

11. Meeting – June 3, 2007

Opening Speech by Nicolai Viktorovich Levashov



Good afternoon. I'm glad that someone still decided to come to such a stuffy room on such a beautiful day. Let's begin — and I think it's best to start with what's most important for those who have come here. That is probably to hear some answers to the questions that specifically interest *you*. If anyone has questions, I would prefer that you not ask personal ones — unless you're comfortable with them being discussed publicly. If you *don't mind*, I can answer personal questions. But if you *do mind*, then it's better not to ask them. Any question you feel is appropriate to raise in public — please go ahead. I'm ready, as much as I'm able, to answer them.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

11.1. QUESTION: *I saw a poster of yours that said you would be releasing a new book titled "Russian History Viewed through Distorted Mirrors." Nicolai Viktorovich, could you at least roughly explain what you intend to present in this book — the main idea? This is a question often asked by your admirers and like-minded readers. Many of them have read your first booklet, The Silenced History of Russia, and it revealed the truth about our past. That's the context I'm asking in.*

ANSWER: For those who haven't heard yet, I'll repeat once more — the first volume of the book "Russian History Viewed through Distorted Mirrors" is about to be finished. The title of this volume is *From the Starry Rus to the Cursed Rus*, or rather, the *defiled Rus* — or more accurately, the *defiled Russians* — because everything has been distorted. In this volume, I address several aspects from the perspective of the understanding that has come to me. The way history is presented to us is completely incorrect — and not by accident, but intentionally so.

What do I mean by that? For example, take a certain historical event — and then an interpretation of that event is offered. But every event is always interpreted according to the interests of the political forces who are doing the interpreting at the time — in other words, the *victors*, right? Naturally, they interpret it in the way that is most favorable and convenient for them.

And it is precisely this approach that allows for the manipulation of everything and everyone — however one likes. But there are situations where it becomes possible to create an understanding of the processes occurring both in nature and in human society, where such arbitrary interpretation — the “everyone sees it how they want” approach — becomes impossible.

Someone might quite reasonably ask: what makes *your* interpretation more valid than others, for example? And to avoid such a situation, I seek an approach to how we perceive the past of our country in particular. Our country — its past — is inextricably linked with the civilization of the entire Earth, for at least 600,000 to 800,000 years.

The oldest city on Earth that still exists today is 108,000 years old, and it is located on the territory of Russia — in Siberia. Today, it's commonly known as Omsk. I won't go into that now, because it would immediately make things too difficult to grasp — too many questions at once about what, how, and why.

Any historical event is merely the *tip of the iceberg* — the visible part. But in order to truly understand and correctly interpret an event that occurred — to understand *why* it happened — you must comprehend everything that lies *beneath the surface*. And what lies beneath has always been hidden from people. The information was always deliberately presented in such a way that people could never access the submerged part — and therefore could never form a true understanding of the nature of events and the processes occurring in society and on Earth — our little planet.

In the first volume — which includes two chapters — I lay out my ideas. The first chapter is titled “The Origin of Man.” In it, I examine all the currently known theories about where we — such wonderful and not-so-wonderful beings — actually came from. I present what science today claims about human origins, as well as the myths, legends, religions — each one praising its own version as the only correct one.

So, I took the task of breaking down *each and every* possible existing version of where we came from. Because before we can talk about society as such, or its past, we must first understand *who we are* and *where we came from*. Without that, it's hard to understand anything else. As I analyze the currently accepted versions, I gradually draw logical conclusions — and clearly lead the reader to what really happened and where we truly came from, how we appeared on this planet.

You see, we're kept in the dark for one simple reason. Let's say a person opens a book. They see words written on the page. But that doesn't mean they can *truly see* what is written — not because they're stupid, as some might say, or lack talent. It's simply because there's a special kind of programming involved — and for most people, it's completely invisible.

There's a kind of trickery. You see the text, but you don't see everything that exists *above* the text. Most people are unaware of this. And naturally, when reading some material, they interpret it exactly the way the author — or more precisely, the manipulators behind the author — intended.

Today, many people have heard of **neuro-linguistic programming** — where certain combinations of words are used to *encode* people. But this method has been used for *thousands of years* — not just recently, as if someone got hit on the head with an apple, a brick, or a book and suddenly had an epiphany.

By arranging words in a certain sequence in a text, one can *make* a person perceive the information in a way that serves someone else's interests. And this has been going on for millennia. But that's only the *tip of the iceberg*. Because above those words, there are *many more levels* — and most people don't see them. And it's those *invisible levels* that implant into a person's consciousness whatever the creator of those levels intended. And believe me — people are *shocked* when they find this out.

Sometimes, even during my own seminars, I would ask people to read the New Testament. Then they would bring it to me, and I — without even opening the book — would simply wave my hand over it. From the point of view of any normal person, it might look like: "This fool is just waving his hand over a book — I can wave my hand too." But when I moved my hand, something else was happening — not just air vibrations.

And after that, I'd give the book back to the person, and they would read it again and say: "How is this possible? I've read this several times before — and this part wasn't there!"

I would say: "Of course it wasn't. *I wrote that part.* I waved my hand — and rewrote everything."

You see, people are being zombified on all levels — starting from basic linguistic programming, where words influence you on multiple layers. It's always been hidden from people that these levels even *exist*, and that one can influence others *through* them. And this applies not only to religious texts — it applies to almost *any* literature, regardless of whether the person reading it understands or doesn't understand.

If the person *does* understand, the impact is deeper and more profound — it depends on their personal potential. But even if a person doesn't understand anything consciously, if they have a strong internal potential, it still works. Because when someone writes something, they invest certain personal positions, perceptions — and these are invisibly connected to the words. It doesn't matter that it's later printed — all of it gets transferred.

It's like copying — but holographic copying. A complete holographic transfer of what the person embedded in the text. That's why, when someone reads a book and then wonders how it's possible — they saw the same letters, they read the same words — but in fact, they saw only half of it. And even that gave them an impression that has *nothing to do* with what was actually there.

How is that possible? Strange — but nonetheless, it's real. This isn't just an unfounded claim — it's a factual reality. Unfortunately, most literature — especially the kind related to worldview, perception, and morality — contains embedded programs that are deliberately placed there in order to control people.

One might ask: *What if someone did that with good intentions?* What if it's for the better — if a person can't do good on their own, then maybe it's better to force them to do good? Let them be like a robot, doing what is "right." But believe me — that's not how it works. Because in my view, what separates a human from a biorobot or an animal is the ability to act *consciously*.

When a person *understands* what's happening, it means that they are making a conscious decision. Their actions aren't based on someone else's implanted program, but on their own awareness and genuine desire to act that way. You see, today someone implants a "good" program — and the person behaves "properly." But tomorrow, someone else inserts a different program — and the very same person starts doing *something completely different*, without even realizing it. And yet they will believe that what they're doing is right. That's a long discussion, and I don't want to get too deep into it now, since the question was about the book and about history.

So, in this book, I show that even the current religious myths, like the Old Testament, do *not* reflect what people are told they do. Even in the Old Testament itself, it describes actual historical processes — *real* events in which the white race and the black race clashed multiple times on the territory of what is now India. All those events are described — everything is there. You just have to *read it properly* — and understand it, having freed yourself from the influence.

The coordinates of the places are even given — you just need to dig a bit, find the old names, and compare them to the modern ones. The events described in the Old Testament don't speak of the *origin* of humanity as such at all. Remember the creation of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden? That's *not* the creation of the first humans — at least not if you consider that, even within the Old Testament itself, it says Adam and Eve had two sons.

So where did the *wives* come from, to bear their children afterward? They came from "outside," supposedly. But if Adam and Eve were the *first* people, where would "others" have come from? There are only two sons and their parents — four people in total. So where did the sons' wives come from?

It's the same story when we read in the Old Testament about the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by God. Lot escapes with his daughters, and everyone else is destroyed. But later, suddenly, *other* people appear. It even says they took husbands "from there." From there — understand? But where would they have come from, if everyone had supposedly been destroyed? What happened in Sodom and Gomorrah is also related to events that took place in that same region — modern-day India. But that's not being reported.

What is described in the Old Testament is a classic description of a nuclear explosion: a bright solar flash that kills people. Lot's wife turning into a pillar — not because God "froze" her, but because of a nuclear blast. Excavations in the north of India, in what is now Pakistan, revealed two cities. When they were uncovered, it was found that the destruction was exactly like what you'd expect from a nuclear explosion. All the damage radiated from a central epicenter — the farther out, the less the damage.

Skeletons were discovered — not broken skulls or hacked-off limbs, as you'd expect from ancient warfare — but intact skeletons, with radiation levels a thousand times above normal. Interesting, isn't it? One could easily compare both sets of facts — but people often don't bother doing that.

Another fact comes from the chronicles of the so-called Alexander the Great and his legendary campaign into India. There's a moment that many people overlook. It says that they approached two cities and demanded that the inhabitants open their gates to the victorious army of the great Alexander. But the cities knew perfectly well what would happen if they did. Whether you open the gates or not — the outcome would be the same.

Apparently, they still retained fragments of ancient knowledge — and they used that knowledge and detonated bombs. In these chronicles, it says that when the cities refused, suddenly two bright suns flared up in broad daylight, and ash began to fall from the sky. Alexander's soldiers panicked and rushed into the river to wash the ash off themselves. Many died in the river, and the survivors — many of those who took part in the assault on these cities — quickly lost weight and died soon afterward. At the time, they didn't understand why they died, but today we can say: they were exposed to *massive doses of radiation*, right? Back then, no one knew what that was.

Look at that: *two bright flashes*, just like in the chronicles of Alexander the Great, just like in the story of Sodom and Gomorrah, and just like the excavated cities in northern India. These need to be *connected* — and it turns out that what's described in the Old Testament is the *same thing*, though distorted, of course.

These were real events that occurred on our planet Earth — and they have nothing to do with the "creation of man," but rather with what happened in that same India after the appearance of the White Race on Earth. That is — our ancestors colonized the planet some 600,000 to 800,000 years ago. And again — this is not just empty talk.

Recently, an acquaintance of mine showed me a website where several American scientists discovered numerous inscriptions on stones and fossilized imprints in the northwestern region of the United States — all of them over 200,000 years old. And do you know what language these phrases were written in? Russian. And what's even more interesting — written in a simple, ordinary alphabet, one that we can still read today with ease. Not the entire phrases, of course — because the meanings of words have shifted — but the words themselves can easily be read in modern Russian using our current alphabet. These inscriptions are estimated to be over 200,000 years old. The researchers wrote several books about this, but of course — *no one talks about it*.

Other races appeared about 40,000 years ago. There was a Star War in which our planet took part. At that time, space-level travel — moving from one planet to another — was completely normal. Just like for many of us here: getting into a car or a train in Moscow and coming to this place — for them, traveling between planets was equally routine. And it wasn't just for the "elite" — but for ordinary people, even those from small villages. There are facts confirming this. One just needs to look for them and understand what's behind it. For them, interplanetary travel was normal.

But about 35,000–40,000 years ago, there was a Cosmic War — not on Earth — and Earth became a refuge for those who had suffered from that war. These **were** refugees from other planets, of different races. Biologically, they were compatible, but evolutionarily, they were vastly different. And so, our ancestors — for those who have read ... — carried out the First and Second Aryan Campaigns into India. These campaigns were undertaken to put an end to human sacrifice and the worship of the black cult of death, which that race was devoted to.

The first time, our ancestors came and simply drove them out — and left. But those they drove out quickly returned, and everything went back to the way it was. The second time, they understood that leaving things unfinished was pointless. You see, we've all been fed completely false notions — that all races are equal, that all races came from the same origin. But that's not true.

And yet there's nothing wrong with the fact that black, white, yellow, and red races differ from one another. What's wrong with that? Is it bad that this is an apple, and that is a pear? Which one is better or worse? Who can say? It depends on what someone likes — but they're both fruits, right?

In the same way, different races have different genetic codes and biochemistry. In the United States, there are even special heart medications made specifically for black people. So, if all races are really the same — why is it that a white person doesn't need that medication, but a black person does? Because their biochemistry is entirely different. And biochemistry has a profound impact on the psyche, on the development of consciousness, and on evolution.

In my book, I try to explain all this *step by step*: That these different races arrived as refugees, and they weren't selected to be of the same developmental level. They were just rescued from "sinking ships," so to speak — and no one was checking what level each race had reached at the time they were accepted on Earth. And that's why Earth ended up with races of different evolutionary stages.

But can you blame a three-year-old child for not understanding quantum mechanics? That's all there is to it — different races, having followed different evolutionary paths, naturally found themselves at different positions of development. And it was precisely the coexistence on a single planet of races with varying levels of development that led to the conflictual situation which our ancestors tried to resolve — according to the understanding and means available to them at that time.

They believed they understood eugenics. Are you familiar with what eugenics is? It's the science of human evolutionary development — the study of traits and characteristics as they relate to genetics. And even then, they knew that there existed something called alpha-genetics. That is, if you alter just a few percent of the genetic composition within the general pool of alpha-genetics, those changes automatically propagate to the rest. Those who have studied this topic probably already know this. And those who don't — you don't have to take my word for it. Go and look up the relevant information yourself, and you'll see: I'm not making this up.

So, they understood this — and what did they do? They engaged in breeding enhancement — that is, they introduced their own genetics, which contained more advanced traits and active qualities, into the active genetics of less developed races. Their goal was to elevate all these races to the same level, making them equal to one another through genetic alignment.

And here, in my view, they made a colossal mistake. They wanted the best — but, as the saying goes, it turned out the way it always does. You can't equalize things like that *mechanically*. Everyone has to walk their own path. Yes, some may move faster, others more slowly — but you can't pull someone forward by force. It won't help.

You *can* help a person go faster — as much as possible — but if every individual, every representative of a race, has certain limitations linked to the qualitative state of their genetics and abilities, you *cannot* force acceleration. Can you make a person move at 1,000 km/h? No — because it's not physically possible.

It's the same here: for each genetic code, there are its own optimal capacities. They *can* be changed — but not by dragging someone by the ears. Rather, by helping them move forward more quickly, without

unnecessary stumbles and injuries. But this applies not only to different races, it applies even within a single race.

I can give you an example. When I managed to find a method of transforming a person's brain that gives him incredible opportunities, from the point of view of most who understand, I thought I was ready to give something, explain how to use it, what to do, it's "two times two makes four." That is, it seemed like a person could just take it and use it properly.

I have been watching people who have gone through such a transformation in Russia, in the West, for 20 years now. I saw that, unfortunately, this was not the case. I seemed to be trying to act correctly from my point of view, not only to give a computer, programs and explain how to work with them, but also to try to force a person to act on his own, not just to be a parrot when a person blindly repeats what I said. Blind repetition is stupid and leads nowhere.

My goal was to teach a person how to receive information himself, work with this information, and move forward as a result of working with information, because evolutionary progress is possible only through actions. Just to sit and wait by the sea for the weather...

Has anyone been interested in integral yoga? Its creator is Sri Aurobindo. Why have they been trying to act in India for a thousand years, and nothing special has gone ahead? But because there is a golden grain in one place, in another, in a third, if you could just collect all the golden grains in a pile, the pile would already act. But he put it all together, and do you know what his conclusion was?

You have to be ready when the epiphany comes to you. Brush your ears, brush your teeth, and wait for something to come down to you, someday, and you sit and wait. I'm exaggerating, but you'll understand. You can sit and wait for the great ocean to come; it will also come when the platforms come together and collide. And indeed, it will come sometime, quite possibly, but I don't know how long it will take, a billion years, 2 billion years. Do you understand?

That's why I also tried to give my students a system not in the sense of simply providing some knowledge they had to swallow and memorize. No, that's the wrong approach. There should be enlightenment through knowledge — understanding. A person must truly comprehend the information that enters them.

I tried to teach them how to scan properly so that, as a result of scanning, they could obtain reliable information about the state of the body — how the scanning is done, how the information is received and processed. That is, one should not project their own desires, but instead analyze the information and understand what has been received. It's a complex process, and we won't dwell on it now — it's not the most interesting topic at the moment.

It seemed to me that I had created all of this for my students — take it and use it. I tried to help them master these tools, how to work with them. The funniest thing I encountered was that everyone believed they knew better what was good for them. They would take this part from here, and that part from there, and then go on to act in their own way.

I didn't observe this for long in Russia because I moved to the U.S. fairly soon after conducting my school. And in the U.S., after the school, I conducted seminars for 13 years. So, I kept giving to my

students, and they kept acting in that way — and I would check their progress. From my point of view, the progress was negligible, and they understood this too, because they were projecting what they wanted to see.

You see, the most important thing is not to project what you want to see, but to actually see what *is*. The funniest thing is that most people I dealt with would suddenly ask: "Can you tell me what will happen to me, to my loved ones, my relatives, and so on?" Clairvoyance, right? Yes, you *can* find that out — and it's interesting. But almost no one ever listens, because every person wants to hear that everything will be wonderful, that all their plans will turn out perfectly.

Sometimes, strangely enough, that actually is the case — but in most situations, it's not. When you tell someone that such-and-such will happen, and that to avoid it they need to do this or that, the person thinks: "How does he know? I have my own opinion about this, and I'll act in my own way." Fine — does he have that right? Absolutely — he has the right. But if a person continues to move along the same track he has always followed, he will arrive exactly where I told him he would.

There was a situation when someone asked me something, and then ten years later, they called and said: "You know, what you told me — it all came true over these ten years." Sometimes it gets to the point of absurdity. For example, someone asks a question — I don't go around giving unsolicited advice when a person hasn't asked for anything. Why should I? But if someone *does* ask, then I give them an answer.

So, I tell someone: "This, this, and that." And they respond: "Well, I agree with some of what you said, but not with this part, because of this and that..." There was a situation — a guy from San Francisco. He had some business issue and came to me and asked: "What should I do?" I said: "As long as you have control, if you don't act now and get confirmation of your current position while you're still in control, then that partner of yours (the one in New York) — to put it bluntly — will screw you over."

He replied: "You're totally wrong here. He's my best friend. I've supported him all my life, we're inseparable, he owes me everything, he's like a brother to me — we're thick as thieves."

A few days later, he comes back — exactly what I had told him happened. The guy got burned, got his lesson — you'd think that would be enough. I wasn't just saying things randomly — there was no reason not to believe me. So, he comes again: "What do I do now?" And I say: "You need to do this, this, and this. If you don't, then this, this, and this will happen." And what do you think? Did he listen the second time? No.

That's why I've often come to the conclusion that people are just looking for reasons *not* to do what they're advised to do. Sorry, but if you don't do what's necessary, then nothing will change — things will stay exactly the way they were.

Human nature is very strange, in my opinion. A person seems to want to know a lot — to lay something soft where they might fall — but when you tell them exactly where they *will* fall, they say: "Why should I lay anything down there? It's already soft. I'm not planning to fall." That's why, unfortunately, in most cases, clairvoyants end up being more like good psychologists — they tell people what they *want* to hear.

I had a funny case once in the U.S. One of my patients also worked with Tarot cards. She was into that kind of thing, but she had no clients at all. And I explained to her: "You see, you're using the cards simply as a key — a trigger — to tune in to the person. It creates focus; the person concentrates on something, and everything opens up from there. You tune in and read certain information from them. So why do you even need the cards? You can do it without them."

She said: "I can't do it like that — people won't understand." I said: "Just try it." I helped her a bit, made some adjustments so she could work directly. Sometime later, she comes back, completely shocked. One of her clients — she described to him what was going on with him — and he said: "I'm not coming back to you." She asked: "May I ask why? Did I say something wrong?" He said: "No, you said everything correctly — but I didn't like it. Other readers tell me things I *do* like." You see?

That's the strange thing about human nature — a person wants to hear something, but when they actually receive it, they don't want to "consume" it, because it doesn't align with their internal picture of the world. On one hand, that's a kind of stubbornness — not because the person is stupid, but because human understanding is based on one's own *evolutionary state*, on the level of awareness that particular person has reached.

You see, you *can't* force someone to understand something in a different way. You *can* force them to blindly believe — but blind belief is dangerous. In my view, fanaticism is the worst-case scenario: when a person, understanding nothing, drives an idea into their head and starts spreading it around and imposing it on others. That's the worst.

The only real path, from my perspective, is conscious realization — to let the information pass through oneself, to achieve *enlightenment through knowledge*. That is, when knowledge becomes part of the person, when they truly understand it — *then* real progress begins.

So, for a person to change, they first have to change *within*. By changing their inner state, they also transform the external reality around them. Without that internal transformation, a person will just keep drifting along the same river as before — and nothing will change. And the truth is, many people *don't* want to change at all.

11.2. QUESTION: *Is there such a thing as genetic memory? It's been said that a person only becomes truly human in society.*

ANSWER: Genetic memory does exist. But again, a person is *born as an animal* — that's not my opinion or desire, and I myself was born as an animal. Because we are living nature, whether we like it or not.

There have been real cases where children, at a very young age — infants, or a year, a year and a half old, before they had fully formed — were raised by wild animals. Real-life *Mowglis*. Not the beautiful story Kipling wrote, which is wonderful, but not accurate.

These real "Mowglis" still exist — cases where children ended up with animals and were raised by them. Later, they were returned to human society. But if this happens after the age of nine — say, the child is ten and has spent eight years among wild animals — then that child *will never* (this is a fact, not just my opinion) — *never* be able to learn to speak.

That child will behave exactly like the animal that raised them — only more intelligently, because a human has much greater potential than any animal. So, the behavior will be smart, but still modeled entirely on the animal's instincts and patterns. Such a child won't even be able to learn to speak like a parrot.

It's strange, isn't it? The child's brain is completely healthy — perfectly healthy, the body is healthy — so what's the problem? The problem lies in the fact that our brain goes through specific *evolutionary stages*. Just like a plant: first roots appear, then leaves, then flowers, the flowers get pollinated, fruit begins to form, and eventually ripens. In the same way, as rational beings, humans go through a similar cycle — only we don't see literal "fruits," but we *do* see progress, forward movement.

A child's brain has the potential to move forward. But here's the issue: the experience of just one person — or even two — is *not enough* to trigger the qualitative transformations needed for the brain to shift from one developmental phase to another. That's why, during that brief "window" when a transition from one stage to the next is possible, the child's brain — each of our brains — goes through this phase. If the child is being raised within human society, then there is enough external input, enough environmental information, for that leap to occur.

All of us went through this. As children, we were like sponges — absorbing *everything*: all the sounds, the words, everything happening around us. Of course, ideally, the environment should have been of better quality, but we work with what we have. The better the surrounding environment, the better for the individual.

But even the minimal level of stimulation present in modern human society is usually enough for a child to make the transition to the *second phase* — the phase of the so-called *rational animal*. That is, the point where a person begins to think independently and act on their own. And this is where the next phase begins — when a person absorbs information and begins to act on it. It's through *action* that a person starts to change — not passively, but actively — moving step by step forward.

Unfortunately, when it comes to development, a human being is a *social animal*, a social creature. That is, a person cannot fully become a *Human* in the complete sense of the word if they live as a hermit, especially from an early age. Only human society — the accumulated experience of thousands of generations — absorbed naturally by us in childhood, makes this possible. We didn't even realize it was happening.

In the past, there was a more proper arrangement — when grandparents were involved in raising their grandchildren. They already had the life experience, the developed qualities that come with age, and the children had the raw energy. It created a symbiosis. Grandparents would absorb the *excess energy* from the grandchildren — energy that the children didn't yet know how to use. But the grandparents were strong, powerful "magnets" that helped their grandchildren develop quickly. They created *optimal conditions* for growth. The grandparents received this abundant, untapped energy — which would otherwise go to waste — and in return, they lived longer, healthier lives. Meanwhile, the children developed much faster.

But once they started putting all the kids into kindergartens — that's where the problems began, that's where the natural cycle broke down. Because in a kindergarten, unless the caregiver or teacher is a *powerful magnet*, capable of covering all the children with their energy and focus — which is not easy —

the children simply wander around, watch one another, and interfere with each other's development. They undermine what the child may have already begun to learn in the family.

Yes, we develop in a social environment. But we are *not* blind cogs, not mere screws and bolts in the machine. It's true: without absorbing the experience of thousands of generations into our brains, we *cannot* become full-fledged human beings. But once we absorb that collective experience, we start transforming into individuals — each of us beginning to pass that experience through our own consciousness.

So, *development* is not something society gives us directly — rather, we *receive* something *from* society. But once we've received it, our becoming human — in the true, deep sense — no longer depends on whether society is there or not. That part is already internal.

11.3 QUESTION: *So, does that mean there are age limitations when it comes to learning and teachability?*

ANSWER: Yes and no. You see, what I was just describing is the natural course of events: a child is born — we all go through that — and then comes the second phase, the so-called "*phase of the rational animal.*" What is the phase of the rational animal? These aren't my own words — I read it somewhere — but I really liked the phrasing, because it's very concise and precise.

What's the difference between a person in the phase of a rational animal and an actual human being? Outwardly, both look like people. But it's very simple: if a person's actions are governed by instincts, then they are a rational animal; if the person controls their instincts, then they are truly a human being.

It's actually very simple. We all have instincts — and to say a human should be some sort of shapeless, neutral being is nonsense. So, when a person passes through the phase of the rational animal, they don't become amorphous — "neither man nor woman," you know? They remain a man or a woman — *but*, unlike a rational animal, a true human being is someone who can *control* their instincts. So, the key difference between us and animals is precisely that: the ability — or inability — to govern our instincts. That's what defines the second phase.

And the third phase — that is the *true human being*, when a person is capable of *controlling their instincts*.

Yes, there are age-related "windows," so to speak, during which it is *optimal* to go through these transitions. If a child develops properly from an early age, they can move through these stages relatively quickly. But unfortunately, what has happened — and continues to happen today... When a teenager is going through what I call the "*evolutionary jungle*" — instead of helping them through it, especially nowadays, instead of, metaphorically speaking, buying them a ticket to ride through the jungle more quickly, what happens instead?

Why do young people — teenagers — react so strongly to alcohol, nicotine, or sexual promiscuity? Because that's the moment in their life that *resonates most strongly* with these experiences. They get *100% pleasure* from it — it gives them a real high. And when they're told "this is bad," they just don't understand. Yes, they *might* understand *later* — but by that time, it might already be *too late*.

I always give this example: think of smallpox in children. When smallpox appeared, sores would break out on the face. Naturally, they itch terribly, and the child *wants* to scratch. But if the child is allowed to scratch the sores — and they *really* want to — their face will be disfigured, and that's especially unfortunate for girls. What was done in the past? They would *tie the child's hands*, so they couldn't scratch their face. Of course, at that moment the child was upset — they felt it was unfair, like a form of oppression or violence. "Violating my freedom," right?

But I believe that in certain cases, this kind of *restriction* is fully justified. Not in the sense of "the child starts scratching — let's chop off their hands" — *that* would be violence. But simply *limiting their ability to harm themselves* — that's not oppression. That's *protection*.

So then, in order to prevent a young person from reaching that edge of *self-destruction* — when all of us go through these *evolutionary jungles*, which can lead to real inner damage — we must help them. The goal is to help a child or adolescent pass through that phase quickly, with minimal losses, and continue onward. But the entire system — especially in recent times, across the whole world — is deliberately structured in a way to make sure the child never passes through it.

Why? Because if a young person remains stuck in the state of the *rational animal*, they become a *conveniently controllable object* — easy to manipulate, incapable of grasping more global or holistic concepts, of seeing the bigger picture or the complexity of life. Such a person is *ideal for manipulation*. That's all. Now, yes — this is part of a natural developmental cycle. But if a person misses this crucial window of development, it becomes very difficult for them to later compensate for the damage or the gaps.

It's like this: imagine someone has a plane ticket, but chooses to finish watching a football match. They enjoy the game, but miss the plane. The same thing applies here — if a person misses that developmental "flight," they cannot, in most cases, change themselves afterward, at least not on their own.

So, what distinguishes *a true society* from the lack of one? It's individualism in the best sense — meaning, a person can receive help from *another person*. That "other" person must take them by the hand and *lead them through the phase they missed* — doing the work the individual skipped, whether consciously or (more often) completely unconsciously. To fix the damage, it must be restored and compensated for. Only after that can a person begin to move to the *next level*. So, to your question, the answer can be both "yes" and "no."

Yes — a person *can* change on their own, but it's incredibly difficult. If someone has already missed the developmental window, then trying to fix it is like trying to pull yourself out of a swamp by your own hair. Baron Münchhausen did it, but as far as we know — no one else ever has, right?

(Voice from the audience: "No fool ever thinks they're a fool. Everyone thinks they're completely rational, just a little unlucky.")

There's truth in that, too. You see, people tend to think in binary terms — *yes or no*, black or white. And yes, that's exactly how people often get drawn in by misleading teachings, like Sahaja Yoga, for example — at least from *my* point of view. I'm not saying your point of view has no value, of course — I'm just speaking from having studied the material closely, so I feel qualified to comment.

Sahaja Yoga proposes that a person doesn't need to do *anything*. People come into a hall, sit in front of the "Mother" — not a Mahatma, just a woman — and they feel a cool breeze up their spine. That's it. The moment that coolness appears — *you are saved*. You don't need to do anything. You're free from karma. All your problems are gone. You are healed. Your financial troubles have vanished. Success is here. Everyone is beautiful, happy — as they say, *blooming and fragrant*.

Do you know how many people flock to that? Thousands, tens of thousands — because they're being given an *illusion* that everything is okay. Right? They're told they don't have to do *anything*. And *that's the whole problem*. Because if you don't do anything — nothing happens.

I remember a cartoon from childhood — "*Vovka in the Faraway Kingdom*," you know the one? With the "two from the chest," remember? — "*Wait, you're going to eat for me too?*" — "*Yep.*" Well, that's exactly the idea. Sahaja Yoga is the same way — it "eats for them," too, leaving people with an illusion of "nirvana," as if they're already completely happy.

But those same people who had physical illnesses keep dying from the very same diseases they had. And their financial situations? Still going nowhere. Why doesn't anyone talk about that part? Because it's *not profitable* to admit it.

Another big problem: people have been intentionally made passive. They've been conditioned to believe that they are *imperfect*, that they're *sinful*. In various religious forms, sure — but strangely, they were never told what sin actually *is*, what karma is, or how these things really function.

If you truly understand what sin and karma mean — it's not about "*I think this is a sin, and this isn't.*" That's irrelevant. It's not about what *you* or *someone else* thinks. What matters is: does this action cause real harm? Does it affect you negatively? If yes, that's the core of the issue.

This isn't abstract. For anyone truly interested, you can download the book "*Essence and Mind*," Volume 2, from the internet. There's a chapter called "*Anatomy of Sin or the Nature of Karma*," where mechanisms are described — how every action we take affects us at the level of:

- genetics,
- essence (soul or core self),
- and cellular biology — all *three* levels.

It shows that every action leaves a mark on our condition. From this perspective, *sin* or *karma* is not about judgment — it's about what destroys what we've already developed. Actions that pull us *backward* evolutionarily are what we call sin or karma.

And many behaviors fall under that: murder, lying, betrayal, and so on — actions that cause a person to lose their "evolutionary tissue," as I call it. You can build evolutionary muscle, or you can *lose* it. Certain actions cause regression — you don't move forward, you go backward.

When a person understands that *every single action* affects them — through their genetics, and even through to their children and grandchildren — and if they understand what kind of action causes what kind of outcome, then the person becomes responsible for *who they are*.

They begin to make conscious choices, knowing: “If I do this — I accept that I’ll pay this price.” And the key is: the punishment doesn’t come from someone else. For every action, a person punishes themselves *at the very moment they act*. Whether they want to or not, whether they understand it or not — it *still happens*.

And when people start to really grasp that... I’m not saying everyone will suddenly turn into sweet, gentle little bunnies, soft and cuddly. But it *will* awaken a different level of responsibility — and with that, *conscious evolution*.

Unfortunately, no — even with all of this knowledge, many people will still act against their own best interests, choosing to harm others rather than put in the effort to change themselves. For some, it seems easier to kill someone and take what they have, rather than to work for it. “*Why work, when I can just take?*” — that kind of thinking.

But a person must understand: If I kill someone, I don’t just get the consequences from that specific act, from that person, I also create certain consequences for myself, on many levels. Once a person realizes this, then only someone who is *mentally unwell*, in my view, would still choose to act that way. Because this understanding fundamentally changes how you relate to actions and consequences.

We have to realize: the laws of nature don’t care about what we want or understand. Whether we like them, whether we agree with them, whether they are convenient or not — they are real. And they function regardless of our beliefs.

If someone doesn’t know the laws of nature — and here we’re not talking about *state laws*, but natural laws — and they act and suffer consequences, it doesn’t mean they are forgiven because they “didn’t know.” No — they still receive the result. But their *ignorance* can help explain *why* they acted that way. They can be understood, but not forgiven, in that deeper sense. Understanding doesn’t erase the consequences.

However, when a person *knows* and still acts — that is a conscious transgression. And in such cases, there can be no sympathy extended to that person. Because — and this is the most important thing — that person punishes themselves *first and foremost*. When people *truly grasp* this reality, I believe many of them would stop doing what they do — simply because they do not understand what life really is, or what happens *after* life, or what *essence* is, or what we *truly are*. There are many layers here.

But when it comes to development, I firmly believe: a person *can* and *must* evolve. And sure — someone might say: “*Well, I want to do this anyway.*” You’re free to choose. But you’re not free from the consequences of what you choose. First of all, for *any given person* to reach a certain level of ability or potential, they must work very hard, exert serious effort, create, build — only then can they rise to that level.

For example, take a material like wood. From wood, you can build a house — even a two- or three-story house. But if you try to build a *skyscraper* — say, 300 stories tall — out of wood, will it work? No. Because the wooden foundation simply cannot support the weight of the entire structure. It would collapse. So, the question arises: *Are we doomed by our foundation?* Each of us is born with a kind of “foundation” — we receive our genetics from our parents. And we didn’t “choose” it, right? Or — did we? Well, not in the conscious, voluntary way most people imagine. But at the moment of conception —

the moment our parents create the conditions for us to enter this world — our essence is drawn into *that* particular genetic combination, precisely because it resonates with our level of development.

In other words, we don't choose our parents — but our entry into a particular body happens because there's a resonance of qualities between us and them. It's not some conscious "I pick these two." In 99% of cases, this process happens automatically. The essence (or soul) that matches the quality level of that conception is pulled in and attaches to the egg cell — that's how incarnation occurs. So yes — we are born into the genetics that matches our *current* level, not by whim, but through natural resonance. And that's just scratching the surface of a much deeper topic.

It's worth saying here — and quite directly — that any abortion is truly an act of killing. Not because the *church* says so, not because of religious dogma labeling it as a sin. It *is* a sin — but for a very different, much deeper reason. Even if it's just a few fertilized cells — once development has begun, once the egg cell is active — this already means that a soul, or essence, has entered that biomatter and has begun forming a new body for itself.

Let me repeat something important, especially for those who may not have heard it before. There was a case where researchers — quite by accident — made a photograph of a buttercup seed using a specific imaging device. And to their amazement, the image showed *not only the seed*, but a fully developed buttercup plant attached to it. Even though the seed hadn't been planted, hadn't sprouted roots yet, the adult form was already imprinted and connected.

Now, if they had used a cedar seed, they wouldn't have seen the adult tree — because the size difference between the seed and the mature cedar is so vast, no device could capture it. Even if the device existed, someone would need to understand how to "scan it by levels." But with the buttercup seed, it just so happened that the imaging plate captured the entire plant — by pure chance.

And this process doesn't happen *only* with plants. It happens with humans too. Just like the buttercup seed, when a human embryo begins to grow, the biomass develops and structures itself according to the blueprint of the adult human form — guided by the essence (or soul) that enters it. The embryo doesn't develop merely because of DNA or genetics being "turned on."

If you were to replace the genetic code or "shift" the essence — the *soul* — to another one, the human form wouldn't develop properly at all. And yes, there are cases and experiments that show this — but they take time to explain, and we simply can't cover them all here.

So, when an abortion is performed, it's not just about *removing a few cells*. And it's not just *forcing the essence to leave*. It causes immense harm to the soul that had already entered that forming body. In some cases, the soul — the essence — can even be torn apart, fragmented. It can be "devoured" — just like we eat pork, lamb, or beef in a restaurant.

Because yes — essence is material too, just on a more subtle, less dense level. And if there's no specific protection in place, it's just as accessible as a physical body. Now, we can't eat one another's souls — we don't resonate on that level, so we can't interact in that way. But cannibals can eat our bodies, because those are on a material plane we *can* access. It's all about resonance of quality — a soul can only act in accordance with its developmental state. In certain destructive environments, that resonance is broken, and this allows real, often invisible, violence to happen.

So, when we speak about abortion as simply “a medical procedure” or “a few cells,” we ignore a very real and very *grave* energetic and evolutionary reality — one that affects not only the mother, but the soul, the essence, and even the subtle layers of future generations. A human essence can suffer serious harm from an abortion, because it may become prey to what are called *astral predators*. Some may have heard this term before, but for those who haven’t, I’ll explain it so it’s clear.

Astral predators are the essences of extinct animals. These are not just abstract “bad energies” — they are real, surviving *entities* that once belonged to living creatures who walked the Earth but have since died out. In order to survive after their physical extinction, these essences adapted to new conditions and became parasitic.

Over the course of evolution, many animal species went extinct. But the *essence*, the subtle consciousness or energy structure behind those animals, did not disappear. Instead, a part of them evolved into *astral parasites* — feeding on the energy of the living, especially the emotions of humans.

These entities try to:

- Attach themselves to a human host
- Feed off emotional turmoil, especially fear, pain, despair
- Consume or destroy human essences when the opportunity arises

Now, during an abortion, a vulnerable situation arises:

- The human soul has already entered the forming body
- The process of development has begun
- And suddenly, that process is violently interrupted

At that moment, the human essence may be:

- Torn out abruptly, unprepared
- Weakened, and thrown into a state of confusion or shock
- Left “wandering” between planes — neither here nor in the higher planes, because the soul can only return to the higher levels through proper death or through the completion of incarnation.

In other words, the “portal” between levels opens only during conception or death. And if neither of those paths is completed properly, the essence is trapped between worlds. Sometimes the soul, in order to escape, must even burn away part of its own structure to open a one-way exit — a massive loss that sets back its evolutionary development. This results in severe damage — and in some cases, even complete destruction. But the harm isn’t limited to the essence alone.

An abortion also creates:

- Energetic trauma in the mother
- A karmic imprint on the family line
- Weakening of the genetic matrix
- And opens the door to further parasitic infiltration — not just into the mother, but into the broader energetic structure tied to that lineage

These predators are opportunistic — and abortion, in the astral sense, is a kind of *energetic rupture*, a wound. Where there is a wound, predators gather. So, the consequences of abortion are not only biological or emotional — they are deeply metaphysical and long-reaching. Not every case ends in catastrophe, but every case carries risk, and when viewed from the perspective of essence and evolution, abortion is never “just a medical procedure.” It is a profound interference in the journey of a soul — one that affects *both* the essence trying to incarnate *and* those responsible for the event.

11.4. QUESTION: *You said that abortion affects the woman’s body because the child’s essence is destroyed or lost. Does this have an effect on the woman’s own essence in terms of karma?*

ANSWER: Of course it does — there is a destructive impact. This kind of event causes not only hormonal or physiological changes, but also qualitative energetic changes that go much deeper. When such an act occurs — especially an abortion — it creates a structure of dead matter inside the woman. And that “deadness” isn’t just physical. It leaves behind an energetic residue, a negative imprint that affects both the physiology of the woman and her own essence (soul structure).

Yes, if the woman doesn’t understand what is really happening — or the doctor performing the abortion also acts without awareness — they still incur serious karmic consequences. Because make no mistake — this is killing, and a very serious form of killing. In fact, from my point of view, it’s worse than killing an already-born human being.

Why? Because when a living adult or child is killed — yes, it is terrible — but the soul (essence) of that person is already developed enough to leave the body properly. It can return to the higher planes, complete its cycle. But when the unborn are killed — the essence cannot leave. It doesn’t have the energetic impulse or momentum (the “spike” of release) required to exit the physical plane.

So, the unborn soul is trapped, damaged, or even destroyed. And because of that, abortion becomes a far greater transgression, karmically and energetically, than even the murder of a born human — *strange as that may sound to many*. It’s a crime not only against the body, but against the very architecture of evolution, against the very structure of life trying to incarnate.

That’s why abortion isn’t just a personal matter. It carries deep metaphysical weight, and its consequences are often misunderstood or entirely overlooked in modern society. You see what women are often forced to do — driven by the hypocrisy of certain societal norms, by financial interests, or by deception. People exploit ignorance or vulnerability, and many women are left with choices they barely understand.

Now, you might say: *“But aren’t there cases where abortion is necessary — when a woman’s life is truly at risk?”* Yes, such cases do exist. Sometimes abortion becomes a necessary evil, not because someone carelessly chose it, but because the situation leaves no other option. For example, if childbirth would almost certainly lead to the death of the mother, then both lives are lost. What’s the benefit of that? In such cases, difficult as it is, preserving at least one life may be the only realistic choice.

Yes, sometimes pregnancy happens at the wrong time — in a dangerous or impossible circumstance. That *does* happen. But can help be offered in such cases? Yes — *but* it’s not enough to simply destroy a few cells. Why? Because a soul (essence) does not come into this world *just to visit*, like a tourist. It comes for a very specific evolutionary purpose — to pass through a stage, to complete a cycle.

So, if you are going to remove that soul — not just terminate the physical embryo — then the person facilitating this process must be able to do something profound: They must give the essence everything it was meant to go through during that entire lifetime — in one condensed energetic act. Yes, it's true: a person may not fulfill all of their potential in life. But if you deny them the very chance, then you take on the responsibility to compensate that loss fully.

That means:

- Taking the soul from the point where it entered
- Guiding it *evolutionarily* through the stages it was meant to experience
- Elevating it to the level it would have reached naturally — had it lived
- And *then* safely releasing it

Only then can the soul leave without pain or damage, without karmic debt, and without resentment. No universal law is violated in that case. In fact, the essence may even be *grateful*. Because it received *everything* it came for, and didn't have to endure a lifetime of struggle and suffering to get there.

A whole life — in 5 minutes. But such an act requires deep knowledge, great inner strength, and a rare level of responsibility — not just from a technical perspective, but from the level of *conscious spiritual stewardship*. That's why true resolution of such ethical and metaphysical dilemmas is possible — but only with awareness and skill, not through denial or convenience.

11.5. QUESTION: *If we've all committed questionable acts — we all have sins or negative actions in our past — how can we, starting today or tomorrow, begin life with a clean slate? What would you suggest, so we can forget yesterday and become a better, truly new person? Is that even possible for ourselves?*

ANSWER: Of course — that's an excellent question. You're absolutely right: in most cases, what has already been done is difficult to undo. Not impossible — but it requires approaches very different from what we're used to. Let's say someone can't yet act differently in every situation, but they've already decided they no longer want to act the old way, right? That's already a powerful shift.

Yes — if you stop repeating your past mistakes, if you've learned from them, and you begin to act *consciously and correctly*, then you begin to create positive substance, positive outcomes. That doesn't necessarily erase what was done in the past — but you begin to form a kind of counterweight, a balance.

You're not canceling the past — but you're compensating for it through what you now build, step by step. Even if it's slow — it's real. What matters is not magical erasure, but the direction in which you're now moving. You're not stuck in regret — you've started to generate light to offset the shadow. And that's the true beginning of transformation.

So yes — the possibility does exist to become a new version of yourself. Not by pretending the past didn't happen, but by choosing a different trajectory, and committing to it — sincerely, consistently, and with inner clarity. You can compare it to moving forward in life: One thing is walking freely, and another is walking with a 32-kilogram (two-pood) weight chained to your legs. Can you still move? Yes — but it's much harder.

Now, the more right actions you take — the more you act consciously, without harming yourself or others — you begin to lighten that burden. Those weights don't vanish immediately, but instead of 32 kg, they become 10 kg... then 9... then 8...

And more importantly — as you start generating positive momentum, you also begin to receive inner strength, support, and even external help that allows you to move forward faster. The weight might still be there, but your growing inner force can carry it more easily.

As for truly *correcting* the past — this is where many spiritual teachings fall short. For example, the Church teaches: "*Confess your sins, repent — and you're free.*" That the key thing is not the sin, but the *repentance*. But I believe that's absurd. Because what does that imply? You go out, kill someone, and then come in, sit down, cry a little, and say: "*Oh, what a scoundrel I am, how terrible, I killed someone. But now I understand! I repent with all my heart!*"

And that's it? The person comes back to life? No. And if you then pull out a fat wad of cash, someone might even say: "*Wow, you're not just forgiven — you're a saint!*" Is that right? Of course not! That's deception — a blatant and shameful lie. What's worse: it becomes a tool for self-soothing, so that people feel "cleansed," and come back with even more money to place on the altar.

But in truth? Nothing disappears. The consequences of your actions remain — in the world, in others, and most importantly, in you. You can *compensate, redeem, balance* — but only through action, through transformation, not through words or donations. Real change comes not from symbolic rituals, but from real deeds — consistent, conscious efforts to live differently, to *build* where once you destroyed. That's the only authentic path forward.

For example, let's say someone has killed another person. (We're speaking hypothetically here — not about *you*, of course, but in general.) Can such a sin, such an act, be compensated? In principle — yes. But only if one correctly understands what has actually been done.

So — what does it mean to say "*you killed a person*"? It means you took away their right, their opportunity to realize themselves in life. Now, it's entirely possible that person might never have fulfilled their potential — but you took that chance away, the possibility for them to try. That person was killed at a certain point on their timeline — but they were supposed to travel onward, reach another point, and somewhere along that path, realize what was encoded in them by nature, by destiny.

(*Voice from the audience: "What if you kill a mosquito?"*) N.V.: That's self-defense in that case.

Now — in order to remove the consequences of such an act — you must possess certain qualities. You would have to:

1. Find the essence (soul) of the person you killed
2. Restore to that soul the *evolutionary potential* they lost
3. Compensate, *to the fullest extent*, everything your action took away

Remember — potential doesn't guarantee realization. But if you took away even the *possibility*, then to correct it, you must guide that soul as far as they were meant to go — had they lived a full and proper

life, and developed naturally. Only then can you say they've been "freed" from the burden your action placed on them. And if that person has already reincarnated, then you must go even further:

- Trace all incarnations
- Compensate for every loss caused by your original act
- Support them fully until they reach the point where they would have been had the death never occurred

You see, this is not symbolic — it's not poetic guilt or vague karma. This is a real energetic and evolutionary process. And yes — it also extends back through your ancestors, through genetic memory. Because your genetic line reflects the accumulated effects of the deeds of those who came before you, for better or worse. But all of this — even ancestral burdens — can be corrected. This isn't mysticism or fantasy — it's an actual, measurable transformation.

When such restoration happens:

- Your genetics change
- Your energetic structure changes
- Even the patterns on your palms (dermatoglyphics) can change — because palm lines reflect genetic and energetic states

But... This doesn't mean you'll suddenly sprout angel wings and ascend into heaven. No. It simply means you've taken responsibility, you've repaired what was broken, and you've re-entered the stream of conscious evolution with clarity and integrity. That's true redemption — not through words, but through work.

(Audience question: "*What about soldiers? They kill too. But they're sent to do it — how does that fit in?*") That's a valid question. And yes, soldiers kill — but the situation varies greatly, and everything depends on the *motives* behind the act, the emotional state driving the person at that moment.

(Audience follow-up: "*Does it matter if they do it consciously?*") Not just consciously. Because even villains kill with full awareness — but what drives them? Greed, lust for power, hatred, cruelty.

Now compare that to a situation where someone kills an enemy who has come to murder, rape, or destroy their family and homeland. In that case, the person isn't killing because they want to, but because they feel a deep responsibility — a drive to protect others, to prevent even greater evil.

Here's the key: Every action we take is accompanied by a particular emotional quality. And that emotional frequency determines whether the action lifts us upward or drags us downward in our development. For those who are interested, this is explained in detail in "*Essence and Mind*," where I describe how our emotions influence our evolutionary trajectory.

In the case of a warrior:

- If he kills not out of hatred, but because he must protect,
- If he acts not out of bloodlust, but from a painful necessity, — then yes, it's still technically a killing, but the karmic consequences for him are minimal, or in some cases, nonexistent.

Because intention matters, awareness matters, and above all, the quality of the energy behind the action is what the universe responds to — not just the action itself.

11.6 QUESTION: *What about protection — when it comes to defending one's family? But in long-lasting wars, there are heavy losses, and people begin to feel hatred and a desire for revenge. At that point, a person wants to kill, to get revenge. How should that be understood?*

ANSWER: That's a serious problem — it marks the beginning of psychological breakdown. And it's in situations like this that a person's *true inner nature* reveals itself — "who you really are." You see, even in war, a person can still remain a human being. If someone goes to war and becomes a beast, as unfortunately does happen — then everything begins to unravel.

Why? Because they are no longer killing out of necessity, but because they've developed a desire to kill. And that — is already a crime. Once a person wants to kill, feels pleasure or justification through hatred or revenge, then they've crossed a crucial internal line. At that point, the external conditions of war no longer excuse the action — because now the motivation is not defense, but indulgence in destruction.

This is why war doesn't just test bodies — it tests *souls*. It shows whether you still carry *humanity* within you, or whether you've surrendered to the lowest impulses. So, even in war, motive and inner state matter deeply — because they determine whether your actions lead to evolution or to degradation.

11.7. QUESTION: *Children are born, we raise them, love them... But then, after some time, some parents end up regretting — "Why did it turn out this way? It would have been better if this child had never been born." That happens too. Why?*

ANSWER: There are several layers to this. First, parents — as much as they love and nurture — unfortunately only provide the biological form, the *body* of the child. The essence (or soul) that enters that body brings with it its own consciousness, its own level of development, understanding, and perception.

That's why such regrettable situations happen — because parents often don't understand this one crucial thing: Yes, *they* brought a child into the world biologically — but they did not create the personality or the essence of that child. That personality can be shaped or "polished" to a degree — through education, love, guidance — but the soul still undergoes its own internal stages of development, learning, change, or resistance.

Sometimes parents pour their best into their child — good intentions, strong values, deep love — and yet the child does not turn out the way they hoped. Just look at serial killers, rapists, or violent individuals — they, too, had mothers. And we can reasonably assume those mothers did not wish for their children to become such people. No one wants that.

But these things happen not because the parents wished it, but because during conception, for various possible reasons, the essence that entered the body was one of a much lower level — primitive, corrupted, or evolutionarily negative. In other words: The quality of the soul that incarnates can be very low — and this is often beyond the parents' control. Their love is real. Their efforts are real. But the soul itself may not be ready or willing to grow in the way that would lead to harmony.

So, when people say "*I wish this child had never been born,*" it often comes from a place of heartbreak, not hatred. But the root cause isn't the birth itself — it's the disconnect between what the parents gave, and what the soul brought with it. That's why conscious conception and spiritual preparation for parenthood is so critical — not just biologically, but energetically, emotionally, and karmically.

(*Voice from the audience: "So, would it better to have an abortion?"*) No. Absolutely not. The minimum risk of attracting a low-level essence — and the best chance for a high-level, evolved essence to enter — is when a child is conceived in love. Not out of instinct, not out of a primitive, animalistic drive, but when the parents truly love each other. There's a fundamental difference between mechanical intimacy, what is commonly called "sex," and genuine love.

Unfortunately, people today are rarely taught that difference. Modern culture has equated sex with love, reducing love to a physical act. But love — real love — may *include* physical closeness, but it is something vastly deeper.

When two people come together in genuine, soul-filled love — when they dissolve into one another, not out of lust or hormones, but because of something sacred — then the energy field they create during conception is pure and strong. That's the kind of condition under which a high-level soul — a bright, strong essence — will choose to incarnate. Because essence responds to resonance — and high-vibrational love creates a resonant portal for a higher soul to enter.

Now unfortunately, the system that dominates society today — especially in recent years — has made this almost impossible. Why? Because children and teens are being pushed into early sexual activity, long before their psyche, emotions, and energy fields are ready. And when this happens:

- They never learn what true connection between man and woman *can* be
- They lose the capacity to feel deeply
- They become like the blind, unable to sense the true scent, taste, or vision of love

In other words: they're blinded, not physically, but emotionally and spiritually. They're taught that the cheap surrogate they've been given is love — when in truth, it's only a fragment, a shadow of what's possible. So no, the answer is not abortion. The answer is: conscious conception, true love, real education — and the restoration of sacred understanding between man and woman.

Indeed, if children were truly raised properly, much could be changed — but for that to happen, we must first give people the understanding of fundamental distinctions: That there's a difference between true emotional connection — when people genuinely love each other — and mere instinct, which drives people to act out of biological impulses. These are *not the same thing*. And failing to make that distinction leads to enormous consequences.

For example: Parents who consume alcohol or other harmful substances (drugs, nicotine — even if to a lesser extent) before conception — and unfortunately, this is *very common* — end up contributing to a degraded energetic environment at the moment of conception. A child conceived under the influence of alcohol or narcotics is likely to attract a low-level essence — a soul of primitive or weakened quality — simply because the resonance at that moment matches only that level.

A number of factors influence the moment of conception. The first factor is the genetics of the parents. The second factor is whether the parents truly love each other or are simply having sex—feelings matter. Then comes the influence of negative substances—alcohol, drugs.

The location of conception can also have a negative or positive impact, because every place on Earth has its own energy, whether we like it or not. There may be a very negative zone, and a person might not know or understand it, but it still affects them.

The stars also have an influence — not in the way astrologers usually interpret, but they do have an effect. Environmental conditions also play a role, as do stressful experiences prior to conception. Stress depletes a person; they become empty, meaning evolutionarily lacking in the necessary qualities.

All of these factors, taken together, creates a situation — a superposition of all the conditions and qualities — and it determines which kind of essence (soul) will be attracted and what level of evolution that soul brings into the world.

This is why conscious conception, done with understanding, love, and care, is *one of the most sacred acts a human can perform*. It is not just the beginning of a life — it is the gate through which a soul enters the world. And what kind of soul enters depends largely on the consciousness of the parents at the moment they open that gate.

People, more often than not, don't think about these things — and that's the real tragedy. Because if they *did* understand, if they *knew* what was truly at stake, then many of the misfortunes and mistakes we see wouldn't happen at all.

Let me share a somewhat *amusing* example related to essences (souls) — one that happened to me personally. I was giving a talk in Arkhangelsk. Now, most people aren't actually interested in knowledge — though they often don't realize this. But ignorance doesn't change the nature of reality. Many people came not for learning, but to be healed — so I combined both: teaching and energy work.

I conducted mass sessions, where I worked on the entire audience simultaneously. Some people came just to watch — like it was a circus show. So, I developed a method to ensure that every type of person who came — whether they sought healing, understanding, or entertainment — would receive what they were looking for... *plus* something they hadn't asked for, but actually needed.

It turned out to be a very effective approach. Because once people received *what they thought they wanted*, it opened them up to go much deeper — they started searching for things they didn't know they were missing.

Now, during one of these sessions, I was working with everyone at once — just conducting a full-scale energetic impact across the entire audience. Of course, you can't do everything in a single session, but for many people, even that was a major breakthrough or healing.

After a mass session, there was usually some overload for certain individuals — typically 20–30 people out of several hundred (there were 500–600 present) would be knocked out, that is, in a coma or a state of clinical death. It was a massive energetic overload for their system. But it wasn't as dangerous as it might sound — the key was simply to return them to normal as quickly as possible. So, I would walk

around the hall, personally bringing people back after they had gone into overload — reviving them, so to speak.

And here's the important part: Many of them came just for "entertainment" or "healing," but left with an entirely new sense of who they were — because their essence had been touched, awakened, or shaken out of stagnation. Sometimes, the path to knowledge starts in very unexpected places — even in the middle of what someone thought was just "a show." Here's the story, a rather curious and telling case.

At one of my mass sessions, someone came up and told me: *"There's a girl over there, she's not well."* I approached — and saw she had completely blacked out, slipped into a coma-like state. And what is a coma in this context? It's when the body becomes empty — the essence (soul) has left the body due to overload or some other trigger. Normally, I would just *grab* the essence — figuratively speaking, "by the scruff of the neck" — put it back into the body, seal it in, and move on.

So, I did that. Put her essence back in. Took a step away — and *boom* — she's out again. Put her back in a second time. Started to walk away — *boom* again, out. I thought, *what's going on here?* I have others to help — I can't be stuck here. So, I paused and established telepathic contact with the essence to see what the issue was. And the soul said to me, in our terms: "Thank God, you freed me from this stupid body! I'm so glad!"

Turned out, this was a female essence of rather high development, much more evolved than the physical girl she had incarnated into. Frankly, the girl's face didn't show any signs of intellectual refinement — and the soul couldn't *fully express* itself in this incarnation. When the energetic overload hit — it basically gave her an escape window, and she jumped at the chance.

(Audience: *"But you still had to put her back in?"*) Of course. I told her: "No, dear. This is your body — now go and work. Unfold yourself, make it happen." And this time, now that I understood the cause, I reinserted the essence and properly anchored her in the body — and everything went back to normal. It was a very clear example, quite fascinating.

You see, the essence had reached a fairly high level of evolution, and had chosen or been drawn into a body that had the genetic capacity to support her development. But — she couldn't *manifest* her potential. Whether due to her social environment, upbringing, trauma, or something else — maybe she lost her parents, maybe she was raised without proper guidance — I didn't investigate the life story in detail.

But what was clear was this: She couldn't unfold her potential, and her soul was frustrated by that. She felt trapped in a life where nothing resonated with who she truly was. And that's an important reminder for all of us: Even a powerful essence, if placed in the wrong circumstances — the wrong body, the wrong environment — can find itself stifled, disconnected, and wasted unless it has the strength, will, and tools to push through. In this case, though, the return was made — and perhaps, just perhaps, after that experience, the integration could begin.

So, the task of every person is to realize themselves to the fullest, as far as their potential allows. It would be great if we all did that, of course. But if we do nothing, then nothing will happen at all. So, we

must act — even if it's imperfect, even if it's just a start. Some people say: “*Well, tell me what to do, and I'll do it.*” That *can* work — but it comes with a serious limitation.

For example, there are people with photographic memory. They can read something once and remember it perfectly. But they don't understand what they've memorized. They simply repeat it mechanically, without inner comprehension. And *that* is very dangerous. Because, from my point of view, a person must act consciously. A person must understand: what they are doing, why they are doing it, and what responsibility they carry for their actions.

Only then does real development take place. Sure, you can take someone, sit them down, and transport them from one planet to another — (speaking both literally and metaphorically — yes, I've done both) — but just because someone has *gone along for the ride* does not mean they understand how to make that journey themselves.

Some people have seen me perform deep brain transformations, and even though I've tried to explain in basic terms what's happening, they still walk away thinking: “*What's so special? I can do this too.*” But what they don't realize is that when I work with someone's brain, I do it with a full protocol, an internal test, a structured process. I embed a program — “If I get *this* result, it means *this* happened. If not — I recalibrate.”

And I don't distract the person with the technical layers — I might just ask: “*Do you see this?*” And if the person says “*Yes, I see it,*” that tells me a specific neurological shift has taken place. But that's only the tip of the iceberg. I've brought it up to that level for ease of interaction, but what most people don't realize is that this surface reaction is just a signpost. Not the work itself.

Others see this and think: “*Oh, I'll just saturate the brain with energy, create some rainbow glow around it — voilà!*” But the fact that someone sees a “rainbow” around their brain doesn't mean that the brain itself has changed and is producing that energy on its own. They confuse external visuals with inner transformation. They think: “*Oh wow, I saw a light — everything's done!*”

But then — they go out and start messing with things, and end up doing such damage that I've had to step in and rescue both them and those they harmed. It's happened more than once. So yes — you can help others, you can even learn to work at deep levels — but only if you have absolute clarity about what is being done, why, and how. That understanding — precise, conscious, and responsible — is not optional. It is the foundation of any real work with transformation, energy, or consciousness. From my point of view, a person must act, and not just sit around waiting for the weather to change at the edge of the sea.

Now, you might say: “*But what if I misunderstand something? What if I draw the wrong conclusion and do the wrong thing?*” Yes — that's entirely possible. But if you make the effort to truly think things through before acting — to immerse yourself, to try to comprehend deeply — then even if you do make a mistake, you will at least understand where and why you went wrong, and you'll be able to correct yourself. And that is evolution. Of course, it's ideal to make the right judgment from the start — and that is indeed possible — but not always. When it happens, that's called right action — action based on awareness.

Now, as for development — Yes, it is possible and even necessary. And that brings us back to the metaphor I started earlier — the wooden foundation. You see, you can't build a high-rise tower on a wooden base. It simply won't support the weight — not even the weight of more wood, let alone something heavier.

But here's the key question: *What if your “foundation” — your genetics, your starting conditions — just don't allow you to realize the qualities you want?* You were born with what you were born with. We don't get to choose that directly... at least not in the usual sense. But there *is* a way forward. If someone wants to go beyond what nature gave them, they must change their foundation. That can happen in two ways: someone else helps them change it (if they have the right knowledge and ability) or they do it themselves.

If they manage to do that — then they can go far beyond what was originally “written” into them. Because the truth is: Human evolution is limitless. The only limit to your growth is your own refusal to move forward. As long as a person continues to search for solutions, to find ways to overcome the challenges in front of them, they will keep progressing — and there will be no ceiling, no cap, no final wall. The key, once again, is simple: “Keep those brain cells working.” That's it. No one will do it for you — but you *can* do it.

(*Voice from the audience: “How do you get those brain cells working, then?”*) You do it by learning to trust yourself more, and, most importantly, by avoiding mental templates — pre-set patterns of thinking that were *given to you*, not discovered by you.

For example, from a very early age, I never accepted anything on blind faith, no matter who said it — no matter how much “authority” they claimed to have. Not because I was arrogant or rebellious, but because I had a simple principle: *“If something is stated as true, it must be explained. Otherwise, it is just noise.”*

If someone says: *“That's how it is — because that's how it is.”* — that has never been acceptable to me. If you're going to make a claim, you must be able to justify it, either to me or to anyone else asking sincerely. And if you can't explain it, then — in my view — you don't have the right to speak about it as truth. That's my position. Am I right? Am I wrong? That's a separate question. But this is what I hold to for myself.

And here's the most important point: A person must begin to ask questions for themselves. Not to impress others. Not to fit in. But because they genuinely want to understand. And of course — especially early in life, especially as children — it's hard to figure everything out on your own. So yes, it's perfectly natural to ask someone else for explanations. Even if the explanation they give you is flawed, as long as it's coherent, it can still be a step forward.

Because knowledge doesn't just appear from nowhere. You don't wake up one morning and *bam!* — suddenly you know everything. That's not how it works. Everything happens step by step, layer by layer. And even if a person understands just a tiny fragment of something — if they gain even a moment of clarity, of insight — that little flash can allow them to re-examine the entire structure of what they thought they knew.

The problem is this: A person gets that first insight, but then doesn't take the time to review and reassess their entire foundation. They just add the new piece onto the old structure — and stay stuck in the same limited framework. That — right there — is the biggest danger. True development begins when you don't just accept new pieces, but when you're willing to revise the whole foundation, to challenge everything, even the "sacred cows" you've carried for years. And *that* is how you really start to use your brain.

So, if you truly grasp the essence of something and shift from a certain point, then from this new position you must re-examine everything else — your entire worldview and perception. You review it and raise the entire foundation to a new level, which allows you to see even further, to penetrate even deeper, leading to more enlightenment. And by completely changing your perception, you continue moving further and further.

(A voice from the audience: "*So, the more people begin to understand, the better? Have you tested this in practice? Does collective consciousness change?*")

Of course. But again, public consciousness exists in the sense of Hegel's concept — and it's only negative. It is the state of the crowd, which is deliberately created to turn a human being into cattle. Not to turn cattle into a human, but the opposite — to turn a human into cattle. And there are plenty of examples of that.

The state of the crowd is the state of a super-organism. For primitive creatures (bees, ants, etc.), this is a positive evolutionary adaptation. But for humans, this state is negative. And unfortunately, those who understand this (and such people have always existed) find ways to influence and use people, forcing crowds to do what they want.

11.8 Question: *You mentioned that if people are on a sufficiently high spiritual level, have already risen to a higher level, and there are many of them in one place — for example, they are flying in a plane, in an enclosed space, and an accident is supposed to happen — could they stop the accident with their energy? Does such a theory have a right to exist?*

Answer: The answer is both yes and no. First of all, there are different ideas about what high spiritual development means — everyone puts their own meaning into that term. And secondly, it doesn't depend on the number of people. That is, it doesn't matter whether there are a hundred people or a thousand — one person is enough if that person can influence or affect the process.

You probably know that the ships that periodically come to our planet (for those present here, this is no secret) — this is a reality, not the ravings of madmen. If you've read about it, you know that these ships never have more than six crew members — the minimum is four, the maximum is eight, six is optimal. Why? Because these ships are controlled by the psi-field of a person.

Let's say one person has a certain level of potential. If we gather ten people, in theory, we'd get ten times more potential — but simple arithmetic doesn't work here. Yes, if you could just add up the potential of ten people, that would be great. But with each additional person, the risk of desynchronization increases. Therefore, in order for all of this to work and for the power to increase, those ten people would have to function as a single whole — they'd have to be able to withstand loads equally, to respond to the situation equally, as if they were copies, as if they were twins.

And even twins are not always one hundred percent identical. You see, if that unity is not there, the slightest misalignment can lead to disaster. That's why the number of pilots is limited to such a number. Because beyond that, the risk of catastrophe increases many times over. And if, as you say, a hundred spiritually advanced people started meditating so that the plane wouldn't crash — the meditation wouldn't help at all. But if someone could understand what was happening and intervene, adjust the instruments, correct the cause — then that would be possible. So, the answer is both yes and no.

You see, we are used to simple, clear-cut questions — a clear answer for a clear question. But in reality, there are billions of nuances, and in each situation, there might be a nuance that never occurs again in exactly the same way. It's the same with a person: a person in a different situation will already be different. They have drilled into us that we must all be the same — even think the same.

(A voice from the audience: *"Should a person's age be greater?"*) And for what purpose? ("Well, it was written somewhere that people used to live up to 150 years, and they had children at an older age.")

If you're referring to the Bible, it says there that people lived 900 years or more. But the Bible is of special interest because the events described in it took place four thousand years ago — real events. So, in order to fill in the gaps, they had to assign each person a thousand years so everything could be laid out in order.

Now here's a question: people sitting here in the audience are of completely different ages, but what do you think — what is the biological age of the cells in our bodies? It varies, but no more than fifteen years, because the full cycle of cell replacement is fifteen years.

That is, a man or woman who is 90 years old — the age of their cells is the same as that of a fifteen-year-old boy, you see? But they look completely different. So, the body ages not because the cells have worn out, but because other processes occur that cause the very same cell life cycles to function quite differently.

So, it is possible to live longer — but is it necessary? After all, death is the beginning of life. We don't die just to die; we die in order to move on to the next stage, if that is necessary. That's why freezing oneself and living for a thousand years, for example, is actually real evolutionary death. Life only has meaning (continuing in the same body) if a person has found a way to change themselves without having to die.

When a person can change themselves without shedding their outer shell — and can change their outer shell — then they don't need to die. And if a person has reached such a level, then of course they don't need to go through death. But if a person hasn't reached that level and just clings to and preserves their outer shell, it will only slow down their progress forward.

11.9 Question: *How do you assess the development of humanity 100,000 years ago? Is it completely getting worse, improving? Over the past thousand years, over the last 200 or 300 years, have people become kinder, better?*

Answer: I can say the following. Of course, I can't speak with full certainty about 100,000 years ago or a thousand years ago. I can only assume based on what I know about it. I don't know everything about everything, but I do know something about what happened a thousand years ago, 100,000 years ago,

and even earlier. So, I can say this: whether people were kinder or not — people were simply different 100,000 years ago.

Our ancestors had a completely different philosophy, a completely different worldview. By the way, this worldview in Russia was destroyed in 1775, if we speak in today's calendar. In 1775 in Russia. Again, no matter what you touch on, you end up coming back to history, to the "same old story."

I have the first volume of the 1771 edition of the British Encyclopedia, which describes all the countries as they were understood at that time. And everything else seems correct, right? But when it comes to Russia, some very interesting things emerge. There is no mention of a Romanov Russian Empire stretching from the western borders, from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific — not on the maps, not in the descriptions.

Up to 1771, the territory controlled by the Romanovs was called Muscovite Tartary or Muscovy. In my article, I've already included an actual map — the border clearly ran in the south to the Dnieper rapids, at that level across the territory; in the north — the Arkhangelsk region. Right here where your city is, that's where the border of Muscovite Tartary ran. It went slightly touching the Northern Urals, then along the Volga, stopping short of the Caspian Sea — that's where the border ended. That was the small territory they controlled. All of this came after the conquests of Peter I, which was in 1717, that the Romanov dynasty controlled. And the same was true under Catherine II.

(A voice from the audience: "But there was Kievan Rus'.") No, in 1771, after Peter I, while fighting the Swedes, annexed part of what's now called Ukraine — that's all that's shown, no more. And all of Siberia, the Far East — none of it belonged to any Romanov dynasty. On that territory, which in the British Encyclopedia is described as the largest country in the world, lived the same Russian people, who spoke the same language — only their worldview was different: it was Vedic.

The last remnants of the Vedic worldview were destroyed in 1775, during a war — a world war of that time, in my view, the position of the Romanovs was treacherous toward Russia. The Romanovs were put in place with Western money and had no rightful claim to it. According to the Rank Book (Discharge Book), the Romanovs had no right whatsoever to take the Moscow throne. Moreover, the Moscow throne itself was just a breakaway province of that same empire.

In fact, there never was any so-called Mongol-Tatar yoke — it simply didn't exist. Do you consider yourselves Mongols? Does anyone here think they have Mongol blood? Read Gumilyov — he wrote an interesting bit about this. He studied China and so-called Mongolia. And when Soviet power came to Mongolia and established socialist rule there, I think in 1923, they told the Mongols: "Do you know that you had Genghis Khan, who ruled the whole world?" And they said: "Really? Oh, we like that!"

In Mongolia, no one had ever heard of Genghis Khan or that he ruled the world. And why? Because those who are called modern Mongols have no connection whatsoever to those who entered history under that name.

Gumilyov, in his research, discovered that the tribes of modern Mongolia have traditions, legends about batyrs (warriors). But there is not a single legend or epic tale about Genghis Khan, or about his companions — there never was, and still isn't. Doesn't that strike you as strange?

First of all, “Mongol” is actually a mispronunciation of *Mogol*. It’s a Greek word, meaning “great.” And it was our ancestors who were called *mogols* — they were the ones who always and everywhere thoroughly defeated those Greeks. And the Greeks called them great.

The distortion began after the Romanov era — there were a lot of distortions. They deliberately destroyed all traces. Read that same Gumilyov — he describes (though perhaps he didn’t fully grasp everything, maybe he didn’t have enough information, or maybe he just didn’t think about it) — he gives the example that in the so-called Mongol-Tatar armies, 80% of the warriors were Slavs. Not bad, right?

Yes, there were other nationalities too, who lived on the territory of what we now call modern Russia, but they made up about the same proportion as they do now. In modern Russia, about 89% or 81% are ethnically Russian, and all the other ethnic groups together account for just a small percentage — just as it was back then. Naturally, there were both in the army. But just because there are Buryats, Kazakhs, Uzbeks serving in the Russian army today doesn’t mean we can say the entire Russian army is made up of Uzbeks and Kazakhs.

It’s interesting that Gumilyov writes about Genghis Khan’s appearance — a description that still exists today. He had blue eyes, a European-looking face, light reddish hair, and a thick beard. Can you find even one modern Mongol who comes close to that description?

You’ve probably heard that not long ago, on the territory of northern China, they found the mummified body of a Scythian warrior. A Scythian warrior whose type, body, were completely Slavic — even the weapons, everything was absolutely the same as the Scythians who lived in Crimea.

So, these territories were always inhabited by our ancestors. And what is described in modern history as the Mongol-Tatar yoke is nothing other than Kievan Rus, whose throne was unlawfully seized by the Rurik dynasty. Although I myself have some connection to the Rurikids, that doesn’t change the fact. They made it their hereditary domain and broke away.

Now, for example, Ukraine has united with Russia. And what, Ukraine always existed from beginning to end? That’s absurd, you see? In principle, the current division into the Russian and Ukrainian peoples is the work of an enemy, because the Ukrainian language as such never existed — it’s a dialect.

Who can say when the first work was written in Ukrainian? *Kobzar* by Shevchenko — that is, around the 1830s. Was there a single work written in Ukrainian before that? Not one. All books were written in Russian. Yes, there is Church Slavonic, but it has no relation to either the Russian or Ukrainian language — that’s a separate matter.

What was done? In order to divide a single people, they took the Russian alphabet 100%, Russian grammar, and with their help recorded the southern Russian dialect, which contains many Polish, German, and Hungarian words — and that’s it. They made a new people and then began pitting them against each other. That’s how the Ukrainian people appeared. But now people shout that Ukraine has always existed.

Kievan Rus was one of the provinces of the Slavic Empire, which included not only the entire territory of the Soviet Union, but also most of China up to the Great Wall (which was never built by the Chinese), a

large part of Tibet, and much of North America. That was the Empire — and almost all of Europe was part of this Empire.

But as the Night of Svarog began — if you've read my article, if not, take a look, I think it's written in an interesting way — where people in power were morally and ethically unworthy, the negative influence of the Night of Svarog affected them the most. These people became deformed and turned into monsters quite quickly and began to break away from the Empire.

And the Kiev province, or the Kiev Khaganate (another name for it, it was called a province or governorate in those days), broke away from the Empire. And what did that mean? It meant they stopped sending 10% in taxes to the Metropolis (which was Asgard Iriysky — today called Omsk) and also stopped sending every tenth boy to serve in the army.

Just look at the Cossacks, and you'll have a complete idea of what the so-called Mongol-Tatar army really was. The region of southern Western Siberia — which, for some reason, was handed over to Kazakhstan — KazakStan means "Cossack camp," and the Kazakhs have nothing to do with it. The word *Kazakh* itself only appeared in the 20th century after the revolution, when those people who had called themselves *Kaisaks* were, for some reason, renamed Kazakhs.

There was a headquarters there where young boys were taken at the age of seven. Every tenth boy, regardless of nationality, living in the Empire's territory, was given to the professional army, where from the age of seven he was taught the military arts — because a professional warrior obviously doesn't just appear in a day.

This army was stationed in the area of the southern Russian steppes, in what is now Western Siberia. It was called *Cossack Camp* because it required several hundred thousand, even up to several million, horses that needed pasture — and that was the ideal place for this. And every tenth boy was sent there, where they would serve, train, and fight.

The Kiev *khagan* or prince (he became a prince only after seizing power — before that, he was just an appointed administrator, i.e., an elected official), having seized power, refused to pay the 10% tribute and to send the children.

In other words, he broke away from the Empire, from the Metropolis — just as many western regions had done before that. Naturally, any Metropolis — both then and now — tries, if that happens, to restore order, right? And so, an army was sent to punish the rebels.

That's precisely why such absurdities arise — where many Russian princes supposedly sided with those very Mongol-Tatars. The chronicles write without much explanation: these princes sided here, those princes sided there — because most princes didn't want to go against ancient customs and traditions.

You can find this in the works of Fomenko and Nosovsky — *The New Chronology of Rus, England, and Ancient Rome*, where they show Hungarian engravings supposedly depicting the Mongol-Tatar army that allegedly defeated Kievan Rus and advanced as far as Hungary, where it stopped and went no further.

Well, if you look at those Hungarian engravings, how the Hungarians depicted the Mongol-Tatars, you'll recognize our Russian Cossacks — the clothing is 100% accurate. They depicted their own people

precisely — so why would they depict those others incorrectly? What difference would it make to them who those people were? Do you think they knew what Mongols looked like? Do you think they knew who had come to them? No, they depicted what they actually saw.

And something else interesting from Gumilyov: he writes that Genghis Khan had a military code that was translated into Russian from Chinese and Persian. But what's curious is that the same Gumilyov writes that Genghis Khan, after supposedly conquering a literate people, made all his subjects literate and required that in all courts, all matters be conducted and recorded in that language.

Now imagine that we had an empire — how many courts, how many government offices would there have been? The government orders must have been written in some language, right? There must have been tens of thousands of documents, correct? Do you think even one of those documents exists? There is one. And do you know what language that document is written in? In Russian. Interesting, isn't it?

In that same Europe, all the literate *khans* — and *khan* is like a general-colonel, for example, it's a military title, Genghis Khan wasn't his name, it was his title — all the charters that the so-called *khans* of the Golden Horde sent to all the Western states were written in Russian. These documents have survived to this day. So, simply put, it was a civil war — a rebellious province trying to defend its independence.

Do you know when Kiev became Kiev? The Kiev that exists now is the third Kiev. And do you know where the second Kiev was? Have you ever heard of Ruskholan? That's the North Caucasus — that was another province, and its center was the second Kiev, not the first. And its location was very close to what is now Pyatigorsk. That was where it was situated several thousand years before Kievan Rus.

One could talk endlessly about how we're deceived, how they feed us lies about how primitive we all supposedly were. Just take, for example, the surviving letters of Princess Anna, daughter of Yaroslav the Wise, when she became the queen of France, and the "*delight*" she expressed upon arriving in Paris. Haven't read them? You should. She describes it as being exiled to the most remote province, like to Tmutarakan. (Although Tmutarakan, by the way, was actually located on the territory of Ruskholan.)

She writes that it was just a large village where there were almost no literate people. And this was supposed to be the center of civilization? She, arriving from "wild" Rus, could read and write in several languages — and of course not just that, you understand? And the only entertainment of her husband, the King of France, was hunting and throwing bones to his dogs in his castle. That was the level of intellect.

And the famous phrase of the *Sun King* — Louis XV: "*A true Frenchman bathes twice in his life: when he is born and when he dies.*" A high culture, indeed! And do you know why perfumes and cologne were invented?

(A voice from the audience: "So it wouldn't stink.") Exactly — because the stench from the court ladies was so strong that only by pouring on a whole bottle of perfume could it be masked. That was their culture — noblemen of the 17th century, not all of them of course, but many couldn't even read or write. That's supposed to be such high culture, right?

Few people know that during the Christianization of Rus in the 12th century, when it was especially intense, more than 30% of the cities in Russia — or rather, in Kievan Rus, which was a province that had broken away — were destroyed. And that's just according to the documentary evidence that everyone agrees on. And do you know what the West called the territory of Kievan Rus at that time? The land of heraldry — meaning the land of cities — more than 500 cities.

(A voice from the audience: "And for a time the lords lived in that castle... (inaudible), then moved to another.") Exactly. Even the simplest peasant in Rus had an outhouse for thousands of years, but for them it was difficult to figure out. It's true that later they learned a lot from us — but for some reason they never admit that they learned it from us.

I'll finish with what I started. In my book in the second volume, I show the underwater part of the iceberg — that is, where humanity came from, where different races came from, what they brought, and what forces intervened. I show the cosmic phenomena that were reflected on Earth as well. The wars — the Star Wars that lasted more than a hundred thousand years, in which Earth also took part, how this manifested on Earth, what it led to — a catastrophe more than thirteen thousand years ago, as a result of which Earth's civilization was thrown back to the level of savagery.

I show that man was neither created by God nor did he come from apes, because the Neanderthal is incompatible with modern man, but that humans colonized the Earth — they came from other planets. In my book, I clearly show that the Old Testament and describe the same processes, just from completely different perspectives: from the point of view of the victors and the point of view of the defeated.

The victors at that time were our ancestors; the defeated were those who created the Old Testament. The program of the victors and the program of the defeated are shown, and as long as the defeated are planning to take revenge — which they have already carried out — the instructions for how and what are laid out quite precisely in the Old Testament. That's one part of the book.

And then the second part — when I show everything in the context of the past, I explain what geopsychology is, that is, how the climatic conditions in which a person exists affect him and his development. And also, the concept of psycho-economics. That is, every kind of activity a person engages in influences him very strongly, because every action leaves an imprint on the person and contributes to his development in one direction or another.

In the book, I give a full, comprehensive picture of this and show everything from the distant past to the present day, ending with the revolution in Russia and also recent events, when the economic system collapsed in 1995-1996. The complete liberation from it occurred in 1992-1993 — this aspect, all of this is revealed and shown. When everything is presented in this way, any event occurring in human society can no longer be interpreted however one likes. Each event becomes unambiguous — that is, it is defined by this entire spectrum of events and situations, and it can no longer be interpreted however someone wants.

Yes, there is a role for individuals in history, but a particular person can either accelerate this process or slow it down; however, without fundamentally restructuring the foundation, it is impossible to change the process itself. Nevertheless, they do alter it — they speed up the historical process, but they do not change the process itself. That is, the process becomes crystal clear; it becomes obvious why certain

events occurred: the revolution of 1917, the Mazdak revolution in Persia in the 6th century — why, who was behind all this, who did it. And so, it becomes transparent from those days to modern times — all the murkiness disappears.

But to achieve this, it was necessary to consider everything in a comprehensive manner — including genetics, physiology, psychology, geopsychology, and psycho-economics. All of this I examine and show that any historical event is nothing other than the result of the complex interaction of all these primary causes taken together. And the given event is the inevitable result of a particular process. And to change something — one must change the entire process. Without changing the process, it cannot be changed, only slowed down or sped up.

The same Prince Svyatoslav of Kiev, by destroying Khazaria, did not change the process; he slowed it down, delaying it by almost a thousand years. And if that had not happened, it is quite possible that things would have been much worse — it is quite possible that neither the country nor we ourselves would exist today. Nevertheless, he merely changed the situation, altered the tactics of our enemies. Do you understand what the problem is? Our enemies change their tactics when they are struck, but our ancestors did not change their tactics, and this was their great mistake, in my opinion. But I hope there will be no more such mistakes.

11.10. QUESTION: *Who are our enemies?*

ANSWER: The enemies are social parasites. I specifically introduce this concept, explain what a social parasite is, who these individuals are, and what groups they represent. In my book, in order to describe and explain who the social parasites are, I used the Old Testament, the Torah, the Slavic Aryan Vedas and a number of other real documents that, by chance or not entirely by chance, ended up in my hands.

(Voice from the audience: "And why did Asgard Iriy fall?") Asgard Iriy fell again because our ancestors were stagnant. I can say the following: Asgard Iriy stood for almost 108,000 years and fell in 1565 according to our calendar. The reason was that the Dzungars came, destroyed it, and left. But enemies had approached its walls more than once before, and nothing had happened. The point is that, in addition to the walls that surrounded the city, there was a certain energy-based defense.

Has anyone heard of Shambhala, which no one could penetrate? There was a field, and the same kind of protection surrounded Asgard Iriy. No enemy with the intention of causing harm — even in their thoughts — could pass through the protective barrier. That is, if you had no ill intent, you could pass freely, but if you had bad thoughts, so to speak, you couldn't get through.

This protection was established and maintained by a group of high-ranking *volkhvs* (sages or priests). And here's what happened. One of the *volkhvs*, a good person himself, pure, on our side, so to speak — a light one — had, when he was still a child, a sort of "Trojan horse" implanted in him, a kind of virus, let's put it that way. He had been selected as a talented individual for evolutionary advancement and had reached the highest levels.

And when the enemies approached — he didn't even know about it — they simply activated this virus in him because he had taken part in creating the shield. And the shield lost its power; it was deactivated. He had no part in it himself — he walked around as a carrier of this virus that the enemies had implanted. They, of course, dynamically try to find options, but one must be dynamic in observing,

investigating, and not allowing such things. As a result of such overconfidence — thinking they had calculated everything and nothing could happen...

In principle, this happened quite recently and is connected with the fact (if you read the Vedas) that only *volkhv*-guardians remained, and guardians are always conservative by nature. Their task is to preserve; they do not think, they only safeguard. When a person is focused on preservation, they become a conservative. And most likely, when for thousands of years they were conservators, and this was passed down, it left an imprint on those who were *volkhvs*, and therefore they could no longer see beyond the conventional screens that had been accepted.

This became the reason for the fall of Asgard Iriy, if we put it briefly. The person who was used was simply a toy in the hands of the forces that implanted such a virus in him when he was just a small child. If the same were done to any of you, and if you didn't know that such a thing existed or how to fight it, didn't even suspect it existed — do you understand what happened?

(A voice from the audience: *"Are there methods of protection from such things?"*) There are, of course.

(A voice from the audience: *"For that, one needs to develop oneself, right?"*) Yes.

(A voice from the audience: *"Tell us, what does it mean to 'carry out the evolution' of a person after killing them? To imagine some kind of life they could have lived?"*)

No. Let's say a person lives and is supposed to realize themselves, their potential. So, if a person realizes themselves, their potential, their essence changes through that realization — meaning it shifts from this point to a higher point. To compensate for this means for the person working to release the karma to carry that essence from this point to a higher one. Instead of the essence doing it itself. Because, you see, evolution in any case changes the person. If you know how you can change a person without them having to live that life, that can also be done.

11.11 QUESTION: *Did you come just to get acquainted, or do you intend to (continue to) give lectures?*

ANSWER: I intend to; you can read — there was a special lecture, on May 12 there was the “Revival of the Golden Age” Congress, where I urged people, in principle, to make a decision and act. But in order to act, a person must have understanding. Without understanding, one must never act. As I say: you must decide, but before deciding to act — you must understand. But even understanding can be dangerous.

Do you know what is written in the Torah, for example? That if a goy reads the Torah, he must be destroyed. That means if someone has obtained secret information, they must be destroyed for that. If you have obtained this information, you become a carrier of dangerous knowledge; you might even be destroyed for learning what they didn't want you to know, understand? That's why I say: a person must make a decision for themselves. If they want to act — great, but they must understand that these actions can bring not only joy, but also problems. Especially when it's not yet a completed phase, but just the beginning. There may be many bumps along the way; a person must be ready for this, or not start at all.

And in order to decide, the next Congress will most likely be in the fall, when the book is finished, and people will be able to get it in their hands and read in full what we talked about today. And decide for

themselves what they want to do — do they want to sit by the broken trough and wait for the trough to turn into something, like in the fairy tale? In the fairy tale too, when the old woman was left by the broken trough, nothing happened afterward, remember?

So now, we are at the broken trough, and if we want to sit and wait for fair weather, it's useless. But if we want to prevent that, we need to act. But action comes with risks. That is, a person must make a decision, decide for themselves whether they want to go against the current, to fight for what is right, or not. And if they want to sit by the broken trough — be my guest, some people like that.

The situation now is such that the position "my house is on the edge — I know nothing" no longer works, because there are no "edge houses" anymore. No matter where the house is, it is no longer on the edge — it is always on the front line. So, you won't be able to sit it out. If something happens, everyone and everything will perish, regardless of whether they sat quietly on the sidelines and did nothing, or whether they did something. If people really act, there is a chance that not everyone will perish. Otherwise, everyone will perish, one way or another.

I wish you all, so to speak, a kind of enlightenment. Maybe today's meeting was not enough for that to happen in full, but at least something. And regardless of your decision — I wish you success in your endeavors in any case. All the best.