

# Salvation of the Saviors (series 139-369) Project 369 – Protocols of Reality: The Birth of the Main Democrat...

*The chief democrat is born not when  
the people gain the right to choose.  
He is born when  
the system itself makes choice  
its primary mode of existence,  
and what becomes permanent  
is no longer the power of a person,  
rather the power of the structure created.*

In the previous article, we traced how revolutions gradually ceased to be spontaneous social upheavals and began turning into an instrument for the profound restructuring of states. How the destruction of the old order, in itself, was never the ultimate goal. Every revolution, however just or unjust it may have seemed to its contemporaries, merely cleared the way for a **NEW GOVERNING STRUCTURE**. Yet destroying the old system is considerably easier than creating a new one. If we look closely at the history of recent centuries, it becomes clear that **AFTER EVERY** major revolution, a far more complex process began — the construction of a fundamentally different political architecture. It is precisely this stage that most often goes unnoticed. His(s)tory recounts battles, uprisings, declarations, and heroes in detail, yet almost never explains how, in the aftermath of chaos, a stable system emerges that can endure for decades and even centuries. This follows a predictable pattern. Every stable system of governance passes through several successive stages of development. **FIRST, THERE TAKES SHAPE** a new information environment. Then society's collective consciousness changes. After that, the institutions of power are restructured. And only **AT THE VERY END** does a new state structure emerge, which people begin to perceive as the only possible and natural form of social organization.

We have already seen how the financial mechanisms of the new era were created, how the invisible contours of governance took shape, how the architecture of power was constructed, and why revolutions became an instrument for transforming the political landscape. Now we face the next, far more important question: how can disparate ideas and revolutionary transformations be turned into a new type of state capable not only of existing, but also of reproducing itself? If we examine this process through the lens of the development of brain genotypes described in the works of Alexander Khatybov and in "The Foundations of the Formation of Humanity," it becomes apparent that **NOT ONLY** the political system was changing, but also the very organization of social thought. Governance gradually shifted from direct coercion to shaping an environment in which people began to regard as natural precisely those forms of social organization that had seemed impossible only a short time before. Power had less and less need for force and relied **MORE AND MORE** on collective ideas, traditions, institutions, and norms that reproduced themselves without the direct intervention of their creators.

Therefore, the birth of a new statehood cannot be viewed solely as a political event. It was a **FAR MORE EXTENSIVE** process — the creation of a new civilizational model, in which the primary object of

governance was no longer individual rulers or even states, rather the very logic of social development. Thus, what would later become the model for a new era gradually comes into being — the **MAIN DEMOCRAT**, around which an entirely different world order would begin to take shape. Understanding precisely how it emerged allows us to discern, behind the succession of historical events, the internal logic of processes that traditional historical research scarcely discusses.



Changing the financial system alone was insufficient. Any new governing structure had to be stable. Creating a mechanism was only half the task. It was considerably harder to ensure that this mechanism preserved its structure **REGARDLESS OF** changes in people, generations, and political circumstances. The next stage therefore became the creation of a sociopolitical model that would itself reproduce the conditions necessary for its existence. This was no longer a matter of a struggle between individual states or political forces. A new governing environment was being designed. The system sought to build an architecture in which the main center of governance remained unchanged, while all other elements were in constant motion. Thus, a model gradually took shape that would later come to be

known as **LIBERAL DEMOCRACY**. Its defining feature became less the existence of elections than the mandatory turnover of visible power. It was precisely this principle that became the foundation of the entire structure.

At first glance, such a system appeared to embody freedom. However, when viewed as an engineered structure, **IT BECAME OBVIOUS** that turnover served an entirely different function. It prevented any political group from consolidating control to the point where it could step beyond its assigned role. A natural pattern quickly became apparent. Anyone who gains power seeks to retain it. This is **NOT A QUESTION** of ideology, nationality, or personal qualities. It is a property of any complex social system. Power has its own dynamics. Once given the ability to make decisions, a person inevitably begins looking for ways to prolong their influence. History shows that this pattern manifests itself almost everywhere. Regardless of slogans and political declarations, **ELECTED LEADERS** seek to change the rules so they can remain in power for as long as possible. If nothing impedes this process, the democratic structure gradually begins to revert to a form familiar throughout human history — **THE CONCENTRATION OF POWER**.

In a sense, this resembles the operation of fundamental laws of nature. Water flows downward, fire rises upward, and social power gravitates toward stability and centralization. If a thousand people find themselves on an uninhabited island without external governance, a hierarchy, a distribution of roles, and a center of decision-making will soon emerge. **NO ONE WILL** deliberately design such a system. It will arise as a natural consequence of the organization of a human community. For this very reason, such processes are understood as manifestations of underlying patterns in the development of organized systems rather than as chance occurrences. Any complex structure **SEEKS TO REDUCE** internal uncertainty. One way of reducing it is through the concentration of control.

For this reason, liberal democracy **CANNOT** exist on its own for long. Left solely to its own internal dynamics, it gradually reproduces the forms of power it was originally directed against. In other words,

the system begins returning to the state from which it once emerged. Here, the central engineering intent behind the new structure becomes apparent. To preserve the principle of turnover, it is necessary to **MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE** for one person to remain in power for an extended period, regardless of their personal wishes. Term limits become an essential element of the stability of the entire system rather than a political declaration. Yet this proves insufficient. The true object of governance is the scope of an individual politician's thinking rather than the politician themselves. If a leader has time to see how the entire structure works, they inevitably begin to act as an **INDEPENDENT CENTER** of governance rather than as an element of the system. Consequently, power itself must be organized in such a way as to prevent this from happening.

The length of time in power therefore took on particular importance. It had to be long enough for a leader to become familiar with the day-to-day matters of state governance, yet insufficient to develop a strategic view of the system as a whole. Most of their time inevitably went toward addressing immediate tasks, conflicts within the administrative apparatus, economic problems, and reconciling the interests of numerous influential groups. This was precisely why attention remained fixed on current politics, while the architecture of governance itself remained beyond direct perception. If we examine this through the **PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT** of brain genotypes, another pattern becomes apparent. As social processes grow more complex, the need increases for people **CAPABLE OF HOLDING** long chains of cause and effect in mind. However, the system of mass governance has no interest in making such thinking the norm for everyone involved in the political process. On the contrary, it functions with considerably greater stability when most people are occupied with immediate tasks, remaining within their own time horizons. As a result, a rather distinctive structure took shape. Visible power **CONSTANTLY CHANGED**, society perceived events as a continuous renewal, and political life was filled with struggle, elections, and changes of leadership. Yet the underlying architecture of governance remained virtually unchanged. It was precisely this stability at the hidden level that ensured the **LONG-TERM EXISTENCE** of the entire structure. Therefore, when analyzing his(s)tory, it is important to distinguish between a change of figures and a change in the system itself. Faces, slogans, parties, and even state institutions change very often. Yet this does not necessarily mean that the principles of governance have changed. Real changes take place much deeper — where **THE VERY STRUCTURE** of reality is formed, defining the limits of possible decisions. However, limiting terms in power alone was insufficient. Any engineered structure is viable only when it possesses a mechanism for self-preservation. The central question arose: how could an inevitable transfer of power be ensured if the rulers themselves one day decided to change the rules of the game?

History has repeatedly shown that **VOLUNTARILY RELINQUISHING** power is the exception rather than the rule. Once given the opportunity to govern, a person almost inevitably begins looking for ways to preserve their position. This has less to do with personal qualities than with **THE VERY NATURE** of social systems. Power always seeks to preserve itself, which means expanding its own authority. Consequently, the stability of the new model required a mechanism whose capabilities exceeded those of any individual state or ruler. Only a force external to national authority could guarantee that the established rules remained unchanged. Here, one of the



fundamental principles of building organized systems becomes apparent — each level of governance can remain stable only **WHEN THERE EXISTS** a higher level overseeing the performance of its functions. Without such a level, the system inevitably begins restructuring itself around the interests of its own center of governance. Laws alone were therefore insufficient. A law in itself **HAS NO** force of its own. Its effectiveness is determined by whoever can enforce it. As long as the ruler remains the highest authority, the law inevitably becomes an instrument of their will. It ceases to constrain power and becomes an extension of it. From this naturally arose the idea of a supranational mechanism capable of overseeing adherence to common political principles regardless of the wishes of particular leaders. If domestic authority began to deviate from the prescribed structure, **THERE HAD TO BE** an external instrument to bring it back within the established limits.

Thus, the outline of a distinctive international arbiter gradually emerged — a force whose task was to preserve the model of governance itself rather than to govern an individual state. Its purpose was to maintain the stability of the entire structure rather than to exercise day-to-day power. If we examine this process closely, **IT BECOMES OBVIOUS** that it represented a transition to yet another level of organization. Previously, governance had operated primarily within individual states. Now, a supranational framework of governance began to take shape, bringing numerous independent systems together within a single architecture.

From this logically followed **THE NEED TO CREATE** a global hierarchy of democratic states. Yet unlike familiar empires, its foundation was a common set of operating rules rather than direct subordination. Each state retained the outward signs of independence, while also recognizing a common standard to which it was obliged to conform. Such a structure required a benchmark of sorts. Just as precise measurements are impossible without a standard unit of measure, so the unity of a political model cannot be maintained without a center that defines its criteria. **FOR THIS VERY REASON**, the concept of a global center gradually emerged, serving less as the guardian of power than of its prescribed form.

An interesting historical analogy emerges here. For centuries, the religious world looked to a spiritual center that defined the canons of faith. Now, a different mechanism began to take shape, in which a political standard gradually took the place of a religious one. Whereas matters of doctrine had previously been subject to scrutiny, the focus now shifted to **THE COMPLIANCE OF STATES** with the established principles of the new model. At the same time, the structure itself had to appear as the product of the collective will of many independent participants rather than as global domination by a single center. Only this perception would preserve the defining feature of the new system — the invisibility of the actual mechanism of governance. The transfer of responsibility from a single actor to a collective therefore became a crucial element of the new architecture. Decisions began to be presented **AS THE OUTCOME** of general agreement, although the logic behind their emergence was determined at far deeper levels of organization. This form proved considerably more stable than direct coercion, since it gave participants a sense of their own free choice. This stage took on added significance. The more complex the governing structure became, **THE LESS** it relied on direct violence and the more it relied on society's ability to reproduce the necessary patterns of behavior on its own. Governance gradually shifted from issuing orders to shaping perceptions, values, and norms. This transition became one of the defining features of the new era, in which the most effective power was the kind that created conditions under which society **BEGAN TO SUPPORT** the prescribed structure as the only possible form of its own existence, rather than the kind that compelled obedience.

If the new political structure was to endure for centuries, merely creating its institutions was insufficient. Any system survives only as long as it can reproduce itself. It was therefore necessary to shape



a social environment in which any departure from the accepted model would be perceived as a violation of the norm itself rather than as an alternative point of view.

His(torah)y shows that mechanisms of this kind **WERE ALREADY KNOWN** to humanity. For centuries, religious institutions performed this function. They both formulated dogmas and guarded them against any deviations. Any heresy was perceived as a threat to the existence of the entire system rather than as an occasion for discussion.

The activities of the medieval Vatican are revealing in this respect. Its task went beyond simply spreading Christianity to preserving a unified canon. Any deviation was regarded as a danger to the integrity of the entire structure. The struggle against heresy therefore employed **A WIDE VARIETY OF** means

— from theological debates and sermons to the Inquisition, military campaigns, and political pressure. The system's primary concern was preserving the unity of the governing program rather than punishing individuals.

If we examine this his(torah)cal experience closely, it becomes clear that we are dealing with a **UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLE** of governance. Any higher-level system seeks to maintain its own stability. To do so, it inevitably creates mechanisms for detecting deviations and subsequently correcting them. Eras, ideologies, and forms of social organization change, yet the principle itself remains unchanged.

As the new political architecture took shape, this function was to pass to a political center rather than a religious one. Its task became maintaining a common understanding of what constituted proper democracy and what constituted its distortion. A wide variety of instruments of influence were to be employed: diplomacy, economic pressure, informational influence, sanctions, special operations, and, in extreme cases — military force. All of this was to be presented **AS THE DEFENSE** of universally recognized values and the restoration of a disrupted order rather than as a struggle for its own interests. Just as religious wars were declared to be a defense of the true faith, any actions by the new center were to be portrayed as a struggle for freedom, human rights, the rule of law, and democracy. The vocabulary changes, yet the logic of the system remains remarkably similar. It always seeks to present its actions as the fulfillment of a moral duty rather than as a display of force. However, **NO** structure **CAN** endure for long unless its principles take root within the individual. Collective consciousness therefore gradually became the primary object of governance rather than the state. This is precisely where the boundary lies between ordinary administrative governance and systemic governance. As long as a person follows a rule solely out of fear of punishment, the structure remains unstable. Once the rule becomes an **INTERNAL NORM**, the system begins reproducing itself almost automatically. It was therefore necessary to shape a particular kind of public perception in which the temporary nature of power would be regarded as the natural and only permissible order of things rather than as a subject for political debate. This attitude had to move from the level of conscious convictions to that of a cultural program determining a person's emotional response even before rational deliberation began. Such processes are understood as the transition of information to the level of stable governing states. At this level, a person **NO LONGER ANALYZES** each proposition afresh. He perceives it as yet another established fact requiring no proof. This is precisely how deeply rooted programs of collective behavior take shape. From the perspective of the development of brain genotypes — this is particularly interesting.

As civilization grew more complex, stable informational structures that shaped the responses of large human communities took on an increasingly important role rather than direct commands. Governance gradually shifted from external coercion to the formation of internal constraints. A person **BEGAN TO REGARD** what had been shaped by the surrounding cultural environment as their own conviction. Europe therefore became the main obstacle to the new model. Despite revolutions and reforms, its cultural memory continued to preserve the centuries-old image of monarchical power. Literature, legends, family traditions, chivalric culture, historical heroes — all of these continued to reproduce the notion of a strong and permanent ruler as the natural center of social life.

Such a cultural legacy inevitably came into conflict with the new political architecture. At the conscious level, a person could agree with the need for turnover in power. Yet at the deeper level of collective memory, an **ENTIRELY DIFFERENT** understanding of the order of things persisted. This was precisely why the temptation always arose to make an exception for a “good ruler,” to let them remain for one more term, then another, and then gradually restore the previous model of power.

The history of the twentieth century clearly demonstrated how enduring such archetypes proved to be. Many European societies that formally professed democratic principles shifted fairly quickly to authoritarian forms of governance at critical moments. This indicates that an outward change in political institutions **DOES NOT YET MEAN** a change in the underlying programs of collective consciousness. The stability of the new structure therefore required more than changes to laws and state institutions. It was necessary to change the very information environment in which a person develops. Only then did turnover in power cease to be a legal requirement and become a natural norm of collective perception. It was precisely this transition from changing institutions to changing collective consciousness itself that became one of the most important stages in the formation of a **NEW MODEL** for governing civilization.

The democratic model could become stable only if the principle “*Dura lex, sed lex*” — “*The law is harsh; it is still the law*” — became unconditionally established in collective consciousness. If the law stipulated that power could not be permanent, then however successful a ruler’s actions might have seemed, however popular they might have been, they were obliged to leave office at the appointed time. The law had to stand above the individual, above circumstances, and above immediate advantage. Yet such a principle could not be established merely by passing a law. Any law survives only as long as a social environment exists that recognizes its unconditional value. It was therefore necessary to create a person of a **NEW TYPE**, for whom the very idea of permanent power would seem as impossible as denying God had seemed to a medieval person.

The **MAIN DEMOCRAT** could be built only from people raised in an atmosphere of absolute commitment to the liberal-democratic model. This atmosphere had to surround a person from birth to death, leaving no room for alternative conceptions of how society should be organized. In essence, this meant creating a new religion — a religion without God, in which political principles took the place of dogmas, and the laws of the new system took the place of sacred canons. It is at precisely this point that the historical narrative takes on particular significance. It becomes apparent that this involved **NOT MERELY** political reform, rather the formation of a new information environment capable of cultivating a different type of collective consciousness. In the terminology of Alexander Khatybov’s works, such changes **INEVITABLY AFFECTED** the level of collective thinking and gradually created conditions in which



new qualities of developing brain genotypes could manifest. First the environment changes, then perception — and only afterward do new forms of social organization emerge.

Let us take as an example one of the best-known historical models of generational change — the biblical Exodus. Just as the Jews who had lived in Egyptian slavery **WERE UNSUITED** to building a new state because they were born and died under the rule of the pharaoh, unable to imagine any other life, so the inhabitants of Europe, raised within a centuries-old monarchical tradition, could not form the foundation of a fundamentally new political system. The required human material was therefore to be obtained through a distinctive “Exodus technology.” Just as Moses led the Jews out of Egypt into the wilderness so that a generation could grow up there that **HAD NEVER KNOWN** the pharaoh’s rule and had been raised in a different environment, it was now necessary to lead large numbers of people out of Europe and England into a new “wilderness.” There, a generation was to be born that, from its earliest days, would know neither kings nor feudal lords. The older generation retained the memory of the former world; the new generation was to know only the new one.

To achieve this, an atmosphere of the greatest possible freedom had to be created within the new society. People had to feel that they were masters of their own destiny. They **WERE GRANTED THE RIGHT** to bear arms so that they could defend the new democratic order should a threat arise. The elite was to be divided into constantly competing groups, **PREVENTING** anyone from concentrating all power in their own hands. From the earliest days of life, the new generation was to be raised in the conviction that democracy was the only permissible form of government rather than one among several possibilities. The spirit of freedom was to become **PART OF THEIR WORLDVIEW** rather than a political slogan. People of every social class — from the poorest person to the wealthiest landowner — were to develop an enduring inner aversion to any form of permanent power.

The new state structure was designed to be governed primarily by institutions rather than individuals. However talented a particular figure might have been, they **WERE NOT TO** determine the strategic direction of development. The overall course was to remain unchanged regardless of changes in leadership. For the elite occupying key positions within the governing structure, permanent power therefore had to become a mortal danger rather than merely something undesirable. If a popularly elected leader ever attempted to turn temporary power into permanent power, their closest allies were to be the first to oppose them. It was precisely these allies who **WERE OBLIGED** to stop such an attempt before it became a threat to the entire system. Personal loyalty gave way here to loyalty to the structure itself.

The overall design gradually took its final shape. The central question remained — **WHERE TO CREATE** a new environment capable of raising a generation unconnected to Europe’s past? Such a territory had to be so far from Europe that the settlers would effectively be cut off from the former world. Neither the old political traditions, nor the familiar social atmosphere, nor even the memory of the previous way of life was to reach them.

Australia, Africa, North America, and South America were considered as possible options — lands inhabited by small populations with different cultural traditions. Ultimately, the choice **WAS MADE** in favor of North America. It began to be portrayed as a kind of “promised land,” with stories circulating about boundless fertile lands, rich forests, abundant rivers, and gold supposedly lying literally beneath one’s feet.

Just as the Exodus of the Jews from Egypt had once begun, a **MASS EXODUS** of people from England and Europe now began. The new “Moseses” portrayed America as a land of freedom, where anyone could become a property owner, grow wealthy, obtain a plot of land, and begin a new life. Even convicted offenders in England were increasingly offered resettlement in North America in place of their



punishment. People of a particular disposition flocked there — adventurers, pioneers, entrepreneurs, and passionate, driven individuals **READY TO RISK** their familiar lives for an unknown future. A society began to take shape on the North American continent that had never known Europe's hereditary aristocracy and had grown up outside the traditions of monarchical Europe. It was here that the first generation was to emerge who, from birth, had never known the rule of kings and feudal lords and had been raised in an entirely different social environment.

Alongside the settlers, others traveled to North America whose task was **BUILDING A NEW** social structure rather than developing new lands. These were the Freemasons — the project's theorists, organizers, and financiers. They were not distracted by secondary matters, clearly understanding the main goal. Their task was to create state institutions that would themselves prevent a return to dictatorial rule. They constructed a complex system of

checks and balances, incorporating mechanisms from the outset that would prevent violations of the fundamental principles of the new political model.

If we look at this process outside the conventional interpretation offered by his(torah)ians, it becomes apparent that change began with neither laws nor state institutions. First, a new information environment took shape, then a new collective consciousness, and only afterward were institutions created to consolidate the emerging state of affairs. This was why such **GREAT IMPORTANCE** was attached to raising the new generation.

Education in the new society was also to be organized differently from education in Europe. There was no intention of developing in most people the capacity for abstract thinking that would allow them to see the system as a whole. The main emphasis was to be placed on organizational abilities, leadership qualities, practical skills, and narrowly specialized professional knowledge. The natural human need to seek answers to the larger questions was to be gradually redirected toward business, careers, and personal success. The motto of the new society could be expressed in one short formula: ***"Get rich and think about nothing else."***

In such an atmosphere, **THE VERY ACT OF POSING** fundamental questions gradually disappeared from the horizon of collective consciousness. Just as almost no one before Einstein had raised the question of the relationship between geometry and physics, so the individual in the new society was not supposed to ask questions extending beyond their immediate activities.

At the same time, a new outlook on life spread alongside democracy. Simple slogans — ***"Get everything you can out of life," "Live here and now," "Don't let yourself wither away"*** — **GRADUALLY BECAME** a new philosophy of life. The emerging ideological vacuum made society especially receptive to such formulas, and the entire system of social values gradually changed along with them. Whereas in the earlier religious era, people had received, however simplified, an understanding of the past, present, and future, of the meaning of life and their place in the world, such questions were now gradually moved **BEYOND THE SCOPE** of public attention. People were encouraged to live for today, concern themselves with their personal well-being, and avoid thinking about anything beyond their immediate interests. When old age came, they were simply to accept it and seek inner reassurance in familiar religious rituals, **WITHOUT ATTEMPTING** to connect them with an understanding of the processes taking place.

This state of affairs suited the average consciousness perfectly well. Most people saw no contradiction in considering themselves both humanists and, for example, Christians. They were untroubled by the fact that humanism rested on one set of philosophical foundations and Christianity on an entirely different one. Few took an interest in such internal contradictions. However, the migration of people from Europe and England to North America was only the **FIRST STAGE** of the planned operation. The second stage was to transform the colony into an independent state of a new type. To this end, internal contradictions had been deliberately built into the future structure while the colonies were still taking shape, leaving only the task of activating them at the appropriate moment.

To understand how this structure worked, we need to examine the position of the English settlers. Both the inhabitants of London and those of North America considered themselves subjects of the English Crown. Formally, **THERE WERE NO** differences between them. In practice, however, differences existed. The English colonists considered themselves just as English as the inhabitants of London. They believed they possessed the same rights as any subject of the Crown. Yet the inhabitants of the mother country viewed them differently. Just as a capital almost always considers itself superior to the provinces, London gradually began to regard the overseas territories as lands of secondary importance. Its attitude toward the people living across the ocean became even more condescending.

The British Isles constituted the mother country, while all other possessions of the empire, regardless of who inhabited them — Indigenous peoples, Papuans, or former Londoners — were perceived primarily **AS COLONIES**. In political thinking, the colonies were regarded chiefly as a source of resources. Concern for their well-being was not among the mother country's priorities.

While the North American settlements remained few in number, London still sought to take the views of its fellow countrymen living across the ocean into account on matters of taxation and governance. Gradually, however, the situation changed. The North American colonies came to be treated on the same footing as all other possessions of the British Empire. This created a contradiction that almost inevitably **HAD TO** lead to conflict. It was one thing to impose taxes and laws without consulting the native populations of distant colonies. It was quite another to disregard the opinions of English and European settlers who considered themselves equal citizens of the English state.

The colonists were willing to pay taxes to maintain the empire and develop their own land. Yet they found it increasingly difficult to understand why they were obliged to pay for improvements to London **WITHOUT HAVING** any say in the decisions made there. It was precisely here that the internal tension gradually developed that would soon become the starting point for the next stage in building the new political system.

When the English authorities introduced new taxes for the North American colonies, intended primarily to address the internal problems of the British Isles, **INTERESTED FORCES** immediately exploited the resulting discontent. A spark became a flame. People began to be fed a simple and emotionally compelling idea: "You are being treated like a flock of sheep that no one consults when the time comes to shear them. This tax is the last straw. We can endure no more. The time has come to fight for freedom." His(torah)y seemed to begin repeating itself. Just as shortly before the French Revolution, superbly organized and well-funded associations calling themselves the **"SONS OF LIBERTY"** suddenly appeared throughout the North American colonies. They called on the population to abandon submission, declared the existing situation unjust, and urged people to take up arms. Farmers, artisans, merchants, workshop owners, blacksmiths, shoemakers, and people from many other trades began forming armed detachments, almost as chimney sweeps, bakers, cooks, and other participants in revolutionary events had done in Paris several years earlier.

Once again, the familiar pattern appeared before us. A crowd of armed citizens **UNEXPECTEDLY DEFEATED** the professional army of one of the strongest powers of its time. All that was missing for a complete resemblance to the French Revolution was the women's march on Versailles and the famous Liberty leading the people to the barricades. Symbolically, France itself would later seem to complete this image by presenting the United States with the Statue of Liberty.

Of course, there was also an important difference. The North American colonists were constantly fighting Indigenous tribes and therefore possessed considerably more combat experience than the artisans of Paris. Yet even this experience **DOES NOT ELIMINATE** the central question. Fighting scattered tribes is one thing. Defeating the regular army of a leading world power is quite another. Any well-organized mass of people, by the very fact of its organization, indicates the presence of organizers, coordinators, and sources of funding. The spontaneous emergence of such complex structures seems highly unlikely. If we examine the history of the North American colonies' struggle for independence closely, the presence of a force steering events in a particular direction **BECOMES APPARENT**. Most historical studies recount the colonists' courage, love of freedom, heroism, and self-sacrifice in detail. Yet the question of how the revolution was financed either remains entirely outside the narrative or receives such a passing mention that it creates the impression that the uprising sustained itself solely through voluntary donations from its participants.

Meanwhile, it is precisely the source of organizational and financial support that **ALLOWS US TO UNDERSTAND** the internal logic of what was unfolding. In 1773, an event took place that went down in history as the "*Boston Tea Party*."<sup>1</sup> Symbolically, it became what the shot fired by the cruiser Aurora would later become for the Russian Revolution — the point beyond which there was no turning back.

Ten years later, in 1783, England recognized the independence of its former colonies. A new state emerged — the *United States of America*.

Now began the construction of a **FUNDAMENTALLY DIFFERENT** political system rather than a struggle for independence.

During the colonial period, all the territories were subordinate to London and had no authority over one another. After independence, the former center of governance disappeared. There was no common capital, no leading state, and no political center recognized by all. All the states considered themselves equal. Each feared the emergence of a new authority over it. Yet all understood that a state **CANNOT** exist without a common center of governance. A solution was found in a system of elections. From the outset, however, the central principle of the new structure was established — no authority was



---

<sup>1</sup> The Boston Tea Party was a famous protest by American colonists on 16 December 1773, when activists from the Sons of Liberty, disguised as Indigenous people, boarded British ships and threw 342 chests of tea into the water in protest against the mother country's tax policies.



to become permanent. It was here that what would later become the foundation of the entire liberal-democratic model was born. For the first time in world history, the temporary nature of power was established **AS THE FOUNDATION** of the state's organization rather than as an aspiration. The highest authority was given a predetermined limit to its tenure. Thus emerged the first country built on the principle of mandatory turnover in power — the future **MAIN DEMOCRAT**.

The first president of the new country, George Washington, established a political benchmark by voluntarily limiting his time in office to two terms. Later, this act would become almost an unwritten sacred principle of statehood, defining a tradition within the American political system. This model resembles ancient Sparta, where the laws of Lycurgus were considered so inviolable that anyone proposing to change them risked their own life from the outset. In the United States, such a punishment, of course, **DID NOT EXIST**, although the very idea of limiting power gradually acquired an

almost sacred character. The only significant exception later became Franklin Roosevelt's prolonged presidency, explained by the extraordinary circumstances of the world war.

From its earliest days, the young state was tightly bound by a system of mutual constraints, divided powers, and constant checks and balances. Even differences in the laws of individual states became an element of the overall structure rather than an **ACCIDENTAL** feature. The president received substantial powers, while simultaneously being bound by numerous constraints that made the office primarily a coordinator of institutional activity rather than a position of sole rule. Viewed on a broader scale, what was being created becomes apparent as a new technology for governing society rather than simply a new state. It was here that the transition to a different model of organizing the social environment was completed. Governance gradually shifted from the individual to institutions, and the system's stability came to depend on a structure **CREATED IN ADVANCE** rather than on the qualities of a particular person. For a society in which the 42nd brain genotype series predominated, such a model became particularly stable, since it relied on trust in its rules and procedures rather than an understanding of the entire system. Under such an arrangement, the only truly permanent force therefore became the center that **REMAINS UNCHANGED** regardless of the outcome of any election, rather than the elected authorities. To this center, it made absolutely no difference who became the next president. Each winner came for a limited time and inevitably left. During that time, they could familiarize themselves only with the immediate matters of governance, while the architecture of the system itself endured far longer than any individual politician. This is probably the central engineering principle of the new political structure: ***people change, while the mechanism that ensures their replacement remains unchanged***. It gradually becomes the true **CONSTANT FACTOR** of the entire system.

From the very first days of its existence, the young state was tightly bound by a system of mutual constraints, divided powers, and constant counterbalances. Even differences in the laws of individual states became a deliberately incorporated element of the overall structure rather than an accidental feature. The newborn United States seemed tightly wrapped in liberal swaddling clothes, reinforced by a system of checks and balances. The existence of different laws in different states was neither an accident nor a historical anomaly. **THIS WAS PART** of the overall engineering design, gradually reducing the

president's role to that of a coordinating center rather than a sole ruler. Presidential powers were already limited, yet the system itself made their exercise even more dependent on numerous institutions, procedures, and mutual constraints.

If we view these developments through the lens of the “Foundations of the Formation of Humanity,”<sup>2</sup> it becomes apparent that this marked the completion of the transition to an entirely different model of governing society. Governance shifted from the individual to institutions, and the system's stability came to be determined by an architecture of social organization **CREATED IN ADVANCE** rather than by the qualities of a particular person. For a society in which the 42nd brain genotype series predominated, such a model proved particularly stable, since it relied on trust in its rules, procedures, and seemingly self-evident logic rather than on an understanding of the entire structure. Under such an arrangement, neither the president nor parliament constituted the only truly permanent force. **THE BANK REMAINED** the sole constant factor — the very Temple of the new era. To it, the outcome of the next election made absolutely no difference. Each winner came for a limited term and inevitably left. The short cycle of power **DID NOT ALLOW** them to move beyond day-to-day governance, comprehend the entire architecture of the system, and see its central node. While one politician was only beginning to understand the mechanisms of power, the time was already approaching to hand authority over to the next temporary administrator. This was the central engineering principle of the new political structure. Presidents, parties, ministers, and political slogans changed, while the system itself **REMAINED UNCHANGED**. *The power of the created structure* became permanent rather than the power of a particular person. It was from this point onward that the mechanism began to take its definitive shape, extending far beyond the United States in the decades that followed and becoming a model for restructuring a substantial part of the world. Yet that is the next chapter of His(torah)y, without an understanding of which it is impossible to see how a local political experiment gradually became a global system for governing civilization.



*To be continued...*

F. Shkrudnev  
25 October 2026

---

<sup>2</sup> “Foundations of the Formation of Humanity,” in four parts — a collective work by Russian scientists.