Salvation of the Saviors
(series 123-369)
Project 369 – Non-Articles: Beyond the Text: Reality and the Limits of Perception…

The world is not revealed to a person — it is assembled by them from a stream of information limited by the boundaries of the Brain. And therefore, the boundaries of the world always coincide with the boundaries of the one who observes it.

Every time a person attempts to understand the world, they inevitably encounter not reality itself, rather its reflection within their own perception. We are accustomed to accepting our surroundings as self-evident: what we see, hear, and feel is assumed to be reality. However, it takes only a single step aside — and the asking of one simple question: What exactly are we perceiving — the world itself, or merely our interpretation of it? — for that former certainty to begin to crack.

Modern science, philosophy, and many schools of thought converge on one fundamental idea: a person does not encounter the world as it is, rather with information about it, transformed and assembled by the Brain into a coherent picture. What we call reality is therefore not something directly given, rather the result of a **COMPLEX PROCESS** — one of interpretation, filtering, and structuring. This means that the boundaries of the knowable world are determined not by external limits, rather by the internal capacities of the observer. And if this is so, then the question of the nature of reality inevitably becomes a question of the nature of perception, thought, and the mechanisms that underlie them.

In this article, we will attempt to move beyond conventional ideas and consider reality not as a collection of objects, rather as a process of formation — as the result of the operation of algorithms, informational structures, and the limitations of the Brain. And in doing so, we will arrive at the central question — an understanding of **WHERE THE BOUNDARY LIES** between the world and the one who observes it.

Every worldview truly begins with one fundamental question: What is the world? Yet this question takes on a far more rigorous and concrete meaning. It is no longer a matter of philosophical reflection for its own sake, rather an attempt to determine the structure of reality within whose boundaries a person is capable of existing, thinking, and acting at all. What is the world? Is it that which surrounds us? Is it that which existed before us? Is it that which will remain after us? Does anything continue beyond the present state of existence? And if it does, is a person's life connected with it? These questions may appear unrelated, yet in reality they all converge into

one: Where does the boundary of reality lie, and how is it defined? Here it is necessary to make the first fundamental shift. The world in which a person exists is not the external world as such. It is a world formed **THROUGH THE SYSTEM** of perception. A person does not live in reality directly. Rather, a person lives in its interpretation. Strictly speaking, the expression "to exist in the world" means "to process the signals received by the Brain." Everything a person regards as reality is the **RESULT OF PROCESSING** the information received through the channels of perception. And here we arrive at a key point: we have no direct access to the source itself. We have access only to its transformed version. This

means that the reality available to a person is not the "objective world," rather a construction assembled from signals. Sensations are not reality itself, rather the **INTERFACE OF INTERACTION** with it. Information enters through the sense organs, is converted into electrical impulses, transmitted to the Brain, and there interpreted into images. These images constitute what a person calls "the world." Yet here a fundamental discontinuity arises — between the source of the signal and its image within consciousness there is no direct correspondence. There is only transformation. It is precisely for this reason that a person's certainty that the world is "exactly as they see it" **HAS NO** real foundation. It is not knowledge. It is an assumption formed within the framework of the Brain's genotype. This is especially important. The genotype determines not only the range of perception, but also the mode of interpretation. The very same signal can be transformed into different images depending on the level of organization of the Brain. Consequently, "reality" is not merely subjective — it is **CONSTRUCTIVELY DETERMINED.**

If we develop this line of thought, one conclusion becomes obvious — a person does not merely perceive the world — they assemble it. From fragments of information, from signals, from impulses. Without the original information, a person is **NOT CAPABLE** of forming any picture at all. This means that a person's world is always secondary in relation to the source of the signal. Yet this gives rise to the next question: What is the source of that signal? And here the familiar picture begins to fall apart. For we **CANNOT** directly verify whether the image corresponds to its source. We merely assume that it does.

If signals identical to those received from the external world are fed into the system of perception, the Brain will assemble exactly the same picture. For the Brain, there is no distinction between a "real" and a "generated" source if the signals are identical. This means that the criterion of reality **DOES NOT LIE** within the sensations themselves. It lies beyond them. Yet a person has no access to that "beyond." Here we encounter an even deeper level. The reality perceived by a person is not merely an illusion in the ordinary sense. It is a **WORKING MODEL** necessary for functioning. However, it is not required to correspond to its source. And this leads to a radical conclusion: the observed world may indeed be exactly what it appears to be. Yet with equal probability, it may be a construction **HAVING NO** direct resemblance to its source.

The images of the body, objects, space, and even time — all of these may be the result of interpretation rather than reflection. From the standpoint of the development of Brain genotypes, this means the following — a person is not merely limited in perception — they are enclosed within a particular model for assembling reality. And until that model is recognized, they accept it as absolute. It is precisely for this reason that philosophical concepts such as solipsism[1] arise not as abstract speculation, rather as an attempt to point to this discontinuity. Perhaps everything that is perceived is

---

[1] **Solipsism** (from the Latin *solus* — alone" and *ipse* — self) is a radical philosophical position according to which the only indubitable reality is one's own consciousness, while the external world and other people exist only within one's subjective perception or as constructs of one's own mind.

merely an "image on a screen." Perhaps the only reality is something that generates the stream of information from which the Brain assembles the world. Yet this idea goes further. What matters is not whether "it is an illusion or not." What matters is understanding who or what determines the structure of that illusion, **BY WHAT** laws the assembly of reality takes place, and why it is common to groups of people while differing at the level of individual perception. For it is precisely here that the transition from philosophy to a system of governance begins. It is from this point that the next step becomes possible — examining a worldview not merely as a collection of views, rather **AS A CONSTRUCTION** that determines the very admissibility of reality.

If the reality of the perceived world can be called into question, then it cannot serve as a point of reference. Any system that claims to be foundational must possess the quality of indubitability. And here what appears to be a paradox arises: if everything is subject to doubt, then nothing remains upon which one can rely. Yet this is true only at first glance. It is important to make a distinction — one may doubt the content of perception, yet one **CANNOT DOUBT** the very fact of perception itself. One may call into question what a person sees; however, it is impossible to call into question the very act of seeing. One may doubt one's thoughts; however, it is impossible to doubt outside of thought.

It was Parmenides[2] who first articulated this insight, asserting that thinking and being are one and the same. Later, René Descartes carried this idea to its ultimate expression: "I think, therefore I am." And George Berkeley completed this line of thought by maintaining that to be is either to perceive or to be perceived. These are not merely philosophical formulas. They point to a fundamental principle — thinking and perception are the only things that **DO NOT REQUIRE** proof. Any attempt to deny them automatically confirms them. To doubt thought, one must think the doubt. Therefore, thought is inescapable. And here the most important turning point occurs. If everything external may be an illusion, yet thought cannot, then thought itself becomes the point of reference. Not the world, not objects, not space and time, rather **THE VERY PROCESS** of forming images. This means that thought is not merely a function, rather the fundamental reality of this level. Everything else is derivative. All objects, ideas, and forms are not independent entities, they are the results of the structuring of information within the system of perception.

Without thought, the world disappears not because it "ceases to exist," rather because it ceases to be assembled as reality. Yet it is important not to stop at this conclusion. For although thought is indubitable, it **IS NOT** primary in the absolute sense. It does not arise out of nothingness. It has a cause. It emerges as the result of a particular process.

If thought exists, then that which makes it possible must also exist. And here the next level of reasoning emerges. It does not matter whether this cause has always existed or came into being at some particular moment. What matters is something else: it is impossible to conceive of a state of absolute "nothingness." For the very act of thought, in attempting to conceive of "nothingness," already transforms it into "something." This means that "nothingness" **CANNOT** be the original category. It possesses no potential for coming into being. If there had ever been absolute absence, presence could never have arisen. Consequently, there has always been something. Not necessarily in a form that we are capable of imagining. Not necessarily in the categories of matter, energy, or space. Yet existence, as such, **CANNOT** have a beginning, because a beginning presupposes a transition from absence to

---

[2] **Parmenides of Elea** — a Greek philosopher of the pre-Socratic period from Elea in Magna Graecia.

presence, and such a transition is impossible without an already existing foundation. From this follows the next principle: existence does not come into being — **IT IS.** And if it is, then it has always been. And if it has always been, then it has no beginning. And if it has no beginning, then it can have no end. For an end is the symmetrical counterpart of a beginning. It is a transition into absence. However, if absence is impossible as an original state, then it is equally impossible as a final state. Here we arrive at a fundamental principle — we are not speaking of the "eternity of the world" in the ordinary sense, rather of the continuity of existence as a category that does not depend upon any particular forms. Worlds may arise and disappear. Forms may change. States may pass from one into another. Yet existence itself **DOES NOT CEASE.** It is precisely here that the transition to the next level of understanding takes place. For if existence is continuous, and thought is merely one of its particular manifestations, then it becomes necessary to understand how thought arises within that existence, what forms it assumes, and how a worldview is formed from it.

Everything that exists is in motion — and this is not merely an observation, rather a **FUNDAMENTAL PROPERTY** of existence. It is impossible to conceive of a state in which everything has come to a halt. Not merely slowed down, rather completely ceased all motion — at the level of particles, energy, processes, and thought. For in such a state there would exist no mechanism capable of initiating subsequent motion. Here we arrive at a key principle: motion does not come into being — it is continuous. If there had ever existed a state of absolute rest, it would have been impossible to emerge from it. Every change requires a cause, and a cause is already a form of motion. Consequently, motion **HAS NO** beginning. It has always existed. This means that motion is not a property of individual objects, rather an inseparable characteristic of existence, as such.

If we consider matter, this becomes especially evident. Matter is not a "substance," nor an "object," rather a process. It is the ordered motion of particles according to a definite algorithm. A stone exists not because "it is," rather because a strictly organized process of motion is taking place within it. If that motion were to cease, it would not be the form that disappears, rather **THE VERY FOUNDATION** of the object's existence. The stone would not crumble or be destroyed — it would simply cease to exist as a phenomenon. Just as an image disappears when power to a screen is cut off. Not because it has been "broken," rather because the process that forms it has ceased. This means that all forms of reality are processes, not things. Stability is merely the illusion of permanence amid continuous change. And here the next level of understanding emerges. If everything is in motion, **THEN EVERYTHING** is undergoing continuous change. There is not a single state that repeats itself exactly. Even when a form appears unchanged, its internal structure is different at every moment. The stone that exists now and the stone that existed a moment ago are not the same object. They are a sequence of states unified by perception as "one and the same." This is fundamentally important. Identity is not a property of the object, rather the result of the Brain's interpretation. And this points to the mechanism of simplification. The Brain smooths over change, forming stable images. It "binds together" a sequence of states into a single

object. Without this, a person **WOULD NOT BE ABLE** to orient themselves within reality. Yet in doing so, the Brain creates the illusion of permanence where none exists.

Motion gives rise to change, and change requires a category through which it can be recognized. That category is time. In this context, time is not an independent entity, nor an "axis" along which the world moves. Time is a **MEANS OF REGISTERING** change. It is the sequence of states perceived as a process.

Time does not exist independently of motion. It is derived from it. No motion — no change. No change — no time. Consequently, time is not the "background" of reality, rather a function of the perception of change. And here an even deeper conclusion emerges.

If motion is continuous and eternal, if forms are merely stable configurations of processes, and if time is a means of registering change, then the familiar conception of the world as a collection of objects existing in time is a **SIMPLIFIED MODEL.** In reality, we are dealing with a stream of states that the Brain structures into "things," "processes," and "time." And then the central question shifts. It is no longer, "What is matter?" or "What is time?" Rather, it becomes: How does the Brain, from continuous motion, form a coherent picture of the world? What limitations does the genotype impose upon this process? And why does a person perceive change as time rather than as something else? For it is precisely here that the foundation of a worldview is established.

We now arrive at the next level — an examination of how motion gives rise not only to time, but also to the very structure of the perception of reality. Let us carry out the proposed thought experiment, not as an abstraction, rather as an **INSTRUMENT FOR REVEALING** the construction of reality. Imagine that everything in existence has become frozen. Every form of motion has ceased — at every level. Particles, fields, processes, thoughts — everything. Such a state is equivalent not to "rest," rather to disappearance. For, as has already been shown, existence itself is motion. No motion — no manifested existence. Yet even if we momentarily accept this model as possible, the next consequence immediately follows. If motion ceases, change disappears. And if there is no change, time also disappears. For time is **NOT AN INDEPENDENT** entity, rather the registration of the transition from one state to another.

If motion is continuous and eternal, if it is impossible to admit a state of absolute rest, then time, as a function of motion, cannot have a beginning either. Eternal motion is eternal change. And eternal change is eternal time. Yet here a contradiction arises with modern physics, which maintains that time came into being at the moment the Universe was born. That before the so-called "Big Bang," time **DID NOT EXIST.** Why does this contradiction arise? The answer is quite straightforward — physics deals not with the category of time as such, rather with time as it exists within a particular system — our Universe.

When physicists speak of the beginning of time, they are referring not to time in general, rather to the parameter **DESCRIBING CHANGES** within a particular cosmological model. This concept of time is bound to space, to the metric of spacetime, and to the expansion of the Universe. Here Albert Einstein plays the central role, having united time and space through the concept of a single space-time

continuum. Within this model, time is not a universal category, rather a property of a particular geometry.

The ideas underlying this approach can be traced back to Nikolai Lobachevsky and William Kingdon Clifford, who regarded space as an active, deformable structure rather than as a passive "void." In their view, matter is not a "substance," rather a manifestation of geometry. Yet here it is necessary to draw a fundamental distinction. There is time as a parameter of a particular system (the time of the Universe). And there is time as a **UNIVERSAL CHARACTERISTIC** of existence (time as a consequence of motion itself). Physics works with the former, yet draws conclusions that extend to the latter. It is precisely here that the logical error arises. If something existed before our Universe (and this cannot be denied, because "nothing" cannot give rise to "something"), then motion also existed. And if motion existed, then change existed. And if change existed, then time also existed — as the **FORM OF REGISTERING** that change. Consequently, the statement that "before the Universe there was no time" is valid only in a narrow sense: there was no time in this Universe. Yet not time as such. This distinction is critically important, because the substitution of one concept for another leads to a distorted picture of reality. Instead of understanding the multi-layered structure of existence, a **SIMPLIFIED MODEL** is formed, in which everything begins "from zero." Yet here, "zero" is not reality, rather the boundary of the model's applicability. And this brings us to the next level of understanding. If time is **NOT A SINGLE** universal entity, rather a function of motion within particular systems, then different levels of time may exist — differing in scale, structure, and principle of organization. This leads us directly to the central question: how, within these different levels, is a person's perception of time formed? Why does the Brain register change in precisely the way that it does? And how do Brain genotypes determine the very form of the experience of time? For time is not merely a physical category. It is an **ELEMENT OF WORLDVIEW.** It is through time that a person structures reality, without realizing that this very instrument has already been predetermined.

To understand the idea of curved space, a simple analogy is often used — traveling along a road. As long as the road is straight, the journey from point "A" to point "B" takes a fixed amount of time. However, if the terrain changes — if a depression, a bend, or a slope appears — the very same distance requires more time to travel. Not because the traveler has changed, rather because the structure of the environment has changed. Physics extends this intuition to the level of space itself. In this approach, gravity is not a force in the conventional sense, rather a deformation of the very "fabric" of space. Objects, including light, do not "deviate" from their paths; rather, they move along a changed geometry. Their paths become curved because space itself **IS NO LONGER** straight. Here an important principle is established — space ceases to be a passive arena and becomes an active participant in the process. It does not merely "contain" events — it shapes their trajectories. From this arises the concept of **"SPACE–TIME,"** in which time is regarded as a property of geometry. Within this model, physics arrives at the following conclusion: if space did not exist before the Big Bang, then time, as one

of its properties, could not have existed either. Yet it is precisely here that a clear and fundamental distinction must be made.

Physics describes the time of a particular system — our Universe. This time is indeed bound to its geometry, its expansion, and its metric. In this sense, the statement that "time began together with space" is correct. However, this **DOES NOT MEAN** that time did not exist at all. It means only that the time of this particular configuration did not yet exist. The analogy with the birth of a person is especially apt. Before a person is born, their own personal time does not exist. Yet this does not mean that time as such did not exist. Rather, there was another time — one existing outside that individual's own system.

The same is true of the Universe. Before its emergence, its own space-time did not exist. Yet it does not follow from this that existence, motion, and change as such did not exist. Here a higher-order principle is established: time is not derived from space. **IT IS** derived from motion. Space may change its form, come into being, and disappear, yet if motion exists, then a sequence of states exists as well — and therefore, time exists too.

The relationship between time and space is a special case characteristic of a particular level of the organization of reality. And then the following becomes evident. If there had been "nothing" before our Universe, it could never have come into being. Consequently, **SOMETHING MUST HAVE "EXISTED"** before it. And that "something" could not have been static. It had to pass from one state to another. And a transition is already time. It does not matter what that "something" was: another form of existence, another Universe, or another level of organization. What matters is that **THERE WAS A PROCESS.** And where there is a process, there is motion. And where there is motion, there is time. This means that the birth of the Universe is not "the beginning of everything," **RATHER A TRANSITION** — from one state to another. Not creation out of nothing, rather transformation.

The cause existed before the effect. Yet that cause was not "outside of time." It existed within a **DIFFERENT CONFIGURATION** of time. Here a fundamental shift in understanding takes place. The Universe is not absolute reality, rather a local configuration within the continuous flow of existence. It has its own space, its own time, and its own laws. Yet it **DOES NOT EXHAUST** the whole of existence. Consequently, the thought formed within it cannot be universal either. From the standpoint of the development of Brain genotypes, this is especially important. The Brain registers time only as it is permitted within the framework of the current space-time configuration. It **DOES NOT PERCEIVE** "time in general." It perceives only a particular form of its manifestation. And then the central question shifts to an even deeper level. If time can exist in different levels and forms, and if space is merely one of its configurations, then by what means does the Brain determine which reality to accept as the "only" reality? It is precisely here that the transition begins toward understanding worldview as a filter rather than as a description. For a person does not live in reality as such. They live in the version of reality **PERMITTED BY** the Brain.

If we attempt to move beyond the conventional understanding of time, without restricting it exclusively to our Universe, it begins to reveal itself not as "a line moving forward," rather as something fundamentally different. Yet, it appears as a flow without beginning, directed not from the past toward the future, rather from infinity toward the point of actualization — toward what we call the present. In this sense, the present moment is not "a point on the timeline," rather a node of manifestation. A point of assembly. That very "point of support" upon which, like Baron Münchhausen, the whole of present reality is suspended. It is not the past that gives rise to the present; rather, the **CONTINUOUS FLOW** of existence manifests itself as the present. Here a fundamental triad is established: existence — motion — time. These are not three separate categories, rather three aspects of one and the same reality. They

cannot be separated, just as the angles cannot be separated from a triangle. Any attempt to consider them independently is already an operation of thought, and **THEREFORE, A SIMPLIFICATION.** And here we arrive at an even deeper level of understanding.

The attempt to describe reality through geometry — point, line, plane, and volume — is not merely a mathematical exercise. It is an **ATTEMPT TO APPROACH** an understanding of how "something" arises from "almost nothing." A point has no extension. It is not a magnitude. Yet neither is it zero. For no magnitude can arise from zeros, whereas a line arises from points. Consequently, a point is a unique state existing on the boundary between being and non-being. A line **HAS NO** width, yet an infinite multitude of lines gives rise to a plane. A plane has no height, yet an infinite multitude of planes gives rise to volume. Volume has no motion, yet an infinite multitude of volumes **GIVES RISE TO MOTION.** This means that each succeeding dimension arises not through the addition of "something," rather **AS THE EFFECT** of the organization of an infinite multitude of the preceding level. And here we arrive at a key point. Motion is not "a property of an object." It is the **EFFECT OF THE SEQUENCE** of states. In exactly the same way, motion in cinematography arises from a sequence of still frames. Each frame is static. Yet their sequence creates the illusion of motion.

A single "instance" of the Universe is a static volume. Within it, there is no motion. Motion arises only **AS THE TRANSITION** between such "frames." This explains why a person perceives the world as continuous. The Brain does not register the individual "frames." It stitches them together into a continuous flow. It does not perceive discreteness — it creates continuity. It is precisely here that the limitation arises.

A person lives within a four-dimensional configuration: length, width, volume, and motion. Everything that a person is capable of perceiving as "reality" must fit within this structure. Everything that lies beyond its limits can only be conceived, but **NOT PERCEIVED.** This means that the Brain genotype determines not only the range of sensations, but also the permissible dimensionality of reality. Therefore, one-dimensional, two-dimensional, and three-dimensional entities **DO NOT EXIST** in our world in their pure form. They exist only as abstractions. Reality begins where motion appears — that is, with the fourth dimension. However, here we encounter the next limit. If higher levels of organization are possible (five-dimensional, six-dimensional, and beyond), a person **IS NOT CAPABLE** of either perceiving them or representing them correctly. Any attempt to visualize them automatically "compresses" them into a four-dimensional model. This is not a limitation of imagination. It is a limitation of the construction itself. And this means that thought **CANNOT** go beyond the limits of its own dimensionality. It can operate only with those structures that correspond to its own organization. This is precisely why any discussion of a "fifth dimension" within our world is inevitably contradictory. If an object is truly five-dimensional, it cannot be fully represented within a four-dimensional system. If it can be represented, then it has already been reduced. A being of a lower dimensionality may be contained within a higher one. Yet the higher **CANNOT** be contained

within the lower. And here we arrive at the key conclusion of this entire construction. A person is not merely limited in knowledge. They are limited in the very capacity to perceive the levels of reality. Their world is not "everything that exists," rather only that layer which corresponds to the Brain genotype. It then becomes clear why every attempt to "go beyond" through thought alone is destined to fail. For one **CAN ONLY** go beyond through a change in the very construction of perception. It is precisely here that the only point at which transition is possible appears. Not through the accumulation of knowledge. Not through increasing the complexity of logic. Rather through changing the range of reality that can be admitted. This means a transition from one Brain genotype to another. And it is precisely to this that we now turn.

By the path of pure thought, it is indeed possible to follow the logic: the infinite multiplication of the preceding level of being gives rise to the next, and this process **HAS NO** limit. Yet here a fundamental limitation arises, one revealed by the very course of the reasoning itself — from conceptual understanding, one cannot pass to mental imagery. Thought can derive the construction, yet **CANNOT** see it. It reaches the boundary — and stops. This is the first direct encounter with the limit of the Brain genotype. The Brain is capable of logically admitting the existence of higher levels of being, yet **IS NOT CAPABLE** of visualizing or perceiving them. This is not a deficiency, rather a property of the construction itself. And then a natural question arises: if the maximum of being extends into infinite unfolding, what constitutes its minimum? Here the point appears. Yet not as a geometric object — rather, as a limiting state. A point is not "something very small." It is a boundary. A boundary between the structured and the unstructured, between that which can be perceived and that which lies beyond perception.

A point is a node of transition. It is that which connects being and non-being. It does not separate them — it **PRECISELY CONNECTS** them. For non-being, in the strict sense, cannot be "nothing." Absolute nothingness possesses no potential. It cannot give rise to being. Consequently, what we call "non-being" must possess another form of presence. This may be expressed as follows: non-being is not absence, rather a state beyond structuring. It is not "zero," rather a pre-form. Therefore, the term non-beingness is not merely a play on words, rather an attempt to designate a state to which the categories ***"is/is not"*** and ***"exists/does not exist"*** do not apply. And here the key transition takes place. If we move beyond the point, we arrive at **STRUCTURED INFORMATION.** Forms. Objects. Thought. Everything that can be distinguished, identified, and described.

If we move below the point, we arrive at information without form. At that which is undivided, unstructured, and unexpressed. Here the most difficult question in the entire construction arises — What is Information?

Modern science, despite all its sophistication, still does not provide an answer to this question. It describes carriers, channels, methods of transmission, and forms of encoding. Yet not the essence itself. For Information is not an object. It is not "something among other things." It is that from which everything else is formed. It is precisely for this reason that it cannot be represented separately. Water can exist outside a pipe. However, Information, apart from form, cannot be represented. For every image is **ALREADY STRUCTURED** Information. This is the same limitation of which Aurelius Augustine spoke with regard to time: as long as no one asks, it seems to be understood — yet the moment one attempts to define it, it slips away.

If all differences between objects are ultimately reduced to differences in the arrangement of particles, then difference itself is Information. It is not matter that distinguishes one object from another, rather structure. If that structure is destroyed, the differences disappear. Objects become

increasingly alike. This means that the amount of Information decreases. This is fundamental: matter is **NOT THE PRIMARY FOUNDATION.** It is a form of the organization of Information. And then the next step follows logically. If we continue the process of "compression" by destroying structure, then, in the limit, matter itself disappears as a process of motion. For matter is motion according to an algorithm. No algorithm — no motion. No motion — no matter. However, Information cannot disappear. It can only change the form of its presence. And here we arrive at the central assertion of the entire construction: Information neither disappears nor comes into being. It passes from one state to another.

When information is structured, we have being. When information is unstructured, we have what is perceived as non-being. This is the deepest level: existence is structured information, while non-being is information beyond structure. It then becomes clear why this "pure information" **CANNOT BE** known. For knowledge is always concerned with form. And here there is no form. It is not thought — it is that by which thought is thought. Not will — rather that by which will is willed. Not life — rather that by which life is lived.

From the standpoint of the development of Brain genotypes, this means that this level is **FUNDAMENTALLY INACCESSIBLE** within the framework of the current construction of perception. It cannot be "seen" or "understood." It can only be designated logically as the limit. It is here that the most important transition in the entire article takes place.

If everything that exists is a manifestation of information, if matter, energy, space, and time are merely forms of its organization, and if even thought is structured information, then worldview is not a view of the world. It is a **MEANS OF STRUCTURING** information into an admissible picture of reality. It is precisely from here that we arrive at the next step. For if information can exist in different states, and if the forms of its organization depend upon the construction of the Brain, then different Brain genotypes give rise to different levels of reality. And this is no longer philosophy. It is a mechanism.

Experiments conducted with particle accelerators produce a result that appears absurd from the standpoint of classical thinking: when two particles collide, the total energy of the reaction produced turns out to be greater than the initial energy. From the perspective of ordinary logic, this is impossible — the greater cannot arise from the lesser. Yet only within the framework of the logic formed by our range of perception. This is not an anomaly. It is a

signal that we are dealing not with "substance," rather with the manifestation of a **DEEPER** structure — an informational one. And here an analogy with a computer game becomes appropriate.

Let us imagine a world in which the smallest unit is a "brick." Bricks are assembled into blocks, blocks into buildings, then into cities, and ultimately into entire worlds. Any structure can be dismantled, reducing it back to its basic elements. However, beyond that lies the limit. A brick cannot be divided. Not because there is "nothing" with which to divide it, rather because the program contains no concept of "part of a brick." To destroy a brick, it is necessary to change not the object itself, rather the code that defines it. This is fundamental: the limit of divisibility is determined not by "materiality," rather by the

algorithm. And then it becomes clear what we call the laws of physics. They are not "properties of matter." They are **THE RULES** by which information is structured into admissible forms. A system of permissions and prohibitions. An algorithm. Why does one body attract another? Why is the speed of light the ultimate limit? Why does heat flow from the hotter body to the colder one? Because the configuration of the system is defined in that way. Not because "that is how it is," rather because that is how it is organized. This means that the world given to us through our senses is not primary reality. It is a visualization of the algorithm. And then the familiar categories begin to lose their fundamental character. Matter is not the foundation. Energy is not a substance. Space is not a container. They are all **FORMS OF REPRESENTATION.**

If we continue the analogy, a stone in a computer game does not possess "real mass." Its "weight" is determined by the parameters of the program. The same is true in our world. Physical characteristics are not absolute properties, rather values within a system. It then becomes clear why, at the deepest level, all objects differ only in their structure — in information. Space is not "emptiness in which something exists." It is the **DOMAIN OF OPERATION** of the algorithm. The field within which its rules are realized. If the rules are removed, not only does order disappear — the very possibility of existence disappears with it. Imagine a region where no laws operate. What would happen to an object that entered it? Intuitively, it seems that nothing would happen. But this is a mistake. Every object is a process. It is the motion of particles according to an algorithm. Remove the algorithm — and motion disappears. Remove motion — and the object disappears. It does not break apart or disintegrate — it disappears. Not into chaos, rather beyond form. This means that a law **DOES NOT REGULATE** existence — it creates it. No law — no structure. No structure — no form. No form — no perceptible being. It then becomes evident that space is not "where," rather "how." It is the means by which motion is organized. Remove the "how," and the "where" disappears as well. And here we arrive at the radical conclusion of the entire construction.

What we call the world is not a collection of objects. It is the result of the operation of a program. An algorithm that forms stable configurations out of information. From the standpoint of the development of Brain genotypes, this takes on an even more rigorous meaning. A person perceives not "the world as it is," rather the interface of that program. The version of reality that is permitted by the construction of their perception. And then **IT BECOMES CLEAR** why the ancient philosophies spoke of the illusory nature of the world. Not in the sense that "it does not exist," rather in the sense that it is not what it appears to be.

Today, in the age of digital technologies, this idea becomes especially vivid. We can imagine a screen on which millions of pixels, lighting up and going dark according to an algorithm, create an image. If we extend this model to a higher level, the Universe may be understood as a multidimensional "screen," in which the role of the pixels is played by fundamental elements — strings, fields, and quanta. Their oscillations and transitions create that very "cinematic effect" which we perceive as reality. However, that is not the essential point. What matters is something else. If the world is a visualization of an algorithm, if laws are the code, and if forms are the representation of information, then the central question changes. It is no longer, "What is the world made of?" Rather, it becomes: Who or what determines the algorithm? How are the rules

formed? And by what means does the Brain become synchronized with this program? For it is at this point that reality, perception, and governance converge. It is here that the next level begins — an examination not of the world itself, rather of the mechanism by which it is assembled.

In summarizing what has been said, it is important to establish the central point: all of our familiar foundations — matter, space, time, and even causality — prove to be not fundamental, rather derivative. They **DO NOT EXIST** in and of themselves. They arise as forms of the organization of information, as the result of the operation of an algorithm that we perceive as the "laws of the world." Religion explained this through the will of God. Science explained it through the properties of matter and space. Atheism explained it through the self-sufficiency of the world. Yet, as we have seen, **NONE** of these models **REACHES** the foundation. It is now becoming evident that the world is not an object — the world is a process. The world is structured information manifested in an admissible form. And then the greatest misconception disappears — the notion that a person "lives in the world." In reality, a person lives within a construction assembled by the Brain from the stream of information. A person **DOES NOT SEE** reality — they see the result of its interpretation. Here the most important shift in the entire article takes place. If reality is not something given, rather something assembled; if laws are not "objective truths," rather the rules of an algorithm; and if space and time are forms of representation, then worldview is not a view of the world. **IT IS A FILTER** through which the world itself becomes possible. It is worldview that determines what is to be regarded as existing, what is to be regarded as possible, and what is to be regarded as true.

However, worldview does not arise by itself. Nor is it formed by upbringing or education in the fullest sense of those words. Its roots lie deeper — in the construction of the Brain, in its genotype. And this means that the difference between people is not merely a difference of opinions. It is a **DIFFERENCE OF REALITIES.** Some live in a world where matter is primary. Others — where energy is primary. Still others — where information is primary. And each of them will be correct — within the limits of their own range of perception.

It is precisely for this reason that it is impossible to convince a person beyond the limits of their worldview. Not because they "do not want to understand," rather because they **CANNOT** perceive what lies outside the permissible range of their Brain. It then becomes clear why every attempt to explain the world through a single universal model fails. For the problem does not lie in the model. The problem lies in the observer. In the observer's construction. In the observer's limits. And if this is so, then the central question is no longer, ***"What is the world?"*** It sounds entirely different: ***"Who, and by what means, forms the reality in which a person lives?"***

In the next article, we will examine worldview not as a philosophical category, rather as a construction shaped by Brain genotypes. We will see how the very structure of perception changes in the transition from one genotype to another, and why, with that transition, not only does one's understanding of the world change — the very world in which a person lives changes as well. For the boundaries of reality do not lie outside. They lie within.

To be continued...

F. Shkrudnev
30 June 2026