

Salvation of the Saviors (series 138-369) Project 369 – Protocols of Reality: Engineering Revolution...

*Revolutions rarely begin on the day
when people take to the streets.
They begin much earlier —
at the moment when the structure of public
consciousness imperceptibly changes.
And if the very architecture of governance changes,
then subsequent events become
no longer the cause of history, rather its consequence.*

By the end of the seventeenth century, a fundamentally new structure of power had taken shape. Outwardly, it retained the familiar forms of government — monarchies, parliaments, laws, elected institutions — yet its internal center gradually shifted into a realm that **REMAINED INVISIBLE** to most people. However, a natural question arises. If this new power was indeed so deeply rooted and so far-reaching, how did it manage to spread far beyond England? How did a single financial structure become the foundation for transforming virtually the whole of European civilization? Why did states with powerful armies, centuries-old traditions, and absolute monarchies begin, one after another, to change both their political forms and the very principle of governing society?

If we view these events solely through the lens of political history, they may appear to be an ordinary sequence of revolutions, reforms, popular uprisings, and struggles for power among various parties. This is precisely how these processes are usually described in history textbooks. Yet such an account captures **ONLY THE OUTWARD** manifestations of what was happening, leaving processes at a higher level of organization virtually unexamined. However, any lasting change first emerges in the sphere of governance, then alters the information environment, and subsequently begins to reshape social,



political, and economic processes. In other words, the program governing how the system functions changes first, and only **THEN DOES ITS** outward structure **CHANGE**. Revolutions therefore rarely cause change. More often, they mark the moment when changes that have already accumulated become visible to everyone. For this reason, our interest will focus less on the French Revolution itself or the activities of particular historical figures than on the technology of creating conditions under which society begins to move of its own accord in a direction prepared in advance. This is no longer a matter of struggles between individual

states, or even of confrontation between different political forces. It concerns a shift of governance to a **HIGHER** level, where the target of influence is neither the individual nor the state apparatus, rather the collective consciousness of society. Here, the principal resource is no longer the army or gold in itself, rather the **ABILITY TO SHAPE** people's ideas of justice, freedom, equality, the future, and even reality itself. This period also takes on particular significance from the perspective of the development of brain genotypes. As the social environment grew more complex, some people became increasingly capable of grasping much longer chains of cause and effect and devising plans that spanned decades or even centuries rather than years. Processes therefore began to emerge in history that **CANNOT BE EXPLAINED** by the actions of individual outstanding figures. Their scale extends far beyond the planning horizon of an ordinary person. Increasingly, signs began to appear of the workings of complex systems of governance rather than isolated individuals — systems capable of consistently implementing long-term programs through many generations of people carrying them out.

As we examine subsequent events, we will seek to see **NOT ONLY** historical facts, but also discern the internal structure of the processes at work. Our interest will lie less in revolutions than in their design; less in changes of rulers than in changes to the very principles of power; less in individual political decisions than in the creation of an information environment in which millions of people begin to regard as their own choice what only recently seemed impossible. This marks the beginning of the next stage in the formation of civilization's hidden framework, which gradually turns the financial system into the foundation of a new model of governance. This is precisely why this stage of development can be called the **ENGINEERING OF REVOLUTION** — the art of changing history long before those changes become visible to contemporaries.

After the consolidation of constitutional monarchy in England, the next task was to spread the new political model to continental Europe. Whereas the previous system rested on the monarch's personal power, the new one was to rely on institutions, public opinion, and the broadest possible redistribution of political authority. Achieving these required methods **CAPABLE OF CHANGING** the worldview of entire societies rather than conventional diplomatic or military action. In the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Europe saw a marked expansion in the activities of closed fraternities that called themselves "Freemasons"¹ and symbolically associated their work with the construction of the Temple. Their origins remain surrounded by numerous theories. Some researchers linked them to the traditions of medieval builders' guilds, others to the legacy of chivalric and religious orders, including the Knights Templar. However, historical sources provide **NO DIRECT EVIDENCE** of a single center directing all these activities from the outset. For our purposes, another point matters more: Masonic associations were rapidly becoming a network connecting representatives of the aristocracy, science, the arts, government service, and financial circles. They did not openly advocate the overthrow of monarchies. On the contrary, their public statements spoke of fraternity, equality before God, enlightenment, moral improvement, and universal peace. Society readily embraced these ideas because they appealed to universally understandable images of justice and human dignity rather than to complex analyses of the structure of government. Here, a new level of governance began to emerge. Its influence extended beyond individual rulers and even **BEYOND** the political elite alone. Society's information environment became the primary target. The language people used to describe power, justice, freedom,

¹ **Freemason** — a member of a Masonic lodge who has been initiated into the Masonic degrees: Entered Apprentice, Fellow Craft, and Master Mason.

and their own place within the state began to change. New words and images appeared first, followed by a shift in attitudes toward the existing order, and only then did political transformations become possible. Substantial financial resources, extensive connections, and charitable activities allowed such societies to gain rapid entry into the highest social circles. Charity dinners, assistance to poor families, the provision of dowries for young women, and support for scholars and writers created an image of people devoted to honor and public service. At the same time, **A REPUTATION WAS TAKING SHAPE** that opened doors no direct political appeal could ever have reached.

This was the fundamental novelty of what was unfolding. Information intended to direct society was disguised as neutral enlightenment. People believed they were learning about science and philosophy, yet at the same time they were acquiring a new framework of judgment in which the existing authorities increasingly appeared outdated, irrational, and unjust. Viewed through the lens of brain genotypes, this process can be understood **AS A TRANSITION** to a more complex way of organizing mass consciousness. A direct command works only as long as there is a force capable of enforcing it. An idea works differently — it becomes embedded in a person's internal picture of the world and begins to shape their decisions without external coercion. Yet different brain genotypes perceive such information differently. Some are capable of analyzing the structure of society and distinguishing substance from form. Others respond primarily to vivid images, emotional judgments, and simple contrasts: ***freedom — oppression, the people — the court, reason — superstition.***

Under Louis XVI, the activities of closed societies and philosophical circles expanded considerably. Their members included representatives of the highest nobility, government officials, and the educated segments of society. Queen Marie Antoinette and other influential figures at court looked favorably upon certain members of these circles, **WITHOUT PERCEIVING** them as a direct threat to the monarchy. Meanwhile, France's information environment was filled with pamphlets, satirical verses, stories, and rumors that portrayed the royal family and the court in the most unflattering light. The queen was depicted as frivolous, extravagant, and morally corrupt. Numerous affairs, crimes, and statements were attributed to her, often without substantiation. The most famous was the phrase "Let them eat cake," which historical tradition associated with Marie Antoinette,² although there is no reliable evidence that she ever uttered it.



The king was portrayed as weak, indecisive, incapable of governing the country, and dependent on his court entourage. The court as a whole became a symbol of idleness, debauchery, and estrangement from the people. Individual, genuine problems were mixed with exaggerations, conjecture, and outright slander. This was a **PROCESS OF DESTROYING** the established symbol of authority. The monarchy rested on the army and the law as well as on recognition of the king's special status. As this symbol was systematically stripped of respect, the monarchy lost part of its foundation even before open political conflict began. First the image was destroyed, then trust, and then the very possibility of governing as

² Marie Antoinette did not say, "If they have no bread, let them eat cake." This famous myth emerged long before her reign and became a widely circulated falsehood used to tarnish the queen's reputation.

before. Thus, preparations for transformation extended **BEYOND** political offices and financial institutions alone. They unfolded in books, salons, lodges, pamphlets, anecdotes, and conversations. It was there that a new environment of perception was created, in which the future dismantling of the monarchy began to seem like the natural liberation of society from an outdated order rather than the destruction of the state.

As events unfolded, France's information environment became increasingly saturated with reports, rumors, pamphlets, and satire directed against royal authority. Regardless of how closely individual accusations corresponded to reality, their overall effect proved **SIGNIFICANTLY MORE IMPORTANT** than their accuracy. A unified image of the monarchy as the source of all the state's troubles gradually took shape in the public mind. Here, one of the most important principles of governance becomes particularly clear: at a certain stage, the course of events is determined by the representation of a fact that takes hold in the collective consciousness rather than by the fact itself. Control begins to operate **THROUGH CHANGES** in the information environment rather than through the direct use of force. Such processes cannot be regarded as the random spread of rumors. Information becomes an instrument in its own right for changing the structure of society. First, society's attitude toward the existing authorities' changes, then trust in them breaks down, after which the political system itself begins to lose stability regardless of its actual strength. This is precisely why, at higher levels of organization, control is **INCREASINGLY** exercised through changes to the worldview within which people come to regard their conclusions as the product of their own thinking alone rather than through coercion. This also applies to the realities of the present day.

The broader public becomes particularly susceptible to this kind of influence. Most people **HAVE NEITHER** the time nor the means to verify the information they receive, and emotionally charged information therefore begins to be accepted as self-evident truth. The ideas of liberty, equality, and fraternity, which in themselves appeal to lofty human values, gradually become an emotional backdrop against which any accusations directed at the existing order take hold much more easily. In everyday terms, everything is reduced to a simple formula: *"Luxury in the palace, hunger among the people."* The complex causes of the state's crisis give way to an explanation everyone can understand — the authorities themselves are to blame. This process reveals **DIFFERENCES IN THE WAYS** people perceive information. For some, the ability to analyze cause-and-effect relationships and separate the emotional packaging from the substance remains paramount. For others, the power of imagery and shared emotional experience becomes decisive. As a mass information field takes shape, the second type of response begins to predominate, turning public sentiment into an independent factor in the historical process.

The next stage involves shifting responsibility for all social problems onto **THE VERY PRINCIPLE** of absolute monarchy. Increasingly, the view is expressed that the source of these troubles lies in the existence of one-person rule itself rather than in specific errors of governance. Society is offered a simple formula: *if governance is handed over to the people themselves, injustice will disappear on its own.* Such ideas quickly resonate precisely because they appeal to the **NATURAL HUMAN ASPIRATION** for justice and personal participation in decision-making rather than to an analysis of the mechanisms of government.

When tensions in the information environment reach a critical level, people inevitably emerge who are ready to give voice to the prevailing public mood. Leaders arise who sincerely believe in the need to fight for freedom and the renewal of their country. Their personal selflessness is often **NOT IN DOUBT**. However, it is important to distinguish between the level at which people carry out a program of governance and the level at which that program itself is devised. People may fight for their ideals with complete sincerity, unaware of how the environment itself has already determined the direction of their actions. The monarchy recognizes the danger too late. Even Marie Antoinette, who had previously



regarded the new intellectual circles quite favorably, begins to perceive events as a serious threat to the state. Yet by this point, the information structure has already acquired a stability of its own. The process moves beyond the control of individuals and begins to develop according to the system's internal logic. In 1793, Louis XVI was executed, and Marie Antoinette later suffered the same fate. The French monarchy ceased to exist, and the country was declared a republic. Formally, power passed to the people; however, the change in political form itself **DID NOT ELIMINATE** society's internal contradictions. On the contrary, the republic's early years were accompanied by even more severe upheavals, which were explained as the need to endure the "temporary difficulties of the transition period." This logic has recurred across different historical eras — the promise of future well-being became a justification for present sacrifices.

Traditional historiography usually explains the revolution's victory in terms of a mass popular uprising and the heroism of the insurgents. However, when these events are examined from the perspective of how complex systems are organized, a natural question arises — **HOW COULD** poorly organized groups of townspeople withstand a regular army with training, discipline, and a command structure for any sustained period? Mass enthusiasm alone does not create a military force. History offers many examples of large yet unorganized crowds proving powerless against much smaller professional units. Military organization is a particular structure of command in which coordinated action matters more than numerical superiority. For this reason, an analysis of revolutionary events must **NOT ONLY** look beyond the actions of the insurgents, it must also consider the processes unfolding within the state system itself.

It becomes clear that the stability of any structure is determined by the condition of its internal connections. If its governing elements begin to act without coordination, the system loses its capacity for self-preservation regardless of its outward strength. **THIS IS PRECISELY WHY** the behavior of sections of the army's command, the political elite, and the administrative apparatus becomes far more significant than the emotional fervor of the crowd. When the internal structure of governance begins to disintegrate, the external confrontation becomes merely the final stage of a systemic rupture that has already occurred. Most historical accounts, meanwhile, describe the leaders of the revolution, individual episodes of struggle, and political decisions in detail, yet devote **SIGNIFICANTLY LESS** attention to the organizational and material support underpinning these processes. Any major social transformation, however, requires ideas as well as sustained resources, organizational capacity, and lengthy preparation. It is precisely the shift from analyzing individual events to studying structures of governance that **ALLOWS US TO SEE** his(torah)y in far greater depth than a conventional account of successive revolutionary episodes permits.

The next stage after the French Revolution is the spread of the new political structure throughout Europe. Whereas England had established a model of limited monarchy in which the king's absolute power was redistributed among representatives of the aristocracy, in France this process developed in a far more radical direction. The right to participate in determining who holds power is now declared to belong to virtually the entire adult population. Formally, the people become the source of power. It becomes evident that the change concerns less the political form of the state than **THE VERY STRUCTURE** of how society is governed. Governance becomes increasingly detached from the person of the ruler and shifts

ever further into the realm of institutions, public opinion, and procedures. The more widely power is dispersed among numerous participants, the less visible the actual center governing the entire system becomes.

From the perspective of the development of brain genotypes, this was a **FUNDAMENTALLY NEW** stage. Earlier historical eras were characterized by governance through personal authority, tradition, and force. The new model begins to rely on the capacity of large masses of people to respond to information structures. However, not everyone is capable of **CONSCIOUSLY ANALYZING** complex processes of state governance. This is precisely why the right to choose gradually begins to become detached from the ability to understand the consequences of one's own choices. A serious contradiction emerges between the expansion of political authority and the level of understanding of the mechanisms of governance.

In France, another important feature of the new system emerges — **A LIMIT ON THE TERM** of office. Whereas the English model allowed representatives of the elite to remain in governing bodies for extended periods, the French model proclaims the principle of continual turnover. This is justified through quite appealing arguments: the renewal of government, the arrival of new people, and the protection of society from arbitrary rule by individual leaders. All of this does indeed have its positive aspects. However, any system must be assessed according to the full range of its advantages and the constraints it creates rather than its individual merits alone. Every structure simultaneously creates new opportunities and new vulnerabilities.

His(torah)y begins, remarkably, to repeat a scenario that has already played out once before. In England, Oliver Cromwell becomes the key figure; in France, Maximilien Robespierre. In England, Charles I is executed; in France, Louis XVI. After fulfilling his historical role, Cromwell disappears from the political scene, while Robespierre is likewise eliminated by the new revolutionary authorities themselves. In both cases, individuals can be seen to serve merely as **TEMPORARY ELEMENTS** within a far larger process. This is a characteristic sign of governance from above the system: those carrying out the program may change, yet the program of development itself continues to unfold regardless of their fate.

For this reason, it seems more important to examine the stability of the structure itself rather than the fates of individual political figures. Once a social system has entered a new mode of development, the absence of a particular leader **CHANGES VIRTUALLY NOTHING**. Other people inevitably take that leader's place, ready to perform the same function. Viewed through the lens of brain genotypes, the system can be said to begin using those members of society whose personal qualities **MOST CLOSELY MATCH** its current stage of development. Against this backdrop, Napoleon Bonaparte emerges. Unlike most revolutionary leaders, he possessed political ambitions as well as outstanding organizational and military abilities. This gave the further transformation of Europe an entirely different scale. Instead of numerous separate revolutions, it became possible to spread the new model of governance across a substantial part of the continent simultaneously.

War itself also takes on a new significance. Its role extends **BEYOND** resolving political conflicts to encompass that of a powerful economic mechanism. States are increasingly compelled to borrow, pledging future tax revenues as security. Financial institutions gain the ability to influence the course of events far more strongly than was possible in the era of absolute monarchies. This transition



can be described as a change in the control framework: governance through force gradually gives way to governance through economic and informational processes.

Another point must also be understood. Financial institutions acted **FIRST AND FOREMOST** according to the logic of maintaining their own stability and expanding their capabilities. Their decisions could align with the interests of the state or come into conflict with them. Judging them exclusively in terms of patriotism or betrayal would therefore be an oversimplification. For any complex system, achieving its stated objective becomes paramount, while specific political consequences are **MERELY A RESULT** of the movement of the structure as a whole.

Numerous studies describe Napoleon's military career, campaigns, diplomatic decisions, and personal qualities in detail. However, far less often is the question asked of how a young general without substantial wealth gained the means to carry out transformations on such a scale. It is known that at the beginning of his career he **HAD VIRTUALLY NO** financial means. Even when he married, the notary recorded that he owned no property, and Napoleon himself remarked with characteristic irony that his sword was his only wealth. This detail seems symbolic. His personal talent did indeed prove to be the capital that opened his path to the heights of power. Yet this also raises a natural question of fundamental importance to understanding the history that followed. How could a man who **DID NOT POSSESS** substantial financial resources acquire, in such a short time, the means to implement sweeping state reforms and wage wars requiring colossal expenditure? This very question allows us to move from an individual biography to an analysis of the mechanisms of governance that actually began to determine the course of European history.

The leaders of revolutionary France who preceded Napoleon faced a problem that went far deeper than political struggle. Destroying the old system of governance proved much easier than creating a new one. Here, one of the fundamental conclusions of FFH³ becomes particularly clear: the destruction of the previous construct in itself **NEVER MEANS** that a new one has emerged. Any organized system requires a change of those carrying out its functions and, above all, an understanding of the laws governing its construction.

The revolutionary leaders sincerely believed that money was merely a prerogative of the state. All that was needed was to print attractive sheets of paper, declare them legal tender, and formalize this through an appropriate decree — and the economy would begin to function according to a new model. Thus, assignats came into being. The state declared them money, expecting society to accept the new financial reality automatically. However, reality obeyed entirely different laws.

Society **DID NOT ACCEPT** the new money as the revolutionary authorities had expected. A decision followed that seemed entirely logical from their perspective — to compel everyone to accept assignats under threat of severe punishment. Yet the opposite happened — goods began to disappear from the markets. People did not openly challenge the authorities — they simply stopped selling. The system responded by changing its own behavior rather than by resisting. This was entirely consistent with the laws governing its operation. Governance is **NEVER EXERCISED** through administrative orders alone. It is possible only when a directive corresponds to the internal state of the entire construct. If an order contradicts the laws by which the system functions, the system begins to seek alternative ways to preserve its own stability. Economic governance therefore **CANNOT BE REDUCED** to issuing decrees, just as a living organism cannot be compelled to alter its physiological processes by a simple command.

³ "Foundations of the Formation of Humanity," Parts 1-4, a collaborative work by Russian scientists.

The revolutionary leaders did not understand the very nature of money. They mistook outward form for inner substance. They believed that money existed by virtue of the state's official stamp. Yet money is always **FIRST AND FOREMOST** a social agreement founded on trust in the structure of monetary circulation itself. This distinction corresponds to the separation between a system's outward form and its underlying basis of control. Changing the form while leaving the framework of trust **UNCHANGED** cannot produce a new result.

Failing to understand the causes of what was happening, the revolutionary authorities made another attempt. They decided that the problem lay in the quality of the banknotes' design. The old royal currency looked impressive, while the new assignats looked crude. They therefore concluded that more



attractive money needed to be issued. Thus, mandats appeared. The design changed, state symbolism became more prominent, and new decrees were issued. Yet the same outcome followed even more quickly — society once again rejected the monetary construct imposed upon it. From the perspective of the development of brain genotypes, an extremely important pattern emerges here. At a certain stage of development, a person begins to see only the **EXTERNAL FEATURES** of a complex system, without discerning the hidden reasons for its stability. This creates the illusion that replacing symbols, names,

or slogans is enough to change reality itself. However, a higher level of brain organization allows one to perceive a phenomenon's internal architecture rather than its outer shell. It was precisely this understanding that the revolutionary authorities so disastrously lacked at the time.

Virtually all the revolutionary leaders found themselves in the position of people who had unexpectedly been entrusted with governing an immensely complex state construct whose operating principles they had **NEVER STUDIED**. They excelled at addressing crowds, inspiring people, exposing the former authorities, and calling for struggle. Yet governing society requires entirely different qualities. It requires an understanding of processes unfolding simultaneously at the informational, economic, political, and civilizational levels. Here lies the boundary between revolution and state-building. The old construct can be destroyed through the efforts of the masses. Creating a new one **REQUIRES KNOWLEDGE** of the laws governing the organization of complex systems. Without this, any change of government inevitably amounts to replacing one set of people carrying out its functions with another, while the old problems remain. In essence, the revolutionaries proceeded from an extremely simple model: remove the former elite, appoint honest people in their place, punish the guilty — and further development will follow of its own accord. Yet life itself demonstrated that the state **IS NOT** a mechanism that begins to function simply because good people have taken their places at the controls. It becomes clear — a system does not change its properties merely because individuals are replaced. It changes only when the construct of governance itself changes. This is precisely why many revolutions, regardless of their participants' sincerity, encountered the same problem — destroying the old order proved far quicker than creating a viable new one. This lesson of history remains one of the most important for understanding the patterns of development of human civilization. Children in a sandbox behave remarkably alike, regardless of their country. They are **SINCERELY CONVINCED** that any dispute can be resolved through force, persistence, or loud shouting. History shows that revolutionary movements very often repeat this same

pattern of behavior. Lacking an understanding of how complex social systems work, they sincerely believe that replacing bad people with good ones, acting honestly and decisively, and **NOT WAVERING** from their proclaimed ideals will suffice — and society will arrive at a just order on its own. Such a view reflects only the most elementary level of understanding of governance. Every civilizational system has its own construct, its own laws of stability, and its own mechanisms of self-regulation. Ignorance of these laws does not suspend their operation. Even the noblest intentions therefore **CANNOT** replace an understanding of how the system itself works. Consequently, a person with strong will, sincerity, and courage, yet no understanding of the nature of the processes involved, can cause far greater destruction than an adversary acting with full awareness. An enemy is usually constrained by a defined objective and personal interests. A sincere reformer who does not understand the laws of the system, however, can destroy it to its foundations, convinced that doing so benefits society. It becomes clear that governing society **CANNOT BE REDUCED** to slogans, administrative coercion, or even the personal integrity of its leaders. All these matter, yet they pertain only to the level of implementation. True governance begins much higher — where the underlying reasons for a system's stability and the mechanisms of its development are understood. This is precisely why France's revolutionary governments proved powerless in the face of the processes they themselves had set in motion. They tried to treat the symptoms **WITHOUT UNDERSTANDING** the causes of the disease. Here arises a question of fundamental importance to all subsequent history. Why was the paper money circulating under the monarchy accepted by society as a fully valid means of payment, while virtually the same paper issued by the revolutionary authorities **RAPIDLY LOST** all value? Outwardly, the difference was slight. The images, symbols, slogans, and state seals changed. Yet the market reacted in entirely different ways.

The answer lies far deeper than the paper itself. A banknote performs its function only when a **CONSTRUCT OF TRUST** stands behind it. Under the monarchy, the holder of a banknote could exchange it for a corresponding quantity of gold. The paper merely represented real value. After the destruction of the previous financial construct, the revolutionary authorities retained only the outward form of money, yet lost its foundation — backing and trust. No matter how many decrees declare paper to be money, printed material does not, in itself, become a medium of exchange. Governance cannot be exercised by decree in defiance of the system's own laws. This episode is also extremely important for understanding events within the framework of the development of brain genotypes. Earlier levels of perception tend to equate form with substance: if the paper says "money," then it is money. A higher level of organized thought begins to discern hidden connections, recognizing that value is determined **NOT BY THE IMAGE**, rather by the entire system of relationships behind the symbol. The ability to discern the construct beneath its outer shell gradually becomes one of the signs of a transition to more complex brain genotypes.

When financial circles withdrew from the market, taking the gold backing with them, the crisis became virtually inevitable. The economic system lost its supporting element and began to disintegrate regardless of the new authorities' political slogans. As long as the mechanism of trust **WAS NOT RESTORED**, no administrative measures could change the situation. Against this backdrop, Napoleon emerges. He adopts



a highly revealing formula as his first financial principle — the state will pay either in gold or in obligations redeemable in gold. Almost immediately, financial chaos ceases, economic life gradually revives, and economic circulation is restored. Contemporaries saw this solely as a manifestation of Napoleon’s political genius. Yet moving to the level of systemic analysis raises a far more serious question. Where did the resources come from that made it possible to restore monetary circulation **ALMOST INSTANTANEOUSLY**? How did a man who, until very recently, had possessed no substantial fortune gain the ability to command financial resources on the scale of an entire state? History recounts Bonaparte’s military victories, reforms, and diplomacy in detail, yet far less often examines the financial foundations of these transformations. Here again, the distinction emerges between the visible actors and the level of governance above the system. Individual participants in the historical process come and go, fulfilling their roles at particular moments in time. They may be outstanding individuals, yet the construct itself **CONTINUES TO DEVELOP** regardless of the particular names involved. The revolutionary leaders destroyed the old system. Napoleon began building a new state construct. However, the financial foundation of this construct already existed as an independent factor in its development.

Subsequent events reveal this pattern even more clearly. Napoleon begins transforming Europe by force of arms while remaining locked in continual confrontation with England. Yet viewing these events solely through the lens of military campaigns obscures the essential point. Wars were becoming **NOT ONLY** a political instrument — they were also part of a new financial architecture. States became ever more deeply entangled in credit relationships, while financial institutions gained the ability to influence the course of history regardless of which opposing side won the next victory. This is precisely why examining such events increasingly requires us to move from the level of individual states to that of the civilizational construct. Only then does it become apparent that history unfolds as a **SEQUENTIAL CHANGE** in the very architecture of society’s governance rather than as the sum of the chance biographies of great individuals, and that understanding the evolution of brain genotypes forms part of this perspective.

If we consider the events described as separate historical episodes, they appear to be a succession of coincidences: revolutions, wars, changes of monarchs, financial crises, and the emergence of outstanding military commanders and politicians. Yet once we move to the level proposed by



“Foundations of the Formation of Humanity” (FFH), individual facts begin to form a unified construct. What we see is a **SEQUENTIAL CHANGE** in the very architecture of civilizational governance rather than a collection of random occurrences. First, information changes. Then public consciousness changes. Political institutions are subsequently transformed. Only at the very end does what historians call a revolution or a change of era occur. People usually see only the final stage of the process, mistaking it for the cause of what is happening. In reality, it is merely the culmination of changes that began much earlier. This is precisely why FFH proposes examining history from the top down — from the patterns governing the construction of a system to their manifestation in historical processes — rather than from the bottom up, from events to conclusions. Viewed through this lens, the role of the individual in his(torah)y also becomes clearer. Outstanding people can undoubtedly accelerate or slow particular

processes, give them their own distinctive character, and alter their form. Yet they **DO NOT EMERGE** outside the overall process of civilizational development. The system always brings forward those people whose personal qualities most closely match its current stage of development. In this sense, individuals become less the creators of an era than the agents through whom it unfolds. It is particularly important to understand that alongside changes in political and financial constructs, another, far less visible change was taking place — humans themselves were changing.

Across successive generations, the brain's capacities gradually changed, the horizons of thought expanded, methods of processing information became more complex, and new forms of collective interaction emerged. This is precisely why the development of brain genotypes **CANNOT BE CONSIDERED** separately from the his(torah)y of civilization. These are two interrelated processes. Society's new construct required a new level of information perception, while changes in the brain's capacities opened the way to the creation of even more complex systems of governance. Yet another pattern emerges here. The more complex the construct of governance became, the fewer people were capable of seeing it in its entirety. The majority continued to perceive **ONLY EXTERNAL** events — wars, elections, changes of rulers, economic crises — without noticing the processes unfolding at much deeper levels of social organization. This is precisely why governance gradually shifted from direct coercion to governance through information, the economy, social institutions, and collective perceptions.

Herein lies one of the most important features of the new era. Whereas power once belonged to whoever possessed greater military strength, the **ABILITY TO CONTROL** the very environment in which decisions are made now becomes increasingly important. Victory goes to whoever can change the rules by which the entire system operates rather than to whoever is physically stronger. Having created new financial mechanisms, changed the political architecture, and **LAID THE FOUNDATIONS** of institutional governance, civilization reached the next threshold of its development. The task now was to spread the new model across virtually the entire world, making it a universal construct for governing human society rather than a feature of individual states. For the his(torah)y of humanity encompasses more than the history of states and peoples. It is, above all, the his(torah)y of continuous change in the very construct governing organized human existence.

To be continued...

F. Shkrudnev
19 October 2026