERE IS NO POINT** in spinning the same letter around if you don’t intend to transcend it. Write not to those like yourself — and not even to yourself. Write for the ordinary person who is unfamiliar with the concept of “transcendence,” who is “not in the loop,” and **IS NOT OBLIGED** to be. Write as you would want someone to explain to you at that very moment when you still understood nothing — yet suddenly **WANTED TO UNDERSTAND**. Remember yourself at the threshold — and extend a hand. Write not from the tower, rather from the staircase — from the place you yourself have just ascended. Don’t drag into the text anything that carries no meaning. **IF YOU SAY A WORD — REVEAL IT**. If you connect words — justify them. These are

your knots of energy. And the reader must see what you have done with them. For they have no other source of understanding than you.

It often happens that you receive certain knowledge as if by a miracle — through revelation, in a dream, in a flow — and then present it as a banality, as though everyone has long known it. In doing so, **YOU DEVALUE** both your own work and the effort that was invested in this knowledge by higher systems. Underestimating what is important is a form of ignorance disguised as confidence. When you devalue an idea — you haven't understood it. When you **HAVEN'T UNDERSTOOD** — you transmit a caricature, not the meaning. That is why a text should have no leaps, no "thorn phrases," no "foreign fragments" — no pieces from another film. There should be no water if it **DOES NOT CARRY** energy. Water can be beautiful, yet it washes away structure, clouds consciousness, and makes the path impassable. Therefore, if there is nothing to say — **IT IS BETTER TO BE SILENT**. Or at least — make a joke, break the rhythm, yet do not destroy it. A pun is better than empty water, if you can control it. To avoid drowning in your own text, hold on to the four questions every author must ask:

1. What? — What have you said that the reader didn't know before? What new angle have you revealed?

2. To whom? — For whom is this written? Who is the focal point where meanings intersect?

3. How? — How is it constructed? Is there a path? Is there structure?

4. With what? — With what words did you express it? Did you define your terms? Did you separate the commonly known from the new?

Remember, there **SHOULD NOT** be too much new. The right balance is 15-20% novelty. The rest is foundation, connection, and path. Terms should be introduced only when absolutely necessary. If you can avoid introducing one — don't enter it. Because **A TERM IS A CRYSTAL**, and if its setting is weak — it cuts the author. And yes — starting from a blank page is difficult. That's why **OLD TEXTS**, even if immature, are your support. Gather them from the corners, sort them, clean them. A bad draft is still a step. You can only leap from where you stand. **DO NOT BE AFRAID** to rely on what you wrote before — the real danger is in not leaping at all. After all, you write not to repeat yourself — rather to surpass yourself.

If you want the chapters of your book to be interchangeable, then they **MUST BE AUTONOMOUS** — not just "in meaning," also in design. This is exactly what is needed today for understanding what is truly happening. Each chapter is like an island: with its own harbor, its own architecture, its own legends. It **MUST GREET** the reader, not demand a passport with visas from previous pages. A chapter should have an introduction, a body, and a conclusion — even if you think you've already said the same thing elsewhere. Repetition is **NOT A SIN** if it makes meaning clear. **THE SIN IS OBSCURITY**. The problem isn't repetition, rather it is déjà vu without result. Cross-references will happen, of course — you can't avoid the shadow of neighboring meanings. However, ideally, one **SHOULD BE ABLE TO READ** at night, on a train, from the middle of the book — and still understand what it's about. Don't "postpone" the explanation for later. **DO NOT** bet on the future — it won't ask what you planned to clarify on page 17. If the reader has reached this chapter — this is where they are now. Help him understand it here, not then.

A book is **NOT A MISHMASH**, rather it is the architecture of a multidimensional city, and each chapter in it is inhabited — with lighting, furniture, and a door handle. A text without self-contained chapters is like a city without addresses: you wander, you stumble, and you can't make sense of where you are. It's better to write one chapter with a clear thought than five — where nothing is clear, yet everything seems profoundly meaningful.

If you are truly creating something worthwhile, and **NOT JUST** producing literary noise, sooner or later you'll have to introduce your own terms — for your insights, assembly points, and **REFERENCE POINTS**. This is essential — without it, you can't convey the uniqueness of your vision. After all, you **CANNOT EXPLAIN** the new using only the old language. However, there's a caveat. Introducing terms requires skill. **First**, do it smoothly — not as a sudden drop, not “head-on.” It takes effort, because a book is **NOT WRITTEN** in order. A writer walks not along a linear road, rather a star map — where everything is connected, though not sequentially. That's why it makes sense to keep a glossary, like a ship's log: note definitions, where a term first appeared, and where it will reappear. When the book is finished, the chapters **CAN BE ARRANGED** according to the chronology of meanings — not the plot, rather the introduction of terms and ideas. If you introduce terms chaotically, without explanations, with abbreviations like IPEEIR, VUKS, and KZP, and without clarifications — your text will make sense only to you. Or... even to you it **WON'T**. For this, you can borrow a rule from science: the first mention — with a full explanation, and every concept — placed in a context where it **DEFINES ITSELF**. And if certain terms repeat across chapters — don't be afraid of seeming repetitive. Repetition is love for the reader, **NOT A SUSPICION** of their narrow-mindedness.

NOW THE IMPORTANT PART. What your article, book, or video will ultimately become — no one knows, not even you. Don't pretend you do — it's like sculpting marble while insisting from the first strike of the hammer that it will be a monument. You'll discover what it is only in the process. After the first third of the book — **STOP AND LOOK AROUND**.

See what has emerged. It's no longer just a draft — it's an organism. After two-thirds — again: assemble the whole, understand its shape, where it speaks from, and to whom. At some point, you'll realize that a book is neither a swamp nor a porridge, rather a **DELICATE CONSTRUCTION**. An almost impossible one. A structure that rests on your attentiveness, your memory, and your responsibility. At the same time, a book **DOES NOT TOLERATE** fuss: disturb it — and everything will crumble. So don't chase brilliance; maintain silence within the structure.

Working on a book is **MEMORY TRAINING**. You have to keep the entire book in your head at all times, not just the current page. In doing so, you learn to maintain a multidimensional field of connections without losing meaning. Want to improve your memory? Write a book. And yes, all of this applies equally to creating video: editing **DOES NOT TOLERATE** fragments or references that lead

nowhere. Each video must be an **AUTONOMOUS CAPSULE** of meaning — yet still a part of a larger project. The plot is the editing of meanings; the structure is the **MONTAGE OF ATTENTION**. And editing requires discipline, logic, a glossary, and love for the viewer.

So, we go on — **NOT HURRYING**, but with precision. As if we know what we're doing, even if for now we only feel it. Writing a book must be interesting to you, not because someone asked, not because “everyone's writing,” rather because **YOU NEED IT**. That's the true criterion of genuine interest



— an inner knowing of necessity. Yet most people live out the same tragicomedy: **THEY THEMSELVES** pinch off the hose of their own interest, cutting off their vital flow, and then wander through the garbage dumps of meaning, scavenging for someone else's leftovers, crumbs of inspiration, fragments of insight they could have reached on their own. Yet that's their path. The path of the consumer and the imitator. The warrior's path is different. The writer, the author, the creator — makes another choice. He **DOES NOT REJECT** his interest — he nurtures it, feeds it, protects it like a flame in a storm. Of course, one can learn only from one's own mistakes — that's considered a "valid" method too. Yet why drink from the cup of defeat **EVERY TIME**, when one can see and understand without stepping on every rake along the way?

A person who makes mistakes most often **DOESN'T EVEN NOTICE** the very fact of the mistake. A repeated mistake, especially, seems to erase the ability to see. A mistake **NOT ONLY** throws one off course — it also shuts down the awareness that the course is off. And one doesn't arrive at this state overnight, rather gradually, over years — as if rehearsing on purpose how not to see, how not to hear, how not to be in the right place. And eventually becomes a professional at it. That's why, once you start writing, you shouldn't take a so-called "smart pause" — "I'll write a bit, then stop, maybe come back stronger." **YOU WON'T COME BACK**. You'll just lose time. At best — years of checking yourself; at worst — your whole life will be consumed by this "suddenly."

The only true practice for the mind **CAN BE** something as subtle, fluid, and elusive as the mind itself. Writing is a form of the mind, a discipline of consciousness, an alchemy of attention. **WRITING A BOOK** is the natural path for a thinking being. It's not just a way to express thoughts — it's the **ONLY POSSIBLE** way to hold a thought over time: not for a second, not for a flash — rather across chapters, structure, an entire intellectual universe. And if you truly live by the Path, you **CANNOT** not have time for this practice. The brew is always simmering — observation is boiling inside you, meanings are forming, answers are being born. To write it down — that's a matter of discipline, not inspiration. Just one hour a day — and you have a page. An hour per page in ten-point font. What could you be doing that's more important than that? This applies to writing, to video, to **ANY OTHER** creative act. No editing, no voice-over, no beautiful shot **WILL REPLACE** the one essential thing — the person who has lived and expressed. Recording video is not just recording — it's **GATHERING WILL**, thought, and sensation into a single point of expression that holds more than sound and image. It must contain a "why." And if you haven't put that in — no one will watch to the end. So, **START WRITING**. Or speaking to the camera. Or crafting a sentence. Or editing. It's all the same: the path of the creator, the path to oneself — through form and meaning. Not the path away from oneself — through self-deception and the endless waiting for the "right moment."

In the previous article, we only slightly lifted the veil on where **TEXT IS BORN** from and why true writing is not an act of the mind, rather something that passes through it. We saw that creativity is not an act of will, rather a **PROCESS OF TUNING** — tuning to what wants to be expressed, tuning to the idea that is stronger than you. Yet this is only **WHERE THE PATH BEGINS**. In this part, we continued that path — and I sincerely hope we've understood: learning to write is not a hobby, not a skill, not a professional competence. It is a form of **BEING-BECOMING**. It is one of the real tools of understanding what is happening. Because only by constructing phrases, refining essence, stitching together images, do we enter the mode of awareness. Writing is not the form of expressing thought — it is the formation of thought itself. Without writing, there is no completed thought. Without thought, there is no choice. Without choice — there is no path. And thus, whoever learns to write, **BEGINS TO LEARN** to understand. And if you begin to understand — you begin to stand on the side of Life. Not merely on the side of

“good,” “light,” or other pleasant words — rather **ON THE SIDE** of the great, irrevocable, absolute Purpose. And that purpose is one — to **conquer death**. In this sense, to learn to write means to learn to speak with Death itself — in the language of Reason, Meaning, and Being. And if, in this context, we look at old age as one of the elements of the **Idea — to conquer death** — which concerns so many today, then we are not merely reflecting on aging; we begin to realize that it **CAN BE OVERCOME**. Because it is not a given — it is a consequence of the absence of a structured idea of oneself and one’s life. As long as a person remains silent, they live by inertia. The moment they begin to write — they begin to construct their own becoming. And thus, they begin to **CANCEL AGING** — because aging is the destruction of structure, not of the body. And if the structure (of thoughts, meanings, directions) is renewed — aging retreats...

To write, therefore — is not about texts. It is about you. About who you are, who you can become, and how close you are to the Idea that is most powerful on Earth.

F. Shkrudnev

3 November 2025