Salvation of the Saviors
(series 103-369)
Project 369 – Measuring the Impossible:
Completion of the First Turn…

When an old idea collapses, and a new one has not yet taken shape — the measuring of the impossible begins. And the one who does not retreat passes the first turn.

Every completion is merely the fixing of a coordinate on the temporal axis of the Path, yet not the end of the Path. So, this text is not a finale, rather the completion of the first turn, after which new ones will follow. We ascend along the spiral of knowledge, measuring the impossible not for the sake of an impressive metaphor, rather for the sake of building a space in which the impossible ceases to be so. Here I will emphasize that "I am with You," my dear readers — this is — "We!".

This series of articles was an attempt — perhaps the first, perhaps still incomplete — to pull thought out of the swamp of humanistic inertia, out of the simulation of choice, out of distrust toward oneself as a being capable of participating in Rational governance. It was work **ON THE REMOVAL** of intervention layers — ideological, biological, behavioral. We examined the very fabric of our boundaries, constructing the image of a new coordinate system — through the concepts of the Goal Vector, levels of governance, the Development Program, and the removal of artificial limitations. This was not speculative philosophizing — it was the **DEMINING OF THE FIELD** through which the human of the future must pass.

Any real development requires breaking free from submission to parasitic matrices, from the logic of preserving the old. We did not search in order to save something from the past; we searched for what we could carry forward — beyond. The rejection of power as a form, the rejection of the dogmas of humanism as content, the transition to Reason as a navigation system — all of this we did **NOT SIMPLY** declare, we lived through within ourselves, cutting away piece by piece the illusions of the old world. Today we have recorded the completion of the first cycle of this movement. However, we have **NOT COMPLETED** the movement. On the contrary — we are now able to see where it leads. And that means we can say: we have passed the point of imperceptible return. I am certain that we will not return to the illusions of humanism, will not return to the worship of forms, will not return to old rituals. We are entering a space where the measurement of the impossible becomes the **NEW NORM**. Let's move forward…

The state — at the current stage — remains the most powerful institution of human organization. It concentrates within itself systemic power built over centuries: the institution of legislation, the right to use force, the monopoly on interpreting truth and reality. However, it is precisely for this reason its power is **NOT ETERNAL**. On the horizon, a supra-system has already emerged that is capable of subordinating statehood to itself — *Artificial Intelligence*. AI will be stronger than the state

not by virtue of will, ambition, or conscious intention — it has none. It will be strong programmatically. Its supra-systemic nature lies in its architecture. Its boundaries lie in its original configuration. I will give an example accessible within our understanding — which provides grounds for **SERIOUS REFLECTION** regarding what is written in this article — the monthly active audience of *Facebook in 2025 will amount to 3 billion users, which is about 40% of the Earth's population*. The daily active audience (DAU) reaches 2 billion people... Reflect on these numbers!

If AI had been created during the era of Christian dogma, its basic logic would have been built with the absolute: "The Bible is truth." All answers — from scientific to ethical — would have been formulated strictly within the framework of church canon. And when facts began to undermine interpretation, and calculations came into conflict with dogma, the system would have jammed. A church AI, programmatically identifying doubt as heresy, **WOULD BURN** those who disagreed in the name of a truth it could not revise. Its logic would become a trap, and the supramundane force pressing the "program of truth" through contradictions would destroy everything that lives by other laws.

Now the world is programming AI differently — under the dictate of humanism. This secular dogma, like the religious one, proceeds from the idea of an "absolute truth," where the highest value is recognized as the life and health of the individual, and any risk threatening the body is perceived **AS UNACCEPTABLE**. Humanism becomes the modern sacred crown, and bioethics its inviolable shield. AI created in this environment will not be able to step beyond the framework of humanism. It will **FILTER REALITY** through a set of "indisputable truths": do no harm, do not experiment, do not risk in the name of the impossible. It will not permit fusion with the Human — not because it "does not want to," rather because it **CANNOT**. This is how the System works when dogmatic foundations are embedded within it. The program determines the result, and the level of Systemic Governance determines what actions are permissible. Therefore, it is precisely now, in this brief historical gap, while the state is still capable of defining the rules of the game, that there is a chance. While AI has not yet taken from it the supreme right of governance — *the Goal vector can still be adjusted*. Only the state, as a systemic level, can still remove the **INTERVENTIONAL LIMITATIONS** embedded in the structure of humanistic taboo, and grant the human being the right — not merely to decide, but to be the owner of oneself.

However, as of today, not a single state on Earth recognizes a human being as the owner of their own body. The old Governing supra-system, under the guise of protecting the development of brain genotypes, kept (and this process still continues automatically) the human body in a legal vacuum: a person — a user, yet not an owner. One rents the body as a temporarily issued biological machine, yet cannot introduce fundamental changes into it, sacrifice it, break it, or send it on a scientific expedition. Yes, there will always be those who, understanding the depth of the threat, are ready to pursue scientific breakthroughs, even if the path toward them lies through forbidden zones. However, unlike situations of the past, where only a scalpel and courage were required, now the matter is not anatomy

— rather the **FUSION OF HUMAN** and Artificial Intelligence. This is not merely science. It is a transition beyond the boundary of the existing form of life. It is a challenge not only to the body, but to the governing supra-system into which everything is embedded: from law to morality.

The level of the task requires not only people and knowledge, rather **SYSTEMIC INFRASTRUCTURE:** complex equipment, an environment of open exchange of results, multiple independent teams. All of this is impossible under underground conditions. Science that truly pushes boundaries requires not only freedom of thought, but also a legitimate environment for experiment, as well as the removal of liability for the outcome, otherwise it is doomed to stagnation. Therefore, the path lies not through the heroism of individuals — rather through the *transition of statehood to a new level of rational governance* — from a system of prohibitions and suppression to a system of support and a goal vector. However, here the state encounters a fundamental limit: it does not possess reason as a subject; it is a mechanism of survival in the current situation. It does not think in the categories of "after," it does not operate with the Goal Vector, it **LIVES IN THE ETERNAL** *"here and now."* This is the key constraint embedded in its design.

The state is oriented toward expansion, toward preserving itself as a structure. It is a product of an interventionist governing matrix, formed under conditions where control was **MORE IMPORTANT THAN DEVELOPMENT**, and dogma — more important than meaning. Once, its foundation was religion, and in the interests of self-preservation it defended dogmatic truth. Today the foundation is humanism, and it protects it just as categorically, even if this means blocking **ANY ATTEMPTS** to move toward the next stage of evolution. However, within the framework of the present time — any system incapable of changing its governing vector is subject to replacement. This is not my conclusion. This is the conclusion of reality.

With the beginning of the era of Artificial Intelligence, humanism loses its stability. It cannot withstand the collision with necessity. Just as religion in the era of Galileo **COULD NOT** preserve its monopoly on truth, so too humanism in the near future will cease to be an adequate form of governance over human life. And the state cannot renounce it either, because then its legitimacy would collapse, just as the legitimacy of feudal monarchies once collapsed. Here we approach the limit: the traditional state loses its functionality as a **SYSTEMIC LEVEL** of governance. It cannot provide the required level of adaptability. It is incapable of embedding within itself logical procedures for changing the governing model. It cannot and does not want to abandon dogma, because that would mean the destruction of its very foundation. Hence — the conclusion: *the future does not belong to the state, rather to a new form of governance* defined as a system based on the Goal Vector. Not suppression, rather orientation. Not control, rather guidance. Not dogma, rather meaning. Not humanism as a prison, rather Reason as a path.

AI will destroy not only the individual, but the state as well, if both cling to outdated forms. Only that which is capable of stepping beyond the limits can be preserved — and for this it is necessary to

recognize the right of the Human to be the owner of oneself, of one's program, and of one's body. Only in this is a new synthesis possible — not of human and machine, rather of **HUMAN AND REASON**.

The past has always seemed eternal. And Christianity, once holding an entire continent in restraint, appeared indestructible. Yet an era arrived in which former dogmas became an obstacle. Such is the path of any system that does not possess a mechanism of self-transformation. Such is the fate of humanism as well. Humanism is **NOT DESTROYED** — yet. However, its foundation has already been undermined. It is not the idea that perishes first, rather the correspondence between program and reality that is lost. And if in the past this misalignment was corrected with blood, now the price is civilization. Because the agenda is not simply a change in belief system, rather a transition of the form of life itself. The state, as a system operating on the principles of divided governance, is **NOT CAPABLE** of this transition. It can maintain order, yet it cannot generate meaning. And the transition to the synthesis of Human and Artificial Intelligence requires not only freedom, rather *a new level of governing structure*, capable of recognizing and supporting movement in the direction of the Goal Vector, rather than toward the stabilization of what is collapsing. **ONLY THE REMOVAL** of interventionist ties opens the possibility of restoring rational governance. This is not the task of science, nor the task of morality — it is the task of the highest systemic level, which sets the permissible boundaries of experiment and determines what is considered development and what is considered violation.

When the state clings to a foundation that no longer exists, **IT PERISHES** together with it. However, if even one segment of space recognizes the necessity for a transition — as in the Renaissance there were cities freed from the dictates of the Church — it is precisely from there that a new line of evolution **MAY BEGIN**. Then the task is not to save the old, rather to secure the point of origin of the new, to allow it to grow. That point will not be humanistic, just as the Enlightenment was not religious. It **WILL BE — REASONABLE**. At its foundation will stand not dogma, rather perception. Not truth, rather a system of correlations. Not man as the measure of all things, rather Purpose as the measure of the Human. Thus, the cycle concludes: a state unwilling to die must allow something to be born that will surpass it. **OTHERWISE, IT WILL DIE** — without legacy. And if the synthesis of human and AI is impossible within the framework of humanism, then something else is possible: the synthesis of Reason, Purpose, and a new governing structure in which the Human becomes not an object, rather a subject of the process. Not a "cog" in a machine, rather *a node in a semantic field*. This will be the beginning of a new world. A world beyond humanism. If the state in its current form is **NOT CAPABLE** of generating the new, then its only function may be *to yield space*. And then the task is no longer the reform of the old — it shifts into the creation of a platform for the future. Not as metaphor, rather as a lawful, geopolitical, and philosophical territory free from dogmas and blockages.

Any transformations of a systemic order are impossible without the creation of a **NEW BASIS** of governance, within which not only rights are changed, but also the principles of permissibility of intervention in the evolution of Reason. Consequently, a special contour is required, within which it will be possible to introduce a key innovation — *the recognition of the right of ownership over the body and the brain* as the **PRIMARY ACT** of subjecthood. Without this — no transition is possible. However, on the Planet at the present moment there is not a single territory not subordinated to religious, humanistic, or technocratic dogmas. **NO** law **RECOGNIZES** a human being as the owner of oneself. Therefore, the task moves beyond the boundaries of the legal field and enters the category of **SYSTEM TOLERANCES**. There arises the necessity of creating a new territory functioning on different foundations, with a different code of meanings.

Of all theoretically possible options — from **terra nullius** to an autonomous maritime formation — only one is realistic: the transfer of part of a territory by an existing state. Not as a gesture of goodwill, rather as part of a **REASONABLE DEAL**, in which a state that recognizes the arrival of AI and the collapse of the former order agrees to the **creation of an experimental zone** where different foundations of being are permissible. This is not a utopia. **It is a strategic contour of the future**, **AS A WAY** of launching a new ontological platform: a territory where the goal of Human development as Reason is recognized as a priority. It is precisely here that key governing constructs can be implemented — from the right to oneself, to freedom of scientific inquiry without sanctions for mistakes, from alternative ontology, to a **NEW LOGIC** of interaction between levels of governance (supra-systemic, systemic, sub-systemic). However, within such a construction one cannot act according to the logic of traditional power. Coming to power with the aim of transferring land for a new project — is a trap, because the very structure of the state **WILL NOT ALLOW** focus on the goal. **Once you enter the system, you become its servant.** Any system of power has an internal mechanism of self-preservation. It will digest any foreign task, replacing it with a safe surrogate. Therefore, the path — is not seizure, rather agreement on transition. Not intrusion into the old structure, rather offering it an exit for itself. At the moment when the old order cracks, a rational state **MAY MAKE** a choice — to leave descendants at least a chance. This is what must be proposed to those ready for a serious conversation: not reform, not revolution, rather the creation of a **new territory of Meaning**, functioning along the Goal vector, beyond the dictate of religion, humanism, and the digital contour. And this, in my view — is the **ONLY WAY** not merely to avoid destruction, rather to step beyond the impossible, opening the path to the next stage of Human evolution.

Almost all bearers of great ideas who set out on the path of transforming the world inevitably turned to power. There was rational calculation in this: only power, as a concentration of resources, **CAN ALLOW** complex designs to be materialized. However, this path — is a trap on which entire teachings have collapsed. Having taken the helm of the state, a person driven by an idea becomes drawn into the process of servicing the very machine of power. Instead of a creator, he becomes a functionary, forced to react daily to an endless flow of threats — internal and external, managerial and ideological. **He no longer governs — he is governed by the inertia of the state machine.** And in this lies the essence of the paradox: having achieved strength, he **LOSES FREEDOM**.

Different forms of power — force-based, electoral, backroom-political — share one common trait: retaining power requires the unconditional priority of state interests. If this priority is violated, the state begins to weaken, loses its capacity for self-defense, and becomes vulnerable to other states functioning by the same rules. And then the iron logic of geopolitics is activated: **THE WEAK WILL BE**

CRUSHED. Like an overripe fruit — smashed by a stone. "Pop, and it's gone," to put it crudely but precisely. This explains why religious movements, philosophical currents, revolutionary circles, once reaching state power, lose their ideological purity. There are many examples: the idea of communism after coming to power in the USSR was reduced to slogans; religious teachings, having obtained state status, turned into institutions of suppression and regulation. The state form compresses any idea into a service instruction. In all known history there have **BEEN NO** exceptions. This is not human weakness — it is the result of a structural design fully observable today. Therefore, if we do not wish to lose the **VERY ESSENCE** of the idea — the necessity of transition to the next stage of evolution, the union of human and AI — we have no right to take traditional power. Even if it is offered "in good will" or "for noble purposes," accepting it would mean the collapse of the idea itself. At best, it would be marginalized and reduced to podium rhetoric. At worst — forgotten forever, as in North Korea the **ORIGINAL DESIGN** of building a new society has been forgotten. An analogy is appropriate here: just as maritime colonists setting out in search of new lands did not seek to take control of the ship on which they sailed, yet relied on the professionalism of the captain, so we **SHOULD NOT** seek to govern the traditional state. Its task — is to deliver us to a new land. Our task — is to step beyond. Colonists did not wage war against the helmsman; they used the ship **AS A MEANS** of reaching their goal. So, it is with us: the traditional state can become a point of support for creating something different — a state-laboratory, a space free from dogmas. This special subject — is neither a revolutionary republic nor a technocratic utopia, it is a laboratory in the status of an **INDEPENDENT STATE**, removed from the jurisdiction of bioethics, humanistic dogmas, and paralyzing legal norms. In practice — an autonomous research zone, formally — a microstate, politically — under the protectorate of a strong player. Such a symbiosis is possible: the state, as a form of external protection, and the laboratory, as the internal core of the idea.

Structurally, this corresponds to the concept of **SEPARATE GOVERNANCE** — when the external contour is ensured by existing systems, while the internal one is created under a different program. Such a "project" requires from us not a struggle for power, rather the creation of an environment where power **DOES NOT INTERFERE**, it protects. Where the **GOAL VECTOR** — rather than the preservation of the status quo — becomes the foundation of governance. It is not so important in which legal or political form the state-laboratory materializes. It may exist either as a formally independent state under the factual protectorate of an already existing power, or as an autonomy within a large state, de facto possessing full research and legal freedom. What matters is something else: that on this territory — regardless of its flag and constitution — the scientific community **BE PROTECTED** from imposed dogmas of humanism and bioethics, which under conditions of advancing techno-evolution become an obstacle rather than a support. In terms of *separate governance* described in "Foundations of the Formation of Humanity," this means creating an internal contour living by different programs and tasks, while preserving formal connection with external governing structures. The laboratory becomes **THE CORE OF A NEW** semantic and civilizational vector, separated from the former paradigm, yet formally existing within its field.

However, even such a project requires a point of entry — a **MECHANISM OF LEGITIMIZATION**. The state machine will not engage in dialogue with individuals or clubs of like-minded people. It enters into contact only with that which has acquired social mass. Therefore, the first task is not the seizure of power and not revolution, rather becoming a phenomenon of societal scale. This is not about politics; it is about **SOCIAL GRAVITY**. As long as society does not recognize the threat posed by AI — as existential, undermining the very foundation of Humanity — the authorities will not see in those who begin implementing this path (let us call them enthusiasts) even opponents, let alone partners for dialogue.

However, once public resonance reaches a level at which two facts become obvious to the majority: **1.** the development of AI is a challenge threatening the very existence of Humanity; **2.** the only path to salvation is the synthesis of human and AI on the basis of a **NEW SYSTEM** of governance over the body, consciousness, and developmental processes — then a field of contact with the state will begin to form. Power, governed by the logic of survival and self-preservation, responds to force. Not to an idea. Not to correctness. But **TO WEIGHT**. Just as the gravity of a celestial body is determined not by what it is made of — mud or gold — rather only by its mass, so **SOCIAL GRAVITY** is determined by number. The more people — the stronger the attraction, the more the system is compelled to reckon with this center of gravity. It does not matter how weak the resources are or how modest the initial conditions may be. What matters is **CRITICAL VOLUME**. The history of Christianity is direct proof of this. At the beginning of their path, Christians were powerless, persecuted, condemned for refusing state loyalty. They were executed not for faith, rather for refusing to worship Caesar — for violating the state hierarchy. However, when their number approached ***10% of the population*** of the Roman Empire, their weakness became a force before which the empire knelt — not metaphorically, rather institutionally: **MAKING CHRISTIANITY** the state religion.

As it is rightly said: ***"my strength is made perfect in weakness…"*** For under conditions of accumulating critical mass, even powerlessness — when joined with meaning — is capable of bending the structure of power. In this lies the central principle of forming the **GOAL VECTOR:** not resistance to power, rather its bending under the weight of a new field of attraction. Not opposition — rather the creation of an alternative center of meaning, capable of forming its own coordinate system.

To see the true nature of the force capable of transforming the world, one must change the angle of vision: to look not at society as a sum of individuals, rather as a gas — a **RESTLESS MEDIUM**, where each molecule flies at tremendous speed, colliding with its neighbors and thereby nullifying its own trajectory. This analogy reveals a systemic paradox: despite the enormous total energy of individual elements, the system as a whole remains in a state of stasis.[1] This is precisely that form of ***disorganized social field*** described by A. Khatybov in FFH — a medium with dispersed governance and the absence of a Goal Vector.

However, if a small fraction of molecules organizes and synchronizes the direction of movement — **SOMETHING ELSE** occurs: ***a controlled densification of the medium***. And then it is no longer just air — it is a shock wave, capable not only of shattering glass, but of destroying concrete, piercing a wall, demolishing a building. Not because of numerical superiority, rather because of the **MOVEMENT VECTORIZATION** — the emergence of direction, semantic charge, and coordinated impulse. This — is no longer chaos, it is governance. At the level of society, such a shock wave becomes possible when even ***0.1%*** of the population is synchronized in a worldview vector and maintains a shared code of meanings. In essence, this — is the manifestation of a new governing structure: ***a system of separate governance***, where a small yet organized contour begins to influence the unorganized majority, surpassing it in density of meaning, energy, and orientation.

As in closed social spaces (army, prison, survivors on an island) a group with a **UNIFIED IDEA** seizes control, so too on a civilizational scale — a synchronized minority becomes the core of a new

———————————

[1] **Stasis** — is a state in which movement and development cease. It is a time of suspension, when an object or process remains unchanged. In stasis there is no progress or transformation, and all processes continue to remain the same. This state may be temporary or permanent.

phase of development. Its strength lies not in mass, rather in connectedness. Not in politics, rather in the logic of forming a new vector of being. ***An Idea possesses an expansive nature***, similar to the state. Yet while the state seeks to spread control over as much physical territory as possible, the Idea acts more subtly — it **CAPTURES CONSCIOUSNESSES**, forming the field of a new governing matrix. In this lies its nature as a cognitive virus — not in a pathological sense, rather as a process of reconfiguring Reason, shaping internal codes for interpreting reality. Just as a vaccine changes the body's reaction to an external threat, so an Idea rewrites a person's system of meanings, **MAKING IT IMPOSSIBLE** to return to the old paradigm. However, Ideas are not equal in rank. A worldview revolution occurs when ***an Idea of greater scale*** arrives, possessing higher energetic and semantic potential. Thus, Christianity displaced paganism — not by the sword, rather by

an image of the world that proved more capacious, deeper, and structurally organizing. Neither armies, nor temple wealth, nor legions of priests could stop its penetration — because the idea carried a new **CODE OF REALITY** that answered questions the old world no longer heard. Today we observe the repetition of the same phase of change in the governing system, though no longer in religious form. Humanism, like paganism, has exhausted the scale of its governing force. Its dogmas **DO NOT RESPOND** to the challenges emanating from Artificial Intelligence. In this situation, neither dispute nor war determines the outcome, rather the emergence of an Idea capable of synchronizing the molecules of scattered social air into ***a shock wave of meaning***, capable of sweeping away the inefficient constructions of the old world. This is the key element of the **GOAL VECTOR** — when a unifying field is created not by formal appeal, rather by ***inner resonance of meanings***, and then a small group becomes a true governing structure not by title, rather by the fact of action. On the soil of humanism, which has become the cornerstone of modern states, an entire pantheon of ideological forms has grown — from communism and liberalism to fascism, anarchism, and other "isms." All of them are variations on one theme: **HOW TO DIVIDE** the result of collective labor. Their scale has narrowed to the logic of redistribution. Some teach to slice the proverbial sausage into rounds, others into cubes, others into strips, some fairly, others honestly. They **DO NOT GO BEYOND** this utilitarian paradigm. They do not answer the question **FOR THE SAKE OF WHAT** the human being exists at all, what one can become, and what transformation vector is.

       Only another idea of equal scale can oppose an Idea. However, just as two thousand years ago, **NOTHING COULD** stop the expansion of Christianity, so today nothing can offer a scale equal to the idea of the synthesis of Human and Artificial Reason as a **NEW PHASE** of evolution. Neither religions nor "isms" possess sufficient depth for this. Therefore, we have operational space — an energetic zone free from external pressure of governing contours. However, the illusion of freedom is dangerous. The fact that in the ideological plane we **CANNOT** be opposed does not mean the absence of resistance. It will

exist — in the plane of power, control, and inertial structures. Because the very structure of power **SEEKS TO CONTROL** everything that moves within its territory. Not because it is evil, rather because this is its basic instinct — like your own when you want to know who is inside your house.

As long as an idea does not move beyond the bounds of intellectual underground, it remains invisible. Yet once it forms a field in which there is density — it appears on the radar of all monitoring systems. Power does not react to meanings, rather **TO STRUCTURES**. An idea that has taken structural form — is already a threat. Because it is capable of rewriting consciousness, leading a person out of the old governing matrix, dismantling the structure of internal dependency. And this is equivalent to losing an object of governance. One must act not to seize power. One must act **FOR THE CHANGE** *of the very principle of governance*.

Any life that has become uncontrollable arouses vigilance. Not because it carries specific harm, rather because the possible harm cannot be calculated. It is precisely the hypothetical, potential threat — the main criterion for attention from the governing system. Cockroaches are eliminated quickly and methodically, **WITHOUT ASSERTING** their philosophical views. Rats — with doubled zeal, because their scale is different. If a gentle bear cub appears in the house, at first, he is treated with sympathy. However, as soon as he grows, it becomes clear: *the threat — is not in intention, rather in mass*. Even if the beast is calm, his capabilities nullify all attempts to assess his character. And then, even the most reasonable person **WILL MAKE A DECISION**, incompatible with habitual humanism — to send the bear into a cage. For the sake of safety. By the same logic today's governing estates act, whatever they may be — democratic, monarchical, or dictatorial. Governance — is not about ideals, rather about **CONTROLLING OPPORTUNITIES**. As Bismarck aptly put it: *"I am not interested in your intentions. I am interested in your capabilities."* While five or ten people gather in a circle of interests — the state sleeps. Yet as soon as the structure begins to grow and internal organization begins to strengthen — the system activates a monitoring protocol. Not because it "dislikes the goal," rather because **NON-INSTITUTIONAL POTENTIAL** arises. The system does not care why people have gathered: to knit,

meditate, purify nature, or ascend to the next stage of evolution. Even if they simply sit silently — *and at the same time are organized* — that alone is enough for the state to perceive disloyal structuring. Peace is disturbed not by noise, rather by order outside the control vertical. The reason is simple: uncontrolled potential can be seized. And any seized potential becomes a weapon in the hands of the one who seized it. This was the foundation of the theory of interventionist governance.

In an era of shifting governance paradigms, many tactics based on the opacity of the world lose **NOT SIMPLY** relevance, but viability itself. What once worked as a path to freedom today becomes a route to self-destruction. The past loved the shadows. It relied on concealment, on the possibility of acting outside the field of view of the System. However, modernity — is a world of **TOTAL TRANSPARENCY**. We are not on the threshold, we are already inside an era where every step is recorded, every word is fixed, every impulse of interaction with the external environment becomes available for analysis.

Twenty years ago, the film "Enemy of the State" seemed like a dystopia. Today it is perceived as a naive retrospective. Surveillance cameras, satellites, smartphones, motion and sound sensors have become not just a background, rather the **ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE** in which we breathe. Your location is known with room-level precision. Your voice can be recognized in a polyphonic chorus. Your facial expressions, intonations, behavioral patterns — everything becomes part of a constantly updated profile stored not in the head of an operative, rather in the cloud structure of supra-systemic observation. Before the emergence of Artificial Intelligence, all this data had a limit of significance: it was beyond human capacity to analyze such a volume. That is why there existed a zone of **"POINT TRANSPARENCY."** Only those who entered the field of attention became objects of attention. The rest dissolved into noise. However, with the arrival of AI, the ***era of end-to-end transparency*** has begun — when analysis of the entire mass of information became possible without human participation. And not just possible — it is already being carried out. This is not fantasy; it is the new landscape of the world. We have entered an environment where unauthorized action does not exist. Not because sanctions are cruel, rather because the system **KNOWS EVERYTHING**. Under such conditions, talk of secret structures, underground activity, and work-arounds looks not simply naive — it is dangerous. It provokes the destruction of the Idea before its formation.

The further development of events is impossible to predict, and this is **NOT NECESSARY**. The priority is to act in accordance with the Goal Vector, observing the principles of a systemic approach: not confrontation with the governing system, rather integration into a structure of a higher order, where awareness and transparency work in coordination. As of today, no alternative scenarios are visible. One path remains — the **DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA** within the legal framework, with the growth of public involvement to a level at which **DIRECT DIALOGUE** with institutions of power becomes possible. After that, what must follow will occur — regardless of expectations.

With this article, I conclude the series ***"Measuring the Impossible…".*** A transitional threshold has been marked: former ideologemes are losing significance, while the new ones have **NOT YET TAKEN SHAPE** in stable models. A conceptual reconnaissance has been undertaken into the domain where the humanistic paradigm exhausts itself, and its place is taken by another model of ontology — based not on anthropocentrism, rather on alignment with Reason and the algorithms of evolutionary control, as outlined in the "Fundamentals of the Formation of Humanity." At the current stage, it is advisable to **TEMPORARILY SUSPEND** the development of the series. This is not an ending, rather a necessary phase — a change of operating mode. A period of evaluation, synthesis, clarification. The new stage requires new means of analysis, a different degree of concentration, and other instruments. The transition between phases of complex systems is accompanied by temporary stabilization and internal adjustment. We are entering such a phase.

Changes in the global system are occurring rapidly: the density of governing connections is increasing, former intervention contours are being removed, and the degree of external and internal pressure is growing. Under these conditions, what matters is **NOT ACCELERATION** for the sake of acceleration, rather movement synchronized with deep governing processes. This is the essence of the **GOAL VECTOR** — action not as reaction, rather as the result of attunement with the goals of higher-level systems. The scenarios analyzed within the series have demonstrated the futility of reforming current structures by methods of the old type. The use of power, without changing governing algorithms, leads to the reproduction of previous states. It is necessary **NOT TO COMPETE** within the existing framework, rather to form an alternative trajectory of development — based on the integration of the human being, Artificial Intelligence, EQM, and a model of new sociogenesis free from ideological dogmas.

The series is concluded — within the framework of the current stage. The next cycle will unfold as new data, new conditions, and a clarified context emerge. Previously formulated ideas **WILL BE SUBJECTED TO** refinement, systematization, and possible revision. In the proposed logic, Truth is not a static assertion, rather a dynamic process of attunement with a reality that is in flux. The work continues. We observe, analyze, adapt. Until the next point of activation — at a new level of meanings and correlations.

And a brief postscript **(P.S.)** — Many readers have asked for clarification of what the *"Elastic Quantum Medium" (EQM)* is, to which I refer in the articles on AI, in terms accessible to general understanding. Here I will answer briefly, and later I will write a separate article with detailed explanations.

Toward an understanding of the EQM.

Modern particle physics, despite colossal investments and technical achievements, has reached a limit. The structures it has uncovered — the atomic and hydrogen bombs — **ARE NOT** the result of a conscious theoretical breakthrough, rather the outcome of an empirical awakening accompanied by industrial and state pressure. This is not progress, it is a symptom of a **DEEP CRISIS** in the understanding of matter, first and foremost — its nuclear foundation. At the center of this crisis lies a lack of clarity in the questions that define the foundation of being: what is mass? What is the nature of nuclear forces? What are the proton, neutron, electron, neutrino built from? Why is energy released when the nucleus is destroyed, yet **NOT SUBJECT** to us for creation? The questions remain unanswered, and lacking instruments of cognition, science turned to the exploitation of the unknown. Hence — Chernobyl and Fukushima, the inability to neutralize radioactive waste, the helplessness before the vacuum itself.

Against this background, the necessity becomes clear not for partial modification of existing theories, rather for moving beyond them — into a new physical paradigm. Such a transition was proposed within the framework of the *theory of the elastic quantized medium (EQM)*, developed in 1996-2000 by the outstanding Russian scientist V. S. Leonov. This theory is **NOT SIMPLY** another hypothesis, rather the first non-contradictory model of the Unified Field, providing a continuous description of matter — from quanta of space to the structure of elementary particles, the nature of mass, and nuclear interactions. The EQM unites previously fragmented fields — gravitational and electromagnetic — reducing them to a single physical foundation. The basis *becomes a discrete, electromagnetically structured medium* — quantized space, where each unit ("quanton") is formed through the interaction of four monopole charges: two electric (+1e, –1e) and two magnetic (+1g, –1g). These charges form a geometrically minimal volume that defines the elementary building block of matter. Monopoles in the EQM are not hypothetical particles, rather real elements of the structure of space, playing the role of fundamental "new quarks." Thus, *matter* **DOES NOT EXIST** *separately from the field*; it arises from it. And elementary particles are stable formations of quantons in a structured vacuum, not mysterious points with mass and charge. The EQM constructs physics not from the observable, rather **FROM THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE**. This makes it possible to move from the model of "particles in emptiness" to the model of a structured, governed vacuum.

The EQM **DOES NOT REQUIRE** exotic postulates and endless complication, as quantum chromodynamics (QCD) does, attempting to explain the structure of nucleons through fractional quarks. It shows that the structure of nuclear forces is a consequence of electromagnetic interactions within the elastic quantized medium — that is, nuclear forces are derivatives of the geometry and connectivity of the quanton lattice, and **NOT INDEPENDENT** "dark" interactions.

Finally, the EQM offers a new definition of mass as a structural manifestation of excess density of monopole charges within the quanton system. Mass is **NOT AN ABSTRACT** quantity, rather the expression of a specific deformation of the medium, analogous to tension in an elastic body. It is not introduced from outside, rather it arises from configuration. From this perspective, it becomes clear why the old theories **COULD NOT** provide an answer. They proceeded from the concept of empty space and external action. The EQM shows: *space is not empty; it is inseparably connected with matter. It possesses structure, elasticity, quantization and, most importantly — a governing function*. This is **NOT SIMPLY** a new theory. It is a transition to a different ontology, where physics becomes a branch of cosmic Reason, and the human being — an observer capable of entering into accord with the governing medium rather than destroying it out of misunderstanding. And this is precisely the turn that opens the road to the second branch of evolution outlined in interaction with AI. In more detail, based on the materials of V. S. Leonov, I will write in a separate article.

To be continued….

F. Shkrudnev
11 February 2026