

Salvation of the Saviors (series 114-369)

Project 369 – Non-Articles: Beyond the Text: The Architecture of Belief and the Control of Consciousness...

*A person does not believe — they are conditioned to believe.
They do not think — they are taught how to think.
And until they see how this structure is built,
they will consider as truth
that which was implanted in them.*

In the previous article, we approached the boundary beyond which familiar explanations stop working. We saw that the issue is not what a person believes in — religion, science, or even themselves, rather how the very capacity to believe, to doubt, and to understand is formed. At that point, a key question was posed: who sets the boundaries of thinking, and how? Now we take the next step, not toward new answers, rather toward the **CONSTRUCTION ITSELF** within which those answers arise, because belief is not merely an internal state of a person — it is an architecture, a system built in such a way as to shape perception, keep it within certain limits, and direct behavior.

We will continue examining the mechanism created to govern people within the framework of emerging states — a mechanism constructed in accordance with the level of development of brain genotypes. In this sense, religious systems become **NOT ONLY** carriers of meaning, but also instruments. Instruments through which governability is established, patterns of thinking are entrenched, and those very brain genotypes we are beginning to speak about more and more directly are formed. And if in the previous text we only began to sense the very existence of these boundaries, now we will try to examine them from within. Not as an abstraction, rather **AS A CONSTRUCT** possessing form, logic, and history. Because perhaps, in order to go beyond the limits of the text — one must first see how it was written.

In the texts recognized by Christians as sacred, there is a direct and unambiguous prohibition against worshipping any objects other than God. The Old Testament states: “You shall not make for yourself an idol or any likeness...” (Exodus 20:4), “...lest you make for yourselves carved images...” (Deuteronomy 4:15-16). The prophets also emphasize: “...we will no longer say to the work of our hands: ‘You are our gods’” (Hosea 14:3). In the New Testament, this line continues — the Apostle Paul calls foolish those who “changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man.” But then a direct question arises: why does the very thing originally forbidden appear in practice? The answer is found not in theology, rather in the **MECHANICS OF CONTROL**. For example, the practice of icons was introduced and abolished not as the result of an unchanging revelation, rather as an instrument corresponding to current objectives. In some periods, icons were introduced — for example, to create distance from Islam. In others, they were restricted when pagan tendencies intensified. And each time, these decisions were presented as initiatives coming “from above.” Here a characteristic principle becomes visible: logic is constructed to justify a decision that has already been made.

The modern justification claims that worship is directed not toward the icon itself, rather toward the image it represents. Yet practice demonstrates otherwise. If two images are identical, yet one is



considered "miracle-working" while the other is not, then the significance is transferred from the image to the object itself.

Consequently, what actually occurs is not an appeal to an abstract image, rather the elevation of a **SPECIFIC OBJECT** as the bearer of special properties. This is precisely the point where theory and practice diverge. However, something else is even more important. Such mechanisms become possible only under a certain level of perception. When thinking is not oriented toward analysis and comparison, but instead functions in a mode of acceptance, the system can introduce mutually contradictory elements without destroying its internal coherence. This is not an error. It is correspondence to the level of the brain genotype within which a person does not verify, rather follows.

That is precisely why such constructs **WORKED STABLY**. They did not require

understanding — they required involvement. However, as soon as thinking begins to shift into a different mode, where there arises a need to compare and identify inconsistencies, such constructions begin to lose their stability. And then what was once perceived as normal begins to provoke a question. And then — a rupture.

In 2013, hundreds of thousands of believers stood in line to venerate frankincense (an aromatic resin), myrrh (an ointment used for anointing the dead), and gold. If the Magi had gifted Christ a hat, boots, and an iron, those objects would also have become items of veneration. Just as today people venerate pieces of clothing (for example, the belt from the dress of Christ's mother), nails, and objects associated with the "holy." Today, objects of worship include pieces of clothing, nails, and fragments of items that supposedly came into contact with a saint. One only has to look, for example, at the veneration of the so-called "slippers of Spyridon of Timotheus" (search for it online) to see how far this process can go. However, something else is even more revealing. These objects often have **EXTREMELY QUESTIONABLE** origins. In different churches and monasteries around the world, there are "authentic" nails from the crucifixion, as well as numerous body parts of the same saints — in quantities that are physically impossible. In the 19th century, a book by L. Lalonde titled *Curiosities of Traditions* was published in France. It contained a list of monasteries in Western Europe where relics of various saints were kept. The count revealed that Saint Julian possessed 20 torsos and 26 heads. The Apostle Luke had 9 heads. Saint Philip had 18 heads and 12 hands, while Saint Sebastian had 5 torsos, 6 heads, and 17 arms and legs. John the Baptist left the Church 12 heads, 7 jaws, 4 shoulders, 9 hands, and 11 fingers. And this concerns only the Western world. The Orthodox world is no exception in this matter. The first

example that comes to mind is that one head of John Chrysostom is kept in the Epiphany Cathedral in Moscow, while a second head is kept on Mount Athos. In Syria, there is a monastery where the preserved child's head of... John the Baptist is kept. Let me remind you that King Herod executed John as an adult. When asked how such a thing is possible, the monks reply that it is a **MIRACLE OF GOD** and that one must believe rather than reason. How one is supposed to believe that an adult man's childhood head could still exist is a serious question. And it becomes even greater when one learns that different Syrian monasteries collectively preserve more than 20 adult heads of John the Baptist and four child heads. Can you bring yourself to believe in such miracles? I share your opinion.

Attempts to make sense of this encounter a characteristic response: "it is a miracle — one must believe in it, not reason about it." And it is precisely this formula that is the key. It does not explain — **IT CLOSES** the possibility of explanation. The system does not eliminate the contradiction. It forbids examining it. If this process is carried to its logical conclusion, it truly takes on caricature-like forms: "sacred relics" appear that have no verifiable basis whatsoever — from the "last breath" to objects supposedly belonging to biblical figures. However, that is not the most important point. What matters is understanding why this is possible.

From a superficial point of view, this may appear to be abuse — an attempt to attract pilgrims, resources, and attention. However, on a deeper level, it is a **MANIFESTATION OF THE OPERATION** of a mechanism designed for a specific type of perception. Where thinking does not require coherence or compare facts, instead it accepts a predetermined framework, such constructs can exist without internal conflict. Moreover, they can produce a real effect. A person who sincerely believes in the power of an object may genuinely experience relief. This is a well-known psychophysiological mechanism. However, the very existence of an effect does not confirm the nature of the source. It confirms the power of belief. And here the key question arises: what relation does all of this have to the original teaching? Or more precisely — at what point does the instrument of control begin to replace the content itself?

When I pointed out such facts to priests, their reaction surprised me no less than the discoveries themselves. Instead of attempting to investigate the matter, there followed a **FAMILIAR PATTERN**: verbosity, retreat into general formulations, appeals to emotion, and then — a shift to the personal level. The topic was not discussed; it was dissolved. Why does this happen if these are facts acknowledged by the Church itself? The answer is not a lack of understanding. Understanding exists. However, the goal in this case is not the search for truth, rather the preservation of the system. The defense of status, role, and position. When a person is integrated into a construction that gives them meaning, status, and a "source of sustenance," they defend it not because it is true, rather because without it their own foundation collapses. To acknowledge falsehood would mean admitting that a significant part of one's life was lived within a distorted picture. For most people, that is too heavy a step to take.

Here another principle reveals itself. In relation to the religious system, there exists an **UNWRITTEN RULE**: it is not subject to examination at the level of its foundations. "Caesar's wife is above suspicion." A person is conditioned in advance: do not delve too deeply, do not analyze, do not compare. Perform what is prescribed — and that is enough. Faith replaces understanding. For the masses, this is sufficient. They do not require coherence. Harmonious-sounding formulas are enough for them. Truth in the strict sense is unnecessary, because their thinking is not oriented toward identifying contradictions. This is not a reproach — it is a characteristic of a particular level of perception. As early as the 5th century, Bishop Synesius wrote: "The masses demand to be deceived... I shall always be a

philosopher for myself, and for the masses — a priest.” In this formula, the division is **ALREADY FIXED**: one mode of thinking for understanding, another for governance.

If one looks at the rituals and symbols themselves from this perspective, the picture becomes more transparent. Many of them do not arise “from nothing,” rather they are reworked from already existing forms. This is not accidental; it is a technological method. A familiar symbol, already embedded within mass consciousness, is taken and filled with new content. In this way, the outer shell is changed without disrupting perception.

A classic example is the cross. Before Christianity, it already existed as an element of religious symbolism. And at a certain moment, this sign **WAS INTEGRATED** into a new system, receiving a different explanation and a new function. From the standpoint of governance, this is an effective solution: not to break perception, rather to redirect it. In a similar way, narratives are constructed that reinforce the significance of symbols. For example, the story of the “discovery of the True Cross” by Constantine’s mother. It contains everything necessary: a search, a miracle, confirmation, and consolidation. This is not so much a historical account as it is a construct designed to fix the importance of the object within consciousness. What matters here is not arguing over details, rather seeing the principle itself. Symbols, rituals, explanations — all of these are elements of a system operating within a particular **TYPE OF THINKING**. As long as this type dominates, the system remains stable. However, as soon as the need arises to verify, compare, and seek coherence, those same elements begin to provoke questions. It is precisely at this moment that it becomes visible: this is not only about religion. It is about the mechanism through which perception itself is formed.

Not only symbols, but even the holidays themselves were adapted to new objectives. The birthday of Mithra,¹ widely celebrated among the people, did not disappear — it was reinterpreted and came to be perceived as the birthday of Christ. The form remained, while the content changed. A similar mechanism can be seen in other elements as well. The pagan custom of venerating the evergreen tree was integrated into the Christian tradition as the Christmas tree — a symbol of “eternal life.” Later, in the secular era, this same element **WAS REINTERPRETED** once again and became an attribute of the New Year celebration. The meaning changed, yet the form remained. This points to a stable technology: a new system does not destroy familiar structures; it fills them with different content. In this way, continuity of perception is maintained. A person continues doing the same thing, but already within a different framework of meaning. This principle is not limited to religion. It manifests in various historical contexts. When ideologies change, already existing symbols, rhetoric, and organizational forms are reused. New content is inserted into a familiar shell. Because of this, the transition is perceived not as a



¹ **The 1st birthday of Mitra**, the ancient Indo-Iranian deity of the Sun and covenant, was traditionally celebrated on **25 December**, the day of the winter solstice. This holiday symbolized the rebirth of light, the victory over darkness, and was widely observed throughout the Roman Empire as the “Birthday of the Unconquered Sun.”

rupture, rather as a continuation. From the standpoint of governance, this is **EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE**. Mass consciousness is oriented not so much toward meaning as toward form. If the form is preserved, the change in content passes almost unnoticed. Within one or two generations, the original meaning is lost, and the new interpretation begins to be perceived as the only possible one. That is precisely why the system operates through the familiar. Not through destruction, rather through substitution. Not through direct coercion, rather through the **RECONFIGURATION OF PERCEPTION**. And here again the dependence on the level of thinking becomes evident. Where perception is fixed on form, it is enough to change the content. However, where the ability arises to compare form and meaning, this mechanism begins to reveal itself. At that moment it becomes visible: this is not about random borrowings, rather about a reproducible technology for shaping public consciousness.

The function of holidays and rituals is, in essence, analogous to military practices — they shape a state of being. Not content, rather precisely the state in which a person lives and acts. In order to transform scattered individuals into a unified organism, **CONSTANT IMMERSION** in a prescribed environment is necessary. In the military, this is achieved through continuous engagement: drills, formations, rituals, commands. It is not so important what exactly the soldier is doing. What matters is that he constantly remains within the same atmosphere, where a model of behavior and perception becomes reinforced. The religious system is constructed according to the same principle. For faith to become not merely a conviction, rather a state of being, it must accompany a person continuously. Every action — from waking to sleep — becomes linked to ritual. Prayers, services, sacraments, holidays — all of this creates an uninterrupted background within which a person lives from birth to death.

The key events of life — birth, family, death — are also incorporated into this structure. As a result, what is formed is **NOT SIMPLY** belief, rather an environment from which a person does not step outside. Repetition and monotony carry particular significance. Long services, repetitive actions, the constant repetition of the same formulas — all of this strengthens fixation at the subconscious level. The less consciously understood the action is, the more deeply it becomes established as a norm. This is not accidental, rather a technological effect.

From the standpoint of a systems approach, what is formed here is a **STABLE MODEL** of perception: a person becomes accustomed not to analyzing, rather to following. Not to asking



questions, rather to complying. This corresponds to a particular level of brain genotype within which governance is carried out through immersion in an environment rather than through understanding. If a person remains inside such a construct from childhood until the end of life, a fundamental sense of their role becomes fixed within them. They perceive themselves as part of a system in which the right to independently determine truth does not exist. The decisions have already been made. The task is to accept and reproduce them. At the same time, the **VERY FACT** that rituals are man-made is not, in

itself, the issue. Any system uses symbols and practices to organize behavior. However, here a fundamental distinction emerges. In some systems, these elements are recognized as instruments. In others, they are declared to be unquestionable sources of truth themselves.

And here another important point reveals itself. The authors of religious texts and services **DID NOT ALWAYS** claim absolute infallibility for themselves. Many directly acknowledged human participation in their creation. However, at the level of the system, these texts become fixed as a final and unchangeable foundation. It is precisely in this transition — from instrument to dogma — that the mechanism we are continuing to examine becomes visible.

Martin Luther, one of the key reformers of Christianity, carried this logic to an almost demonstrative extreme in his polemics with opponents. He could write his assertion in chalk and, if during the dispute it did not “miraculously” disappear, regard this as confirmation of his correctness. At first glance — naive. Yet if one looks deeper, it is the same principle: the **SUBSTITUTION OF VERIFICATION** with a symbolic act, where the sign itself begins to play the role of proof. A person familiar with such narratives may see nothing particularly critical in them. Yes, there are inconsistencies, yes, there are oddities — yet “overall the system works.” The main thing, it is believed, is that it points the way to eternal life. Everything else can be disregarded. One can remain in this position for quite a long time. I myself remained within this logic for some time. Until I **BEGAN** to go deeper — not into the forms, not into the rituals, rather into the foundations. And it was precisely there, at the level of the roots, that the picture began to change.

A historical episode that at first glance may seem secondary, in reality reveals something fundamental. In 63 BCE, Pompey the Great captured Jerusalem — the center of the religious and political life of the Jewish world. He entered the Temple, into its most sacred inner part — the place where, according to the law, only the high priest was permitted to enter, and only once a year. The expectation was obvious: to see something for which people were willing to die. However, what he **SAW WAS EMPTINESS**. No image, no idol, no object — nothing. A space devoid of any visible center. This contradicted his expectations so profoundly that it made an enormous impression on him. And here a question arises that turns out to be far deeper than the historical fact itself. If there is no object — around what is the system constructed? If there is no visible center — what holds the structure together?

The answer begins to emerge only when we stop searching for it at the level of form. Because the religious life of that time **WAS NOT** homogeneous. Israel represented a collection of different religious and political groups, each with its own understanding of God, the world, the law, and the purpose of existence. They differed in their views. They conflicted with one another. They existed in a state of perpetual internal opposition. Yet despite all this, something common remained. And this common element was not located in an object. It was located in the structure of perception. Not in what people were looking at — rather in **HOW THEY LOOKED**. Here we once again arrive at the level that becomes central to the entire logic moving forward: governance is carried out not through objects, rather through the formation of the very capacity to perceive them.

If we consider Israel of that time as a system, it becomes clear that it was not homogeneous. It was divided according to its relationship to the source of knowledge. The first camp proceeded from the idea of completeness. According to this position, God had transmitted all necessary information to Moses, and it had been fixed in the Law — the Torah. If the source is absolute, then it does not permit additions. Nothing new **IS REQUIRED**, nor can anything be added. Any attempt to introduce change is regarded as distortion. The second camp proceeded from the idea of incompleteness. Here it was asserted that Moses received only part of the knowledge, while the rest would be transmitted later — through special individuals called prophets. Moreover, it was assumed that a significant portion of the knowledge had **NOT BEEN** written down at all, but was passed on orally within a narrow circle. Thus, a

fundamental difference emerged not merely in viewpoints, rather in the very model of perception itself: either truth has already been fully given and must be preserved, or it unfolds progressively and requires continual renewal. The leaders of the first position were hereditary priests. Their task was to preserve the immutability of the Law. Any deviation was perceived as a **THREAT TO THE INTEGRITY** of the system. The logic here is extremely rigid: if God had intended future additions, this would have been declared in advance. Since this was not the case, any “new revelations” are false. Hence the reaction: those who claimed to bring new information were declared either mistaken or dangerous. Historically, this led to direct suppression — including physical elimination. However, alongside this there also existed a third layer — the most numerous one. People **NOT INVOLVED** in theoretical disputes. They followed rituals, paid tithes, observed prescriptions, but did not question foundational matters. Their function was to sustain the system. Thus, the structure appeared as a three-level model: guardians of immutability, bearers of renewal, and the masses ensuring reproduction of the system.

Within the “prophetic” direction, separate groups gradually formed, united by belief in specific interpretations. As these groups grew stronger, tension with the priestly system intensified. And when this tension reached a certain level, the religious contradiction inevitably transformed into a political one.

A paradoxical structure emerges. The Law **SIMULTANEOUSLY BECOMES** both the center around which everything revolves and the line of division. It unites — and at the same time it separates. Yet three fundamental points remain that prevent the system from collapsing: recognition of the Law, recognition of the Temple as the center, and the obligation to support it through offerings. It is precisely these elements that form the framework within which even opposing positions continue to exist as parts of a single whole.

If one looks deeper, it becomes clear that what stands before us is not merely a religious dispute. It is the manifestation of different levels of thinking. One level fixes and preserves. Another searches and expands. A third follows and reproduces. It is precisely through the interaction of these levels that the structure begins to form which we are now examining as a system for governing public consciousness.

The second camp **DID NOT HAVE** a single center. It represented a collection of different groups united by a common idea — the recognition of continuing revelation. Among the most prominent of these were the Essenes and the Pharisees. The Essenes moved toward religious practice and sought to minimize involvement in politics. Their focus was concentrated on observing norms, maintaining inner purity, and living a secluded way of life. The Pharisees, by contrast, combined religious ideas with an active social position. For them, observance of the Law **DID NOT EXCLUDE** participation in public and political life, but rather complemented it. Moreover, they connected this with the realization of a broader goal — the establishment of a particular order perceived as the fulfillment of prophecy. It was precisely because of this activity that the Pharisees became the second most significant force. The very word “Pharisee” originally meant “separated” or “set apart” — essentially, a heretic from the point of



view of the dominant system. Over time, this meaning faded, and the term became established simply as the designation of a group.

The **KEY FEATURE** of this line was the recognition not only of written knowledge, but also of oral knowledge. It was assumed that part of the information had not been fixed in texts, rather was transmitted within a narrow circle. Over time, this idea developed into bodies of texts that later took shape as the Talmud and the Kabbalah. It is important to note that the principle of “oral revelation” itself is not unique. It appears in different religious systems. And the reason for its emergence is entirely understandable. As society develops, a fixed, written model begins to come into conflict with changing reality. **A NEED FOR ADAPTATION** arises. However, since the source has been declared absolute, direct alteration becomes impossible. Therefore, a workaround emerges: new information is declared not to be new, rather to have always existed, merely hidden until that moment.

This mechanism is practically impossible to refute because it relies not on verifiability, rather **ON ASSERTION**. The source becomes not an external fact, rather an inner conviction. People striving to preserve the integrity of the system begin to interpret, supplement, and restructure meaning without destroying the form. As a result, an interesting effect emerges. New interpretations, relying on the authority of old texts, themselves begin to acquire authority. And the old texts, bolstered by these “supports,” not only preserve themselves, they also strengthen their significance. The system becomes more complex, while at the same time maintaining the appearance of continuity.

For Orthodox Christians, the analogue of the Jewish Law is the Bible. This is the name given to two combined books. The first includes the Jewish Law and the writings of the Jewish prophets (thus combining the Sadducees and the Pharisees). This first book is called the Old Testament. The second book consists of four accounts of the life of Christ and the writings of his followers. It is called the New Testament. The analogue of the unwritten Jewish Law (the Talmud and the Kabbalah) is Sacred Tradition (the Lives of the Saints). More precisely, the Talmud and the Kabbalah are not Jewish, rather Pharisaic documents. The Sadducees denied the sacredness of this information. If one looks deeper, **IT BECOMES CLEAR** that this is not merely about texts, rather about a multi-layered system for transmitting and preserving information. A system in which fixed forms are combined with flexible interpretations.

The Pharisees, unlike the Sadducees, accepted the idea of an afterlife, the existence of spirits, and divine recompense. Their model assumed that salvation was attained through observance of both the written and the oral law. This logic would later transform and manifest itself in other traditions, including Protestantism, where the emphasis shifts, yet the very idea of an inner connection between the individual and the higher realm remains. If all of this is viewed within a broader framework, it becomes obvious that we are dealing **NOT SIMPLY** with historical differences, rather with manifestations of different levels of thinking. One level fixes and guards. Another interprets and adapts. A third reproduces without penetrating the foundation itself. It is precisely through the interaction of these levels that the system preserves its stability, simultaneously changing while remaining itself.

The third significant group within Israel were the Essenes. Unlike the Pharisees and Sadducees, they consciously distanced themselves from politics and therefore were not perceived as a direct threat. Their position was different: recognition of the written Law was combined with acknowledgment of a significant body of unwritten knowledge. The key characteristic of the Essenes **WAS THE EXPECTATION** of the Messiah. Yet not merely as a religious figure — rather as a force that would transform the very structure of power itself. In their understanding, this involved not only liberation from external domination, rather also the overcoming of internal forms of control — including the authority of the priests and the groups competing for it. By the 2nd century BCE, the three principal lines — the

Sadducees, Pharisees, and Essenes — had formed into a stable structure. At the same time, the difference between them was not superficial, rather fundamental: it concerned the very completeness of the Law and, consequently, the understanding of reality itself. The Sadducees proceeded from the idea of completeness. If the Law contained no indication of an afterlife, recompense, or resurrection — then such things did not exist. Their position was logically consistent: if it is not in the text, then it is not in reality. This also determined their way of life. If reward **CANNOT** be postponed “until later,” then it must be realized here and now. Their position at the Temple — the center of Israel’s life — was perceived as confirmation of the correctness of their path and as a form of recompense itself.

The financial foundation of this position was substantial. Every Jew was obligated to give a tithe, which created a powerful resource concentrated in the hands of the priestly elite. This made it possible **NOT ONLY** to sustain the functioning of the system; it also shaped a particular style of life — demonstrative and oriented toward consumption. Such a situation inevitably generated tension within society. The gap between precepts and actual practice became increasingly obvious. Words about duty and strictness coexisted alongside behavior focused on earthly benefits. As a result, the priestly group inevitably became involved in political processes. Their position required interaction with external powers. And during this period, that power was the Hellenistic world, then at the height of its influence.

The Sadducees proved to be the most receptive to this influence. Their mode of thinking, oriented toward preserving the structure and utilizing present opportunities, **NATURALLY INTEGRATED** into a broader system. This made them convenient partners for Rome. Rome, in turn, relied precisely on them as a stable and predictable force. This cooperation was mutually beneficial: the external power obtained a manageable channel of influence, while the internal power preserved its own position.

If one looks at this picture as a whole, it becomes clear that this is not merely about religious differences. What stands before us are different modes of thinking. One fixes and preserves the form,



relying on the idea of completeness. Another

supplements and interprets, adapting the system. A third seeks a way beyond its boundaries. And it is precisely through the interaction of these modes that not only the religious structure, but also the governing structure of society itself is formed.

If we summarize everything that has been said, it becomes obvious that this article was not so much about religion as such, rather about a mechanism. About the mechanism **THROUGH WHICH** perception was formed, patterns of thinking were reinforced, and the governability of human communities was constructed. In this sense, the Church appears not only as a spiritual institution, rather also as an instrument for the systemic formation of consciousness. Through rituals, symbols, texts, and interpretations, an environment was created in which a person did not simply live — they were shaped. Shaped according to a particular type of thinking, a particular level of

That is precisely why the differences between the groups we have examined cannot be reduced to merely “different opinions.” These are **DIFFERENT MODES** of thinking. Different levels of access to understanding. Different degrees of involvement in the processes of Systemic Governance. Within the framework of state formation, this mechanism played a key role. Because control can be exercised not only through force or law. Control can also be exercised through **HOW A PERSON THINKS**. Through the kinds of questions they ask. And through the kinds of questions they are not even capable of formulating.

It was precisely in this way that a structure was built in which society became not merely a collection of people, rather a governed system. With a predetermined range of perception. With fixed boundaries of thought. With predictable reactions. However, the discussion does not end here. Because if we examine everything taking place within a broader context, it becomes clear: religious constructs represent merely one stage — just **ONE** of the tools — in a process of deeper transformation. A process connected with the development of brain genotypes, with the transition from one level of thinking to another. It is precisely this process that requires separate examination. We will continue this discussion further. **NO LONGER ONLY** through the analysis of forms, rather through an attempt to see the very logic of development itself: how mechanisms of governance changed, how systems of perception were restructured, and in what way, through all of this, the Human Being was formed — as a bearer of Reason, and not merely as an element of the system. Because to understand the past means to see the mechanism. And to see the mechanism means to gain the possibility of moving beyond its limits.

To be continued...

F. Shkrudnev
25 April 2026