

Salvation of the Saviors (series 115-369)

Project 369 – Non-Articles: Beyond the Text: The Birth of Faith as a Mechanism of Control...

*Faith does not arise where truth exists.
It arises where thinking is prepared
to accept it. And if one understands
how it is formed — it becomes visible
who is in control.*

In the previous article, we came to the understanding that religion cannot be viewed merely as a system of beliefs or a set of dogmas. We saw that behind the external forms — texts, rituals, conflicts, and divisions — stands a deeper process. A process of forming controlled perception, within which a person does not simply believe, rather learns to perceive reality in a particular way. At that point, an important observation was established: the differences between groups arise not so much from the content of the texts, rather **BECAUSE OF DIFFERENCES** in the mode of thinking itself. And it is precisely this difference that becomes decisive.

Now we take the next step. If previously we examined how the structure of faith is formed and how it becomes fixed within society, then now it is necessary to understand what this structure rests upon. Because any system functions only when **IT CORRESPONDS** to its bearer. We will speak about brain genotypes. About those levels of perception that determine whether a person is capable of simply accepting, interpreting, or striving toward understanding. And about the way in which mechanisms of governance are constructed precisely around these levels. And if this is expressed in the briefest possible form, a connection emerges that will run throughout the entire discussion to follow: **brain genotypes → faith → governance**. Because faith is **NOT A RANDOM** phenomenon. It is the result of an exact correspondence between the system and the mode of thinking. And if this correspondence is understood, it becomes possible to see how faith itself was born — not as revelation, rather as a mechanism.

In governing human actions, the System had to **ENSURE THE STABILITY** of perception — a stability in which incoming governing information would not be distorted by private opinions or fragmented into arbitrary interpretations. What became essential was not simply the reception of information, rather its precise comprehension — sufficient for making decisions corresponding to the current stage of development. The issue was the formation of a unified understanding of the world. The creation of such a model of perception within which a person interprets surrounding reality and their place within it without critical deviations. It was precisely the accumulation and reinforcement of this process that manifested itself as **SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS** — the instrument through which the organized existence of people was structured. This existence was not accidental. It corresponded to a specific stage of development, a specific territory, and a specific society. And without such a structure, no realization of programmed processes involving people would have been possible. However, here a key point arises. The stability of this system **DIRECTLY DEPENDS** on the correspondence between the

transmitted information and the ability to perceive it. In other words — on the level of development of brain genotypes. As long as this correspondence is maintained, the system functions as a unified whole. However, as soon as carriers of a different type of thinking appear, tension emerges.

It is precisely at this moment that a figure appears in Israel who begins to disrupt this balance. **JESUS APPEARS**, the son of a carpenter. Actions are attributed to him that go beyond ordinary understanding: healings, miracles, manifestations that have no explanation within existing models. This



sharply distinguishes him from other people proclaiming themselves prophets. A circle of followers rapidly forms around him. A new group begins to take shape, **POTENTIALLY CAPABLE** of altering the balance of power among the already existing groups — the Sadducees, Pharisees, and Essenes. By several signs, his preaching is close to the Essene line: rejection of authority, emphasis on the afterlife, and a call to purification. Yet at the same time, his behavior goes beyond their concepts of purity. He deliberately crosses their boundaries, entering their environment accompanied by people they regarded as unacceptable. To direct questions, he responds in an **EXTREMELY REVEALING** manner: “It is not the healthy who need a physician, rather the sick,” “I was sent to the lost sheep,” “I came not to call the righteous, rather sinners.”

These responses mark an important shift. The issue is no longer the preservation of the system, rather engagement with those who do not fit within it. Many details indicate that he did not seek to integrate himself into any of the existing groups — neither the priestly structure, nor the Pharisaic, nor the Essene. His line was different. In effect, what was taking place was the formation of a new group — within the same tradition, yet based on a different principle. Not a new religion, rather a **NEW TEACHING** designed for a different type of perception. And if this is viewed in the context of brain genotypes, it becomes visible that an attempt is emerging to work with another level of thinking — not one that merely fixes or interprets, rather one capable of moving beyond predetermined boundaries.

Jesus does not reject the foundations of the system. He recognizes the Temple, the tithe, and the Law, preserving an orientation toward tradition. Yet at the same time, he introduces principles that begin to alter the very logic of perception itself. The Law says: “an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth” — the principle of direct correspondence between action and recompense. Christ, however, formulates a **DIFFERENT MODEL**: “do not resist evil,” “turn the other cheek,” “whoever exalts himself will be humbled.” This is no longer a symmetrical response, rather a break from the habitual pattern of reaction. Yet at the same time, contradictions are present in his words and actions that usually go unnoticed. He teaches one thing, yet in a concrete situation acts differently. When he is struck, he does not literally follow his own call, rather enters into dialogue: “If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if well, why do you strike me?” From the standpoint of formal logic, this is inconsistency. However, from the standpoint of influence, it is **NOT AN ERROR**, rather a shift of emphasis. The issue is no longer adherence to a rule, rather the transfer of attention to the level of meaning itself. Overall, however, his statements evoke a powerful response. This response is intensified by the actions attributed to him that go beyond ordinary understanding. Around him, a growing circle of followers

begins to form. Interest increases rapidly, and the new group begins to acquire real influence. At the same time, in the early stage, his activity is directed strictly inward, within the existing system. He explicitly limits the spread of the teaching: go not to the “outsiders,” rather to one’s own people. This indicates that the issue is not expansion, rather restructuring from within.

At the same time, strict demands are introduced for followers. The breaking of previous ties **BECOMES A CONDITION** for inclusion within the new structure. The rejection of habitual relationships and family attachments — all of this forms a closed environment within which a new model of perception becomes entrenched. A characteristic example is the rejection of the priority of kinship ties in favor of the group. In this way, a new point of identification is established: not origin, rather belonging to the teaching. Even in relations with “outsiders,” a clear boundary can be seen. Assistance is offered not according to a universal principle, rather on the condition that a certain status is acknowledged. This fixes hierarchy and strengthens the internal cohesion of the group.

If all of this is considered from a systems perspective, it becomes clear that a structure is being formed that requires a **COMPLETE RECONFIGURATION** of perception. A person must not simply accept new ideas — they must change the very way they relate to reality itself. And it is precisely this that provokes a reaction from the existing powers.

The Sadducees perceive him as a source of instability. Any stirring of the masses threatens their relationship with Rome, and therefore their own position. The Pharisees see in him as a direct competitor, drawing people toward himself and forming an alternative line. At the same time, his statements about distancing himself from politics are perceived by them as a cover. Because the very dynamics of what is taking place point to something else: a **NEW GROUP** is being formed, capable of changing the balance within the system.

If this is translated into the “language” of brain genotypes, it becomes obvious that we are dealing with a clash of different levels of perception. Some are oriented toward preserving the structure. Others toward interpreting it. And here appears a line demanding the inner transformation of the bearer himself. And that is precisely why the reaction of the system becomes inevitable.

The closest followers of Christ also perceive what is happening through the model familiar to them — as a movement toward power. The apostles James and John, through their mother, ask for places at his right and left hand in his “Kingdom.” In essence, they are asking for the highest positions within the future structure. Christ’s response is revealing: “You do not know what you ask.” This marks an **IMPORTANT BREAK** between the expectations of the followers and the direction he is setting. Their thinking remains within the logic of power and hierarchy. His line is different, and not fully understood by them.

If one looks at the behavior of the different groups, the reactions are distributed in a predictable way. The Essenes effectively ignore Christ despite the fact that he draws away some of the people. He responds to them in the same manner — in the texts there is no direct appeal to them. It is as though the two lines exist in parallel, **WITHOUT INTERSECTING**. This points to the absence of direct conflict, but also to the absence of coincidence in level. The Sadducees react harshly. They see in him a threat to stability. Any movement of the masses could lead to a worsening of relations with Rome and therefore place their own position at risk. In response, Christ acts cautiously, limiting himself to a warning: “beware the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.” Direct confrontation here is minimized.

The Pharisees, by contrast, receive a harsh response. It is precisely with them that an **OPEN CONFLICT** arises. Christ uses sharp formulations, accusing them of hypocrisy, closed-mindedness, and replacing meaning with form. This is no longer hidden opposition, rather a direct clash. If this is viewed

from a systems perspective, it becomes clear: with the Sadducees — conflict at the level of governance; with the Pharisees — at the level of interpretation; with the Essenes — an absence of interaction due to differences in direction. At the same time, Christ himself demonstrates remarkable effectiveness. His words evoke a response, and his actions evoke astonishment. People see in him not merely a teacher, rather the bearer of another force that goes beyond ordinary understanding. And it is precisely this that makes him dangerous to the system.



When his influence reaches a certain level, the reaction becomes inevitable. The chief priests and the Pharisees gather and formulate the problem in extremely pragmatic terms: if the process **IS NOT STOPPED**, control will be lost. The statement that follows — “it is better that one man dies than that the whole people perish” — reflects the logic of a governing system: the preservation of the structure is more important than the fate of an individual element. From that moment, the decision to eliminate him is made.

Christ is presented to Rome as a source of unrest. Within the framework of the Empire, this is sufficient grounds for execution. Crucifixion was the most demonstrative form of punishment, aimed not only at destruction, but also at public display. However, then something occurs that goes beyond ordinary logic. From the standpoint of governance, the situation **WAS SIMPLE**. If, after the execution, the body had been displayed, it would have destroyed the foundation of the movement. Christ himself had repeatedly linked his mission with resurrection on the third day. The absence of such an event would have meant the failure of his claims and the collapse of the group. Yet the body was not presented. Moreover, the opposite is recorded. The disciples, who had been in a state of despair, abruptly change their condition. They claim to have seen him after death. And not merely claim it — they are prepared to follow this conviction to the end, including suffering and death. From the standpoint of ordinary perception, this appears as a chain of inexplicable events. However, if what is taking place is viewed through the prism of systemic processes, something else becomes visible. **A TRANSITION OCCURS**. From external support — to internal support. From following — to conviction. It is precisely at this moment that a new quality of the group is formed. Not merely a union gathered around a personality, rather a structure capable of existing without him. If this is connected with the line of brain genotypes, it becomes obvious that a new level of perception is being consolidated — one in which external proof ceases to be decisive, and inner acceptance becomes the driving force.

One may assume that the disciples somehow stole the body and proclaimed the resurrection. However, a fundamental problem then arises: it becomes impossible to explain their willingness to endure suffering and death for what they knowingly understood to be a deception. People can send others to die for a lie — this is a well-known mechanism. However, to willingly go to one’s own death while knowing you are lying is practically impossible. The only explanation for their condition is that they

were convinced they had seen him alive. After death, he appeared to them. And it was **PRECISELY THIS** that became the source of the impulse which not only failed to fade, it began to spread.

If one examines what happened with maximum strictness, two possibilities remain. **The first** is resurrection as a real event: death followed by a return to life and appearances before the disciples. This explains the strength of the subsequent movement and its endurance over time. **The second** is a complex staging carried out at the level of authority. Indirect details point in this direction. According to the texts, Pilate did not seek Christ's execution and looked for a way to release him. One possible scenario is that he entered into an agreement with part of the elite and organized a substitution.

The situation surrounding the transfer of the body appears ambiguous. Pilate is surprised by the speed of the death, clarifies the details, and hands the body over to a man loyal to Christ. If this is



viewed as a managed operation, the **POSSIBILITY OF A SUBSTITUTION** cannot be excluded. The body is identified, yet the very fact of identification is not absolute proof. Additional peculiarities deepen the uncertainty. The resurrected Christ is not immediately recognized, even by his closest disciples. This may be explained either by a change in appearance or by peculiarities of perception. In any case, the fact remains: identification does not occur instantly. At the same time, he **DOES NOT APPEAR** as something immaterial. On the contrary, physicality is emphasized: “touch Me,” “a spirit does not have flesh and bones.” This rules out a simple explanation in terms of a vision or illusion.

Secondary versions also emerge — including assumptions about a continued earthly life afterward. They are unconfirmed, yet the very fact of their existence points to the absence of a completely unambiguous picture. However, within the context of the question we are examining, what matters is not

which version is correct. What matters is something else. Regardless of the factual side, the same process occurs: a stable conviction is formed within a group of people, a conviction that becomes stronger than the fear of death. And it is **PRECISELY THIS** that is the key point.

From the standpoint of systemic governance, this signifies a transition to another level of information fixation. If previously the foundation was an external structure — Law, ritual, authority — here an internal fixation emerges. A conviction that no longer requires constant external confirmation. If this is viewed through the lens of brain genotypes, it becomes visible that a **LEVEL IS ACTIVATED** in which perception no longer relies on the verification of facts in the direct sense, rather becomes fixed through inner experience as an absolute reality. It is precisely this type of fixation that proves to be the most stable. Because it does not depend on external conditions. And it is not destroyed when those conditions change.

The strongest argument in favor of the staging hypothesis appears to be the **SHARP CHANGE** in the direction of the appeals. Before the execution, Christ consistently limits his mission to the framework of Israel, emphasizing that he was sent “to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.” After the events connected with the resurrection, the vector changes radically: “go and teach all nations,” “go

into all the world.” Such a transition from a closed national model to a universal one points to the possible intervention of another level. This gives rise to the assumption that there existed a force interested in creating a teaching capable of moving beyond the limits of a single culture and becoming the foundation for a broader system. In this context, the initial emphasis on “one’s own people” appears as a **STAGE IN THE FORMATION** of a core. Without this, it would have been impossible to gather a stable group. However, after a certain level of influence was achieved, the vector shifts — from inward to outward.

If this is viewed as a managed process, such a transformation appears logical. First, a group with a high degree of internal cohesion is created. Then a direction of expansion is assigned to it. The staging hypothesis also explains a number of other points: the absence of the body despite the opponents’ interest in displaying it, the sudden change in the state of the disciples, and their readiness to follow the new impulse to the very end. However, something else is fundamentally important. The question of whether this was a real event or a managed operation remains open. And within the framework of this examination, it **IS NOT** the determining factor. Because regardless of the answer, the result turns out to be the same.

A new system is formed — a system in which faith becomes the central element. At the same time, faith itself receives its ultimate justification: “if Christ has not risen, your faith is in vain.” In other words, the entire structure becomes centered upon **ONE KEY** event. From the standpoint of governance, this means the creation of an extremely rigid foundation — one not subject to verification in the ordinary sense, yet determining everything else. Then another mechanism comes into play. Any group built upon a leader-centered principle, after losing its leader, either disintegrates or transforms itself. In order to survive, it requires a method of transferring the center. In monarchy this is resolved through succession; in other systems, through institutionalization. In the case under examination, this is precisely what occurs. The center is transferred from the personality to the idea, from the living leader to the teaching, from direct presence to a fixed model of perception. If this is translated into the language of brain genotypes, it becomes visible that a type of thinking is being reinforced in which the absence of the direct bearer **DOES NOT DESTROY** the system. More than that — it strengthens it, because now the foundation is located not outside, rather within.

When Alexander the Great lay dying, those around him were already dividing his inheritance. The generals argued not only over power, but over the right to it, justifying their claims by the degree of their closeness to Alexander himself. The issue was not facts, it was interpretation: whoever was “more truly his” possessed the right to continuation.

After the execution of Christ, a similar situation arises. His closest followers begin struggling not for territory, rather for meaning. Who is closer to the teacher, who transmits his teaching more accurately, who is the “true” bearer — these questions **BECOME CENTRAL**. The apostles enter into direct contradictions with one another. John points to those who “call themselves Jews, but are not.” Paul, emphasizing his own background, disputes with Peter over the right to define what constitutes true following. The conflict shifts from the external level to the internal one — to the level of defining truth itself. At the same time, the number of followers grows rapidly. The reason is obvious: a figure associated with resurrection acquires a fundamentally different status. Authority ceases to be merely human and moves beyond the boundaries of ordinary perception. This creates a powerful influx of people. Yet together with growth, another problem emerges. The group ceases to be unified. The disappearance of the center leads to fragmentation **INTO MANY** autonomous directions. Each of them claims a monopoly on understanding, asserting its own version as the only true one.

The situation becomes even more complicated because Christ himself left no fixed text behind. He did not establish his teaching in a form excluding interpretation. The only mention of writing is a symbolic act that leaves no content. This means that the entire subsequent structure is built upon transmission, interpretation, and reworking. A process of divergence begins. What for some is truth becomes error for others. No single unified line exists. Moreover, a significant portion of the followers **DOES NOT PERCEIVE** the writings of the apostles as absolute truth. They proceed from the understanding that Christ himself did not establish them in such a role. For them, these writings are testimonies, not the final foundation. And the apostles themselves initially did not regard their texts as something complete and infallible. Their letters are private communications, reflections of a current understanding, rather than a fixed and finalized system.



If what is happening is viewed within the framework of systemic governance, it becomes clear that after the disappearance of the center, the system enters a phase of instability. The information exists, yet there is **NO SINGLE** mechanism for fixing and preserving it. It is precisely at this moment that the need for a new level of organization arises. If this is translated into the language of brain genotypes, the picture becomes even clearer. Different groups begin to form around different modes of perception: some strive to fix and preserve, others to interpret and adapt, and still others to reproduce without penetrating the foundation itself. And it is precisely this diversity that, on the one hand, destroys the original unity, while on the other creates the conditions for the emergence of a new, **MORE COMPLEX** system.

Different attitudes toward the writings of the apostles lead to a split within the emerging Christian community. Some perceive them as ordinary correspondence reflecting a private understanding. Thus, Papias of Hierapolis directly states that the apostles wrote in the same way people write letters to one another. From his point of view, the later elevation of these texts is the result of interpretations, translations, and accumulated layers in which the human gradually begins to be presented as absolute. Others, by contrast, grant these writings the status of a **DIVINELY INSPIRED SOURCE**. Augustine effectively places them on the same level of significance as the Law, raising them to the level of foundation itself. At this stage he does not yet place them above it; however, the tendency has already been established — a gradual shift of the center is taking place. Here a key difficulty arises. Christ himself does not provide an unambiguous position regarding the Law. On the one hand, he affirms its immutability: “I came not to abolish, rather to fulfill.” On the other hand, he introduces principles that effectively alter the very mode through which the Law operates.

The principle of “an eye for an eye” is replaced by the refusal of retaliatory action. The principle of dividing people into “one’s own” and “enemies” is replaced by a call to a universal attitude. This creates an internal contradiction. Fulfillment and transformation become combined within a single system. It is **PRECISELY THIS** contradiction that becomes the point of divergence. Each group interprets

it in its own way, fixing its version as the only true one. As a result, a multitude of directions emerges, each claiming a monopoly on truth.

At the same time, the rhetoric remains the same. Opponents are declared mistaken, distorters of the teaching, or deviators from the foundation. The forms of confrontation reproduce an already familiar structure: just as earlier between the Sadducees, Pharisees, and Essenes, so now between the **NEW GROUPS**. However, the scale of the difference becomes much greater. Whereas in Judaism there had been several stable lines, here the number of directions increases sharply. The system begins to fragment.

If what is taking place is viewed within the framework of systemic governance, it becomes obvious that the absence of a single center and a unified mechanism for fixing information inevitably leads to a multiplicity of interpretations. And if this is translated to the level of brain genotypes, the picture becomes even clearer. Different groups form around different modes of perception: some strive to preserve and fix, others to reinterpret and supplement, and still others to accept without analysis. It is **PRECISELY THIS** difference in modes of thinking that becomes the source of divergence. It is not the texts themselves that divide people; what divides them is the way those texts are perceived. And this is precisely the foundation of the system's further development. The Church asserts that opposing



Christian groups conducted their disputes without malice, in a brotherly spirit. Perhaps so. However, then it must also be acknowledged that they reached physical violence with the same “humility” — sometimes with consequences extending to death. Because it is precisely in the sphere of convictions that conflicts acquire their greatest intensity. The approach of one of the greatest authorities, John Chrysostom, is revealing. He directly permits the **USE OF FORCE** in defense of faith: if a person blasphemes God, he should be stopped, even to the point of being struck. Thus, the defense of truth begins to justify physical coercion.

Later, this logic would be developed into institutional forms — up to and including the Inquisition. But at this stage, Christianity still does not represent a unified structure. It is a collection of fragmented communities united only by a common orientation toward the figure of Christ.

After his death, such groups begin to arise throughout the Roman Empire. They constantly conflict among themselves, having neither a single center nor a common line. They are united by only two features: recognition of the authority of Christ and the absence of rigid attachment to bloodline or origin. In everything else — complete divergence. The number of opinions corresponds to the number of groups. For a long time, Roman authority **DOES NOT ATTACH** significant importance to this. The Empire constructs a different model: religious neutrality on the condition of political loyalty. A common space is created for all cults — the Pantheon — where each tradition occupies its own place. From the

standpoint of governance, this is sufficient. Faith remains a private matter as long as it does not affect the stability of the system. The requirement is simple: pay taxes and do not disturb public order.

Rome **DOES NOT** concern itself with the search for truth. Its task is the preservation of the structure. Resources are directed toward military, political, and economic power. Religious differences at this stage are not regarded as a factor of governance. If this is viewed in the context of the development of brain genotypes, it becomes clear that different forms of faith coexist because they correspond to different types of perception. And as long as they are not united into a single system, they **DO NOT REPRESENT** a threat. That is precisely why, in the initial stage, the Empire remains neutral. Because fragmented forms of thinking do not create a unified force.

The objective of any authority is not the pursuit of truth — especially religious truth — rather the preservation and strengthening of its own stability. Within this logic, good and evil are defined in extremely simple terms: everything that strengthens the system is considered good; everything that weakens it is considered evil. Since the situation itself changes, these evaluations change as well. In such a context, values become **NOT ABSOLUTES**, rather instruments. They follow the form of the structure itself. When the structure changes, the understanding of what is permissible changes with it. Just as in a living organism: when the nature changes, the reactions change also. The characterization given by Edward Gibbon¹ precisely captures this position: for the people, all cults were true; for philosophers, doubtful; for the authorities, useful. This is the essence of the governing approach. Against this background, one fact **STANDS OUT** in particular. The only religion subjected to systematic persecution becomes Christianity. To understand the reason, it is necessary to move beyond surface-level explanations.

An appeal to religious interpretation does not provide an answer here. The interested side will inevitably explain what is happening through the opposition of “truth” and “falsehood.” However, the facts contradict this. If the issue truly lay in the content of the faith itself, then pressure would also have extended to other forms connected with the same source. Yet this **DID NOT HAPPEN**. Attempts to explain events through isolated circumstances — the character of emperors, accidental conflicts — do not provide a complete picture. They describe episodes, yet fail to reveal the underlying pattern. The issue becomes blurred, replaced by emotion, and ultimately remains without an answer.

If secondary versions are set aside, three directions remain: ideological, economic, and political. The ideological explanation can be excluded immediately. Rome **DID NOT BUILD** its policy upon philosophical or theological foundations. It did not expend resources fighting ideas as such. Everyday explanations also fail under analysis. The scale and duration of the process exclude any accidental character. The economic factor does not explain the three-hundred-year persistence of the conflict. Contradictions of that kind are either resolved more quickly or transformed into something else. What remains is politics. And it is precisely politics that provides the key to understanding. The issue lies not in the content of faith, rather in the incompatibility of two systems. The Roman model of governance and the emerging Christian structure prove to be **FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT**. And if this is viewed through the prism of the development of brain genotypes, it becomes clear why.

The Roman system was built upon predictability, hierarchy, and external control. Emerging

¹ Edward Gibbon was an English historian and rationalist scholar, best known as the author of *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776-1788), a continuous narrative covering the period from the 2nd century CE to the fall of the Empire...

Christianity began to reinforce a different type of perception — internally motivated, not directly dependent upon external authority. And it is precisely this that created the threat. Because a system in which a person acts not only according to external prescription **CEASES TO BE** fully governable by habitual means. The duration of the persecutions indicates that this was not a temporary conflict, rather a deep incompatibility — an incompatibility between two models of governance.

If we summarize everything that has been examined, it becomes obvious that what stands before us is not merely the history of religion nor a collection of disconnected facts. What stands before us is a process — a process of forming a system through which the governance of people, their thinking, and their perception of reality was constructed. What on the surface appears as a struggle of teachings, disputes over dogmas, and differences in interpretation, on a deeper level reveals itself as the manifestation of a far more complex mechanism. A mechanism in which religion functions not only as faith, rather also **AS AN INSTRUMENT** for shaping public consciousness. Through texts, rituals, interpretations, conflicts, and divisions, certain models of thinking were reinforced — models corresponding to the level of development of brain genotypes at each stage. And it was precisely this correspondence that determined either the stability or, conversely, the destruction of a particular structure.

We have seen how, after the disappearance of the center, fragmentation begins. How from a single impulse a multitude of directions emerges. How the absence of a fixed foundation leads to a struggle for the right to define truth. And how, in this process, a new system gradually forms — one **NO LONGER DEPENDENT** upon a personality, rather fixed at the level of perception itself. However, the most important thing is something else. It becomes clear that this is not about the past. It is a mechanism that continues to operate — including within the realities of the present day. It changes forms, adapts, becomes more complex, yet its essence remains the same: **TO FORM THE BOUNDARIES** of thinking and through them govern actions. And if this is so, then the next step becomes inevitable. Not merely to examine separate historical episodes, rather to attempt to see the very logic of development itself: how these mechanisms changed, how levels of perception were restructured, and in what way, through all of this, the development of brain genotypes occurred. It is precisely to this that we will turn next. Because **UNDERSTANDING THE MECHANISM** is only the beginning. The real question is something else: what happens when this mechanism ceases to function as it once did. And the answer to that question no longer lies in history. It is being formed here and now. More about this — in the following articles.

To be continued...

F. Shkrudnev
30 April 2026