

Salvation of the Saviors (series 137-369) Project 369 – Protocols of Reality: The Architecture of Invisible Power...

*True power rarely acts through force.
It creates an environment in which the
desired decisions emerge as a person's own choice,
and control becomes an invisible part.*

Human history is almost always told as the history of rulers, wars, revolutions, and changes of political regime. We are shown kings, presidents, military commanders, parliaments, and political parties, creating the impression that they determine the direction of civilization's development. Yet the more closely we examine history, the more clearly a particular pattern emerges — the most profound changes begin where **THE VERY PRINCIPLES** of governance quietly change, rather than where the faces change. It is at precisely such moments that a new reality is born.

Power cannot be understood solely as the ability to issue orders or use force. True control always begins much earlier — with the shaping of an informational environment in which a person regards a decision **ALREADY PREPARED** for them as their own choice. The higher the level of control, the less visible it becomes. This is why the most enduring systems exist through the creation of conditions in which most people voluntarily act in a predetermined direction, rather than through constant coercion.

The history of Europe's transition from absolute monarchy to a new political structure was **MORE THAN** a series of state reforms. It was a far deeper process of restructuring the very architecture of control over civilization. Visible power gradually gave way to power concealed within institutions, financial mechanisms, laws, information flows, and social perceptions. The forms of the state were not the only things that changed — **THE VERY LOGIC** of governing society changed.

Viewed through the development of brain genotypes, these events reveal how methods of governance grew more complex as society itself became more complex. Direct coercion gradually gave way to informational influence; force — to control through interests; commands — to the creation of conditions in which the desired decision seemed to arise of its own accord. It is this transition that we will examine in the present article, as the **PROGRESSIVE FORMATION** of an architecture of invisible power whose elements continue to shape the modern world, rather than as a collection of isolated historical episodes.

The decentralization of royal power in England meant more than simply limiting the monarch's authority. It involved a far deeper transformation of the entire governing architecture. The king was to lose the right to make strategic decisions determining the direction of the state's development. Legislative initiative, control over the judicial system, and influence over the executive branch were gradually to pass to a new structure in which one person's will was replaced by a system of interconnected institutions. Outwardly, the monarchy remained, yet its substance **GRADUALLY CHANGED**. The king was to become a symbol of the state, while the actual mechanisms of control increasingly shifted into the realm of finance and institutions that remained beyond the awareness of most of the population. This was no longer a struggle between individuals for power. The very level of control was changing. Personal control gradually

gave way to structural control. Governance increasingly operated through an **ESTABLISHED SYSTEM** of rules, constraints, and interdependencies rather than through personal directives. In this way, suprasystem control gradually displaced subsystem control while preserving the outward forms of the previous state.

A lengthy period of preparation for dismantling absolute monarchy began. Ideas that had emerged several centuries earlier were retrieved from political memory. Once again, the argument was voiced that one person was **INCAPABLE** of effectively controlling such a complex state organism. The need to divide power between the monarch and representatives of the elite was asserted ever more insistently, with Parliament's powers continually expanding as the king's capacity to act was just as steadily reduced. A simple agreement with the monarch; however, was insufficient. History had repeatedly shown that any document remained valid only as long as it was recognized by whoever held real power. An absolute monarch could always renounce his own commitments if he saw a necessity of state or a personal advantage in doing so. **FOR THIS VERY REASON**, the task was to change the king's capabilities rather than his intentions. Intentions belonged to the individual. Capabilities were determined by the structure of the system. As long as absolute monarchy remained, any signed charter was merely a declaration. The structure of the state itself had to be changed so that violating the established rules became virtually impossible.

Thus, an entirely different type of political environment **GRADUALLY BEGAN** to take shape. A new



worldview spread among the English aristocracy. Its proponents spoke less about the rights of the people than about the rights of the elite itself. Each member of the upper class was shown an obvious personal advantage: if power were distributed among many, the possibility of arbitrary rule by one person would disappear. No king **WOULD ANY LONGER BE ABLE** to deprive an aristocrat of life, property, or position solely at his own discretion. Power became a collective system of mutual constraints.

Here, one of the fundamental patterns in the development of human society became apparent. Any great idea became truly viable only when it connected with the **PERSONAL INTERESTS** of those who embraced it. Lofty slogans could inspire individuals, yet lasting social transformations arose only when an ideological objective

aligned with a person's understanding of their own well-being. In such cases, the system's energy increased many times over. This course of events followed a consistent pattern. Control information became effective only when it **ENTERED INTO RESONANCE** with the internal programs of the bearers of control. This was precisely why the idea of limiting absolute power so quickly gained the support of the English nobility. It was perceived both as a struggle for a more just structure of the state and as a means of securing their own safety, influence, and future prosperity.

Viewing this process through the formation of brain genotypes revealed another circumstance. As the conditions of society's development changed, some people gradually became more capable of perceiving the structures of control themselves, rather than **INDIVIDUAL** events. For earlier genotypes, the central concern was the particular ruler — strong or weak, just or cruel. A higher level of organization of thought began to perceive the system within which any ruler operated, rather than the person at the

pinnacle of power. This was precisely why attention gradually shifted from the monarch's personality to the structure of the state itself. This represented a different level of perception of the historical process.

As a result, the idea of limiting absolute monarchy began to be perceived **AS A NATURAL** stage in society's development rather than an assault on tradition. The king ceased to be regarded as a figure possessing sacred uniqueness. Increasingly, he was seen as one participant in the overall structure of the state, endowed with particular functions, yet no longer possessing the exclusive right to determine the country's fate. Naturally, the monarch himself could hardly fail to sense the changes taking place. Indirect signs pointed ever more clearly to the source of the growing threat. Suspicion gradually fell on financial circles. The king attempted to limit the bankers' influence by increasing **ADMINISTRATIVE PRESSURE** on them. The response was immediate and highly revealing. The bankers did not instigate uprisings, assemble armies, or storm palaces. They took a far more effective step — withdrawing money from circulation, halting lending, and demanding repayment of funds already advanced. The state suddenly discovered that financial flows could exert an influence on society comparable to military force. Economic life began to slow. Production declined. Trade lost momentum. A sense of general crisis emerged. Most importantly — it became clear that **NO** royal decree **COULD** force the financial system to operate contrary to its own logic.

By this time, the bankers had already gained allies among a substantial portion of the English aristocracy. In the eyes of many members of the elite, they no longer appeared to be ordinary moneylenders. Increasingly, they were perceived as advocates of a new state structure that promised every member of the nobility greater independence, greater security, and greater opportunities.

The king himself continued to perceive events as a succession of separate political conflicts, while the actual changes were taking place **MUCH DEEPER** — at the level of restructuring the entire architecture of state control. He saw individual opponents, yet still **DID NOT SEE** the system gradually taking shape around him. Every attempt to increase the pressure therefore ended in the same way. After each successive crisis, the monarch was forced to make concessions. Financial flows resumed, the economy revived, and its revival strengthened the position of those who were already beginning to control the conditions of people's existence more than the people themselves. Unnoticed by most, a **NEW MODEL** of power continued to take shape during this period — power that operated through the creation of conditions determining the subsequent decisions of all participants in the historical process, rather than through commands.

Banking, by its very nature, began to attract people of a particular disposition. These were more than merely owners of capital; they were highly energetic individuals capable of anticipating the consequences of their decisions, taking risks, and recognizing opportunities for gain where others had yet to notice them. In defending their own interests, they inevitably began to defend the entire financial system of which they became a part. Thus, personal interest **GRADUALLY EVOLVED** into an interest extending beyond the individual, and then into a systemic interest.

The king proved powerless to reverse this trend. This stemmed from his failure to understand the nature of the new force, rather than from a lack of authority or resolve. He continued to think in the categories of an earlier era, when power was determined by the sword, armies, land, and oaths of fealty. The economy, however, had already begun to operate according to different laws. Once a



system reached a certain level of complexity, it began to follow its own **INTERNAL LOGIC** of development rather than the will of individuals. It was precisely this logic that the monarch and his entourage failed to see.

Moneylenders, meanwhile, felt entirely at home in the new reality. They understood the language of money, credit, trust, and debt obligations. Whereas the king regarded the state as a collection of subjects and lands, financiers **INCREASINGLY** saw it as a system of resource flows that could be controlled far more effectively than through armed force. In the immediate historical perspective, the king's position still seemed secure. Formally, he remained the source of supreme authority. He could strip anyone of their title, property, and even life. Every banker remained his subject. Yet this understanding held true only within the old frame of reference.

History already offered the example of Philip the Fair, who had destroyed the Knights Templar and appropriated their wealth. The situation in England, however, **WAS FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT**. In France, the target had been a closed religious order. In England, the financial system had already penetrated deeply into the upper ranks of society. The largest banking houses were closely connected to the aristocracy through joint ventures, marriage alliances, debt obligations, and concealed equity holdings. An attack on the bankers therefore automatically became an attack on the English elite itself. To plunder the moneylenders was to plunder the monarch's own support base. Such a step would have amounted to political suicide rather than a demonstration of strength. A paradoxical situation thus emerged. The absolute monarch possessed almost unlimited legal authority, yet at the same time **WAS LOSING THE ABILITY** to exercise that authority over the most important part of the new system. The financial center gradually moved beyond the reach even of the crown.

Viewed year by year, events gave the impression of a struggle with alternating success. One day the financiers yielded; the next, the king. Viewed over a longer period; however, an entirely different picture emerged. The monarchy's individual victories **DID NOT CHANGE** the overall direction of the process. With each passing decade, the king's scope for independent decisions steadily narrowed. The noose was indeed tightening slowly, yet inexorably.

This development followed a consistent pattern. When a subsystem began to control the vital flows of the entire system, it gradually acquired the ability to influence the controlling level as well. Formally, control remained at the top, yet the actual levers increasingly shifted downward — toward the concentration of resources. Thus emerged the effect of a **HIDDEN REDISTRIBUTION** of power. We may suppose that, had the monarch and his closest advisers understood the true nature of events in time, they would have attempted to dismantle the emerging financial structure at an early stage. Some events might indeed have unfolded differently. On a strategic scale, however, this would hardly have altered the overall course of the process. History would merely have unfolded over a longer period, since the very conditions of society's development had already changed.

Here, the role of changes in brain genotypes became **PARTICULARLY APPARENT**. As long as earlier levels of organization of consciousness prevailed, society perceived power exclusively as a personal attribute of the sovereign. Gradually, however, people emerged who could think in terms of structures rather than individual personalities. They began to see both the figure of the ruler and the mechanisms determining his capabilities. This was a transition to a different level of systemic perception of historical reality.

After Henry VIII's death, events began to unfold much faster. Nine-year-old Edward VI ascended the throne and lived to the age of only sixteen. The reigns of Mary Tudor, Elizabeth I, and other monarchs followed. Each left a significant mark on English history, yet these details are secondary to understanding the main course of development. There is therefore no need to burden the narrative with numerous facts

that distract from the underlying pattern. It is far more important to turn to the moment when the confrontation between the old model of power and the new financial system reached **ITS CULMINATION** — the era of Charles I.

By this time, financial circles had become an independent force whose influence extended far beyond banking. Money opened doors through more than direct means. It created a network of dependencies, obligations, and mutual interests that bound together a substantial portion of the political elite. Control gradually shifted from overt pressure to the creation of conditions in which opponents themselves began to make decisions favorable to the other side.



By creating economic tension, restricting lending, and redirecting financial flows, financiers forced the king to seek a way out of the mounting crisis. One such solution was **RAISING TAXES**. Yet each new tax only intensified tensions within the state. The system began to operate through positive feedback. The greater public discontent became, the more confident the opposition felt. The more the monarch conceded, the more plausible further concessions appeared. Each concession **BECAME THE BASIS** for new demands rather than easing the conflict.

Parliament's demands became increasingly radical. The dispute now concerned the very principle of power rather than specific limitations. Parliament demanded that the king be stripped of the right to appoint ministers independently, effectively depriving him of the ability to form the executive branch. Charles I clearly sensed that the struggle concerned **THE VERY EXISTENCE** of traditional monarchy rather than individual powers. Unable to find a political solution, he took one final step that still reflected

the logic of the previous era — he attempted to arrest the leaders of the parliamentary opposition in person. History, however, had already entered a different phase. A method that had been natural to the passing system proved powerless against the new organization of power. The attempt ended in complete failure. Humiliated and having lost the political initiative, the king left London and headed north. Thus began the **OPEN PHASE** of the confrontation. In reality, however, this was no longer a war between king and Parliament. It was a clash between two different principles of control over civilization — the passing era of personal power and the emerging era of systemic control through finance, institutions, and mechanisms that remained invisible to most contemporaries.

By this time, the confrontation had moved decisively beyond a struggle between individual political factions. Behind outward events, a clash between two different models of state control became increasingly apparent. One continued to rely on the traditional monarchical hierarchy; the other **GRADUALLY ESTABLISHED** control through financial mechanisms, parliamentary institutions, and the redistribution of powers.

Oliver Cromwell became the leader of the parliamentary opposition. Forces interested in restructuring the English state began to gather around him. Creating a professional army required enormous funds, and financial circles provided them. Thus, for the first time in such an explicit form, financial resources **BECAME THE SOURCE** of military power. Gold began to create both wealth and a new political reality.

This support was not disinterested. In exchange for funding, the future authorities accepted certain obligations. Two fundamental conditions occupied a special place among them: lifting the restrictions on Jewish residence in England and removing obstacles to Jewish financial activity. At first glance, these appeared to be specific political decisions. A closer examination; however, reveals that they concerned the creation of conditions for the further development of the state's **NEW FINANCIAL** architecture. Such events cannot be explained solely by political motives. The very structure of control was changing. The state began to be reorganized so that the financial subsystem could develop freely and gradually become one of the principal elements of control over society.

The civil war that broke out, known to history as the English Bourgeois Revolution, became **MORE THAN** a struggle for the throne. In reality, it was a conflict between the passing system of personal power and the emerging system of institutional control. The royal militia confronted Cromwell's army and was defeated. Charles I was taken prisoner. Following the victory, Cromwell became Lord Protector of England. Formally, the monarchy ceased to exist. For the first time in history, an English king stood trial before a court of his own state and ended his life on the scaffold.

This episode had a **FAR DEEPER** significance than an ordinary change of ruler. In society's consciousness, the notion of the monarch's inviolability as the bearer of divinely ordained power collapsed. With the death of Charles I, the centuries-long era of sacred absolute monarchy came to an end. The structure of control began to shed its former conceptual foundation.

Fulfilling the agreements reached, Cromwell lifted the previous ban on Jewish residence in England and opened the way for financial activity to develop freely. This **CREATED THE CONDITIONS** without which the further development of the new economic model would have been impossible. Financial circles proposed that Cromwell take the next step — accept the crown. This option appeared extremely attractive. It seemed symbolic that a new era could begin with a new dynasty arising after the abolition of the previous monarchy. This would have brought the entire reform to completion and lent it additional legitimacy in the eyes of Europe. Yet his(torah)y **ONCE AGAIN TOOK** a different course. Cromwell categorically refused to accept the royal title. He died soon afterward, and his son Richard proved unable to maintain the system that had taken shape. Here, another characteristic of historical processes becomes apparent. An individual **CAN INITIATE** change, yet only a properly formed structure can sustain it. If a change depends exclusively on one person, it remains unstable. Once a new structure has taken shape; however, it continues to exist regardless of the fate of its creators.

A complex political situation arose. With the strong leader gone, the country once again **FACED THE THREAT** of civil conflict. To avoid an endless struggle for supreme power, Parliament decided to restore the monarchy. Charles II — the son of the executed Charles I — was invited to take the throne. This; however, was now an entirely different monarchy. Charles II received the crown on condition that he recognize the new rules governing the structure of the state. The king remained **AS A SYMBOL** of the state, yet his power was now embedded in a system of parliamentary constraints. The outward form of power and its actual substance were definitively separated.

After these events, the English aristocracy had no intention of returning to the previous order. Having gained a role in state decision-making, it **DID NOT WISH** to become wholly dependent on one person's will again. Collective power gave each member of the elite both influence and a considerably higher level of personal security. This revealed an important pattern in any complex social system. Once it had gained a new degree of freedom, the system almost **NEVER** voluntarily **RETURNED** to its former state. It began to defend the new configuration as a condition of its own existence. Very soon, however, Charles II began to understand the true nature of his position. Formally, he remained king, yet his actual capacity to control the state was considerably narrower than that of his predecessors. It became

increasingly clear that the financial system had acquired **INDEPENDENT INFLUENCE** that constrained even royal power. Renewed attempts to put pressure on the bankers yielded no results. A substantial portion of the English elite, fully aware of the advantages of the new order, already stood behind financial circles. The king was left chiefly with historical tradition and the prestige of his title, while the actual mechanisms of control gradually passed to the new system.

After Charles II's death, his brother James II ascended the throne. Unlike his predecessor, he attempted to restore the former model of absolute monarchy. Circumstances, however, had already changed irreversibly. Parliament, the leading aristocrats, and the financial circles supporting them regarded such attempts as a threat to the entire established structure of the state. Even the temporary dissolution of Parliament **COULD NOT** alter the existing balance of power. Here, the transition from personal control to control through structure became particularly apparent. As long as the king's person had been the source of power, a change of ruler could transform the entire system. Once institutions, law, and financial mechanisms became the principal regulators, however, an individual could no longer turn back history.

The religious factor also played a special role. James II's Catholic beliefs conflicted with the social consciousness that had already taken shape. For most English people, the Anglican Church had long been **MORE THAN** a religious institution; it was also a symbol of national independence. The king's actions were therefore perceived as an assault on the foundations of English statehood rather than an expression of personal convictions. Even his closest associates gradually turned away from the monarch. Political allies and relatives alike began to abandon him. History almost literally repeated the fate of Charles I, although the outward circumstances were now entirely different. Under these conditions, Parliament decided to invite James II's daughter Mary and her husband, William of Orange, ruler of the Netherlands, to take the English throne. Interested financial circles once again undertook to finance the entire operation.

The conditions of support **REMAINED UNCHANGED**. The future monarchs were to recognize the



principles of constitutional monarchy and preserve the freedom of financial activity that had become a crucial element of the new state structure. The proposal appeared lawful, modern, and morally justified. It was presented as a defense of the country against arbitrary rule and a return to a just structure of power. Mary and William accepted the invitation, and the subsequent events culminated in their accession to the English throne.

In 1689, Parliament **OFFICIALLY PROCLAIMED** England's new rulers. At the same time, the Bill of Rights was adopted, definitively establishing the redistribution of powers. From that moment onward, the monarch **COULD NO LONGER** independently suspend laws, impose taxes, interfere with Parliament's work, or persecute its



members. This marked the completion of more than a political reform. It completed a centuries-long transition from the era of personal power to the era of institutional power.

Viewed through changes in brain genotypes, this process reveals how society gradually began to perceive the state as a **COMPLEX SYSTEM** of interconnected rules rather than the monarch's personal possession. At higher levels of organization of consciousness, the decisive question became *"how is control itself structured?"* rather than *"who rules?"* It was precisely this change in social thinking that made the transformations practically irreversible.

Formally, England retained the crown. Its substance; however, had changed. The real struggle was now for **THE ABILITY TO CONTROL** the mechanisms determining the movement of finance and resources and, ultimately, the direction of the entire state system's development, rather than for the throne. Here, a type of power began to take shape that operated through the creation of conditions in which all other participants in the historical process began making decisions they regarded as their own, rather than through commands.

The story **DID NOT END** with James II's defeat by William of Orange's forces. Having lost the throne, the English king left the country and found refuge in France. Louis XIV received him as England's legitimate sovereign rather than an exile. The French monarch pointedly refused to recognize the new English king, thereby turning England's internal conflict into a factor in European politics. James was given the use of the Palace of Saint-Germain, financial support, and the opportunity to continue his struggle to regain the throne. His natural allies gradually gathered around the exiled monarch — English Catholics who became known to history as Jacobites. They were **MORE THAN** supporters of a particular dynasty. Most belonged to those sections of society that had lost their former position, influence, and property as a result of the English Reformation. For them, the struggle for James also became a struggle to regain their own place within the state system.

Such processes followed a consistent pattern. Any change in the architecture of control inevitably produced two forces: those who benefited from the new structure and those it displaced. Each group began striving to restore the state of the system **MOST FAVORABLE** to itself. History unfolded through the efforts of different structures to restore a lost balance in their own favor, rather than through any exceptional will possessed by individuals.

Meanwhile, William of Orange faced a task that had moved beyond politics into strategy. Victory did not yet mean that the new model of the state had been firmly established. Retaining power required an army, a navy, the upkeep of the state apparatus, and enormous financial resources. Bankers once again became the source of those resources. The terms of their involvement now became **CONSIDERABLY BROADER**. Whereas previously they had supported individual political decisions, they now proposed changing the very foundation of state control over finance. Financial circles agreed to provide the necessary funds on condition that a special institution be established and granted the exclusive right to determine the country's monetary policy, issue money, lend to the state, and regulate the financial system. In effect, this was no longer a matter of a loan; it meant transferring one of the most important elements of state sovereignty into the hands of a new structure.

William accepted the proposed terms. Having secured the necessary funding, **HE CREATED** a professional army, while James II was forced to rely mainly on a poorly trained militia. Only the seven thousand French soldiers sent by Louis XIV formed a truly combat-ready core of his forces.

The decisive episode was the Battle of the Boyne. Judged solely by military losses, the battle did not appear catastrophic for either side. Both armies remained capable of fighting. The outcome of the war was not yet predetermined. The logic of events pointed toward a continuation of the campaign. Unexpectedly, however, James decided to abandon his army and once again left the country. To this day,

historians have not agreed on a single explanation for this decision. Various interpretations have been proposed — ranging from the monarch's personal qualities to political calculations and external pressure. History; however, has provided no definitive answer. For our purposes, another point matters more. From the perspective of systemic analysis, the fate of an individual had already **CEASED TO DETERMINE** the fate of the entire structure. Even if James had demonstrated outstanding abilities as a military commander, the architecture of control had by then changed so profoundly that restoring the previous order was becoming increasingly difficult. The historical process was increasingly governed by the logic of the system rather than the will of individuals.

This circumstance can be explained particularly well through the concept of brain genotypes. As long as society perceived history as a sequence of actions by great rulers, one person's defeat or victory **DID INDEED CHANGE** the fate of the state. As the ability to perceive more complex interconnections developed; however, it became clear that individuals merely occupied positions within structures that had already taken shape. History was increasingly determined by the organization of the system itself rather than the ruler's qualities.

The next step marked a turning point. In 1694, William fulfilled his earlier commitments to financial circles. England's monetary system underwent a profound reorganization. An institution emerged to which functions previously belonging exclusively to the state were transferred. Thus, the **BANK OF ENGLAND** came into being.

The name itself proved exceptionally effective in terms of controlling public consciousness. It naturally created the impression of a state institution acting exclusively in the interests of the English crown. For many generations, this was precisely how most English people perceived it. In its legal nature; however, it was a private organization granted exclusive state powers.

An extremely important change took place here. Control shifted from the level of overt state machinery to structural control through a specialized institution. Formally, the state retained its sovereignty, yet one of its key instruments began to function according to a different logic.

The bank **RECEIVED THE RIGHT** to control the country's monetary circulation. It issued new money, provided loans to the state, and regulated financial flows. The money it created was now backed by the future tax revenues of English society as a whole rather than by the bank's own assets. In essence, an entirely new principle emerged.

Previously, the state had collected taxes to perform its functions. Now, a substantial portion of future taxes was pledged in advance as backing for newly created money. Thus, the national economy **GRADUALLY BEGAN** to work both to produce society's output and to service the financial structure itself.

The emerging analogy between the church and the bank was particularly striking. For many centuries, the church had possessed the exclusive right to determine what belonged to the realm of the sacred. **ONLY IT** could perform acts through which an ordinary object was declared consecrated. Anyone could reproduce the same outward gestures and utter the same words; without recognition by ecclesiastical authority, however, such an act was considered invalid.



The monopoly did not lie in the ritual itself. It lay in the socially recognized right to declare the act valid. The Bank of England acquired an analogous right in a different sphere.

Any printing house **WAS CAPABLE OF PRODUCING** paper of the same quality or even better. Any craftsman could reproduce the design, signatures, and ornamentation. Yet only paper issued by an institution possessing the socially recognized right to issue money became money. An intriguing pattern emerged. The church transformed an ordinary object into a sacred object. The bank transformed ordinary paper into a medium of circulation endowed with economic power. In both cases, the decisive factor was society's recognition of a particular right rather than the physical object. Recognition itself gave the symbol its power. This marked a shift of control from the material realm to the informational realm. The physical paper was worth virtually **NOTHING**. Its value arose solely from society's collective agreement to regard that particular symbol as a bearer of value. Consequently, public consciousness became the true object of control, replacing gold and paper. This was why the state so rigorously protected the monopoly on monetary issuance. Infringing the exclusive right to create money was always regarded as more than an economic crime — it was an assault on the foundations of the existing order. Just as the church had once guarded its exclusive right to speak in the name of higher truth, the financial system began to guard its **EXCLUSIVE RIGHT** to create a lawful medium of exchange with equal consistency

The subsequent his(torah)y of the Bank of England was also revealing. In 1946, it was formally declared state property. Even afterward; however, government representatives for a long time **DID NOT HAVE** decisive influence over its activities. Only toward the end of the twentieth century did the Bank's leadership begin to be appointed through an established state procedure involving the crown and Parliament. Regardless of subsequent reforms; however, the crucial development had already occurred.

For the first time in human history, an **INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE** emerged in which control over money became an independent center of power. This marked the beginning of an entirely new era in world history, when the financial system gradually ceased to serve the state and increasingly began to determine the direction of its development. It is this next stage that we will examine in detail as our research continues.

Following the creation of the first private Central Bank in England, the next stage of development opened up for the new financial system. If a stable center for controlling monetary circulation could be established in one country, the same model could be **GRADUALLY EXTENDED** to the other states of Europe. The logic of further development became clear: first, establish similar financial institutions in the largest countries, then connect them through common rules, common financial mechanisms, and a common direction of development. Thus, the possibility of forming a supranational financial network gradually emerged. It became clear that this was no longer a matter of establishing another bank. A **NEW CONTROL** structure for civilization was taking shape. Individual states continued to exist, retaining their borders, armies, governments, and symbols of sovereignty, yet another level of control gradually began to form above them, based on control over financial flows rather than administrative authority.

France became the setting for the first attempt to extend the new model. In 1716, following the death of Louis XIV, a financial institution emerged there based on principles already tested in England. It seemed that events would now unfold **CONSIDERABLY FASTER**. Exporting political revolutions appeared to be a lengthy, costly, and risky way of transforming states. The economic route seemed far more effective. Establishing a financial center and integrating it into the country's economy would be enough to make subsequent transformations considerably easier. Reality; however, once again altered the course of events.

Very soon, the true significance of these changes was explained to the future Louis XV. The young monarch understood **QUITE QUICKLY** the potential consequences of placing the monetary system under



external control. Therefore, in one of his first decisions after ascending the throne, he nationalized the Bank of France, returning control over finance to the state. At first glance, the bankers had suffered a defeat. Yet such defeats sometimes provided the system with its most valuable knowledge.

A conclusion was drawn from this event that would shape subsequent strategy for decades to come. As long as absolute power rested with one person, **NO** financial structure **COULD** feel entirely secure. Any monarch could change the rules of the game with a single decision. Consequently, the Bank's stability depended neither on the amount of capital nor on the quantity of gold. It depended exclusively on the structure of the political system itself. This became a kind of systemic law. The more widely state power was dispersed, the more secure the financial center's position became.

Constitutional monarchy proved a considerably more favorable environment than absolute monarchy. Yet it **STILL RETAINED** a certain degree of risk. A natural conclusion therefore emerged: further redistribution of powers would make the financial structure even more stable.

Here, a transition occurred to an entirely **NEW TYPE** of strategic thinking. The system ceased to struggle against individual rulers. It began to change the very rules governing the existence of power. This was precisely why the next stage involved changing the entire model of the state rather than merely limiting the monarchy. If England had become a laboratory for constitutional monarchy, continental Europe was to become the setting for the emergence of an even more complex political structure.

Thus, the idea of **LIBERAL DEMOCRACY** gradually emerged. Whatever its subsequent history, it is important to understand that, within the logic we are examining, it arose **BY NO ACCIDENT**. Its purpose was to redistribute powers throughout society as widely as possible. Whereas absolute monarchy concentrated power at a single point and constitutional monarchy distributed it among several centers, the new system sought to make virtually the entire adult population of the country the bearer of power.

Historically, the idea of popular participation in control had existed as far back as ancient Greece. Ancient Greek democracy; however, extended to only a relatively small portion of society. Women, slaves, foreigners, and a substantial portion of the population **HAD NO** political rights. The new structure was built on an entirely different principle. The right to participate in elections was gradually to extend to every adult, regardless of origin, financial standing, level of education, or other personal qualities. Age and evident legal incapacity became the only restrictions.

Viewed superficially, this appeared to represent the greatest possible expansion of freedom. From the perspective of systemic analysis; however, a different question arises. What happens to control when the number of decision-makers becomes virtually unlimited? The answer proves unexpected. When power is dispersed as widely as possible, the possibility of concentrating it in one person's hands **PRACTICALLY DISAPPEARS**. It is precisely this circumstance that makes the entire structure exceptionally stable.

Viewed through the lens of brain genotypes, these processes also acquire an additional explanation. Earlier stages of social development were oriented toward perceiving a strong leader, hero, or monarch as the principal source of order. As human consciousness developed; however, the ability

emerged to perceive the **INSTITUTIONAL ORGANIZATION** of society rather than an individual personality. Control began to shift from the realm of personal power to the realm of rules, procedures, and coordinated mechanisms. In the new model, the state therefore became less associated with a particular person and more with the functioning of institutions. A fundamentally different type of control emerged. Whereas the previous system had presupposed an individual who made the final decisions, the **PRINCIPAL ROLE** now began to belong to the decision-making mechanism itself. The individual became a temporary participant in the process. The structure remained permanent. This constituted one of the most profound changes in all subsequent history. Control gradually ceased to depend on the personal will of individual rulers. It began to operate **THROUGH A COMBINATION** of institutions, procedures, laws, financial mechanisms, and social agreements. Here lay one of the most important dividing lines between two his(torah)ical eras.

The more widely power was dispersed, the less individual members of the elite mattered, and the more **THE IMPORTANCE** of mass consciousness **INCREASED**. This was fundamental to the new political structure. Controlling a limited circle of influential people was considerably more difficult than influencing a population of many millions. The elite possessed its own knowledge, its own sources of information, and its own interests. The masses, as the entire history of civilization shows, were **FAR MORE EASILY** subjected to external control. It made no difference whether they gathered in a city square or sat at home, absorbing the same information flow every day. They remained a single informational object. Only the methods of transmitting control signals differed. In one case, this occurred through direct emotional contagion within a crowd; in the other — through the mass media, the education system, culture, political advertising, and other channels shaping collective perception. This was precisely why control over mass consciousness gradually became an **INDEPENDENT TECHNOLOGY** rather than the art of individual politicians. Here, a question arises that must be answered if we are to understand the nature of modern democracy. What is choice?

In the conventional understanding, democracy begins with the voting procedure. Yet the procedure itself **MEANS NOTHING**. Voting becomes democratic only when a person *makes a conscious decision*. And no conscious action is possible **WITHOUT KNOWLEDGE**.



If a person does not understand what they are choosing or lacks the necessary information, they are reacting rather than choosing. Their behavior comes to be governed by impressions, emotions, sympathies, fears, hopes, and expectations rather than knowledge. Consequently, from a strictly logical perspective, **DEMOCRACY IS IMPOSSIBLE** without a sufficiently high level of understanding of what is happening. Here, a fundamental contradiction arises. Manipulative techniques can indeed induce a person to perform an action that outwardly appears identical to a choice. The person arrives at a polling station, receives a ballot, marks it, and places it in the ballot box. Formally, all the signs of a free expression of will are present. Yet if the decision is based on an emotional response rather than knowledge, it constitutes a **PSYCHOLOGICALLY SHAPED** response rather than a conscious choice. The distinction is fundamental. Conscious choice arises from understanding. Emotional choice arises from an informational state created in advance. Here lies the boundary between self-directed control and external control. In

the first case, the person makes the decision independently. In the second, they merely regard the decision as their own, although the conditions that gave rise to it **HAD ALREADY BEEN** shaped by the surrounding informational environment.

For society to make truly informed decisions, it must be provided with an enormous body of reliable knowledge. In practice, however, this proves virtually impossible. There are several reasons for this. **First, NOT EVERY** person is capable of absorbing the volume of information needed to understand complex processes of state. **Second, NOT EVERY** person is willing to devote years of their life to doing so. There is also a third, much deeper reason. Every state possesses information that, by its very nature, **CANNOT** be made available to everyone. A substantial proportion of strategic decisions rests on information that constitutes state secrets or is critical to national security. Consequently, even with the sincerest intentions, **IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO PROVIDE** society as a whole with the full body of information. An inevitable conclusion follows. The model of democracy described in most textbooks represents an ideal structure rather than a realistically attainable state of society. Practical politics is compelled to seek another mechanism. That mechanism is the technology of shaping public preferences. This is precisely why election campaigns increasingly resemble the **ADVERTISING INDUSTRY** rather than scientific debate.

Advertising never aims to foster a deep understanding of a product. It creates an image, an emotional response, associations, and a mood. It seeks to inspire the desire to acquire the product rather than to study how it works.



Advertising never aims to provide a deep understanding of a product. It creates an image, an emotional response, associations, and a mood. It seeks to arouse the desire to buy the product rather than to study how it works. Political advertising operates according to the same principles. Rather than discussing the mechanisms of future control, it creates emotional symbols and images of success, threat, hope, fear, or justice. Knowledge does not become the principal factor in the choice. The **IMPRESSION BECOMES** decisive. Increasingly, a person chooses the image of the substance created for them rather than the substance itself. Not the program. Not the structure of control. Its informational packaging. To use a simple analogy, voters are often invited to choose an object's bright wrapping rather than the object itself.

Viewed through the lens of brain genotypes, this also acquires a specific explanation. At early stages of development, emotional and image-based perception of reality predominates. A person

responds more readily to a vivid symbol than to a complex logical structure. Only as **HIGHER** brain genotypes develop does the ability to perceive cause-and-effect relationships, systemic patterns, and the long-term consequences of decisions increase. This is precisely why mass society proves considerably more receptive to emotional control than to analytical understanding. From this arises another characteristic feature of the modern political system. It is considerably easier to offer mass consciousness a **SIMPLE SOLUTION** to a complex problem than to explain the nature of the problem itself. Outwardly,

this appears to be free choice. Yet if the choice rests exclusively on emotional stimuli, what we see is the power of the technology for shaping public opinion rather than the power of knowledge. Here, one of the most important principles of the new architecture of control over civilization begins to emerge.

True power does not belong to whoever counts the votes. Nor does it belong to whoever organizes elections. It gradually passes to whoever **IS CAPABLE OF SHAPING** the informational environment in which millions of people begin to regard as their own precisely the decision prepared in advance for mass acceptance.

We have repeatedly returned to one of the fundamental patterns of organized existence: ***all life strives toward well-being***. The conception of well-being determines the direction of development of any system — from an individual to a state and civilization as a whole. Yet well-being is never identical at every level of organization. What strengthens the state as a whole is **NOT ALWAYS** perceived by an individual as a personal benefit. Conversely, a decision that greatly benefits an individual today may prove destructive to the state tomorrow. Here lies one of the central contradictions of any social system — the contradiction between the interests of the part and those of the whole.

This is a natural misalignment between levels of control. The subsystem **SEEKS TO PRESERVE** its own stability. The suprasystem seeks to preserve the stability of the entire structure. As long as their objectives coincide, the system develops harmoniously. When they begin to diverge, internal tension arises, gradually undermining the integrity of control. This is precisely why a state wholly dependent on the majority's current sentiments inevitably encounters serious limitations. Mass consciousness is **ALMOST ALWAYS** oriented toward the immediate horizon. For most people, present-day security, employment, and well-being matter more than strategic objectives whose consequences will become apparent decades later. This pattern is clearly evident in modern societies. For example, migration processes in Europe demonstrate how difficult it is for democratic institutions to make swift, unpopular decisions, even when some members of society consider them necessary for the state's long-term stability. In systems where power is **MORE CENTRALIZED**, such decisions are made considerably faster, since there is no need to continually coordinate them among numerous political centers. This fact alone; however, does not establish the superiority of one model over another. It merely illustrates the difference between principles of control. Every political system addresses the same question: how to reconcile the interests of the individual, society, and the state. By nature; however, a person evaluates events primarily **THROUGH THE LENS** of their own life. They need work, family, confidence in the future, the opportunity to raise children in peace, a sense of security, and clear prospects in life. For most of the population, these values almost always prove **CONSIDERABLY MORE IMPORTANT** than political declarations; however eloquent they may be. As long as the state provides a sense of stability, security, and the opportunity to live with dignity, society responds relatively calmly to discussions of freedoms, rights, equality, and other lofty principles. As soon as ideological slogans conflict with everyday well-being; however, human nature asserts itself far more strongly than any political theory. This stems from the **FUNDAMENTAL LAWS** of organized existence rather than a lack of morality.

Every system first seeks to preserve its own existence and only then begins to pursue higher objectives. Viewed through the lens of brain genotypes, such behavior also follows a consistent pattern. At the early levels of consciousness development, the tasks of **IMMEDIATE SURVIVAL** and securing the near future predominate. Only as higher genotypes develop does the ability emerge to voluntarily subordinate personal interests to the strategic objectives of society and civilization. This is precisely why, in every era, people at different levels of thinking inevitably perceive the same political processes differently. A natural question arises. If today's most economically developed states use democratic institutions, does this mean that democracy itself is the source of their strength? The answer is

considerably more complex than commonly assumed. We will examine this question in detail in subsequent articles. For now, it is important to note just one circumstance. The modern political system is **CONSIDERABLY MORE COMPLEX** than the definitions commonly used to describe it. Visible democratic procedures constitute only the outward part of a far more complex structure of control. Behind the façade of elections, parliaments, parties, and public politics, **MECHANISMS OPERATE** that remain virtually invisible to most participants in social life. This is natural. The higher the level of control, the less visible it becomes to the system being controlled. Control is most effective when it is perceived as the natural order of things rather than when it continually displays its power. The question, therefore, is no longer whether democracy exists, rather which **ACTUAL MECHANISMS** sustain the functioning of the modern state, how strategic decisions are made, and why the visible turnover of political figures barely changes the overall direction of the system's development.



Another important pattern must be noted. The democratic principle **CAN INDEED** function effectively where the scale of the community allows each person to understand what is happening. In a small group, people know one another well, can assess candidates' personal qualities, and have a fairly clear understanding of the tasks the elected leader will need to address. Here, choice can genuinely rest on personal experience and direct knowledge. As society grows in scale; however, the situation changes qualitatively. Personal knowledge is replaced by an image conveyed through information. Direct experience — by media reports. A person's reputation — by their public image. At precisely this point, space opens up for **TECHNOLOGIES FOR SHAPING** mass consciousness. Quantity gives rise to a new quality. What served as an effective mechanism of self-organization in a small community gradually becomes, in a vast state, a complex informational system in which competition centers on **METHODS OF INFLUENCING** the collective perception of millions of people rather than on the ideas themselves.

This resembles the action of any potent substance. In a precisely calculated dose, it can heal the body. When the required concentration is exceeded, the same substance becomes a source of destruction. Likewise, political mechanisms **ARE NEITHER** an absolute good nor an absolute evil. Everything depends on the scale of their application, society's level of maturity, and the purposes for which they are used. The question of who determines this measure, who sets the rules of the game, and who actually controls the entire structure of the modern world will be the subject of our further discussion in subsequent articles.

To be continued...

F. Shkrudnev

11 October 2026