

Salvation of the Saviors (series 130-369) Project 369 – Non-Articles: Beyond the Text: The Energy of Meaning...

Life is sustained neither by the body nor by time.

It is sustained by meaning.

As long as there is meaning — there is energy.

As long as there is energy — there is movement.

*And that means there is a chance to go beyond what
was considered inevitable.*

For far too long, people have tried to explain their lives through the external. Through the body, through circumstances, through society, through chance. They sought the causes of their strength and their weakness in what could be measured, weighed, described, and broken down into parts. It seemed to them that if they understood the structure of a cell, a hormone, or a neural connection, they would thereby come closer to understanding life itself. Yet each time they encountered a strange contradiction. Two people under identical conditions — and completely different strength of life. Two organisms with similar parameters — and opposite internal results. Two consciousnesses — and two different worlds. And then **IT BECAME OBVIOUS** — the matter is not in the body. And not even in the environment. There is something that either brings a person into life or gradually takes them out of it. Something that cannot be measured by instruments, yet determines everything — from the inner density of existence to the very duration of the journey.

We have become accustomed to calling this something by different names: motivation, meaning, goal, purpose. Yet all these words merely point in one direction — to where true movement begins. Because life is not simply biological existence. Life — **IS ENGAGEMENT**. Engagement with one's vector, one's direction, with that future which draws one toward it and shapes the present. It is precisely there that energy arises, capable of overcoming the resistance of the environment, the inertia of habits, and even the limitations of the body. And conversely — where this connection is broken, fading begins. Not immediately, not abruptly. First interest disappears. Then — tension. Then — inner support. And only at the end does the physical shell register what has already happened long ago at a deeper level.

Modern people have found themselves at a unique point. They have freed themselves from the old systems — religious, traditional, collective. But along with this **THEY HAVE LOST** that which gave them energy — a clear vector of meaning. As a result, they have found themselves between worlds — no longer bound by the past, yet not yet engaged with the future. It is precisely here that the main question arises. If a person's energy truly originates not in the body, rather in meaning — if life is sustained not by the past, rather by the future — if the very possibility of overcoming aging and death depends not only on biology, rather on engagement with a higher level of organization — then what, in fact, is a person? And where does the boundary lie between what a person considers to be oneself and what actually governs one's life? The answer to this question will become the **STARTING POINT** for further movement.

If we look not from the position of habitual human thinking, but rather from the level spoken of by the construct of Reason, then it becomes obvious: that "I" which a person is accustomed to considering

oneself — **IS NOT** something fixed and unchanging, merely a localized node of perception, temporarily assembled at a specific point in space and time to perform a particular function within the overall system of existence. And therefore, the disappearance of this "I" is not the disappearance of the world as such, **RATHER IT IS** the termination of a specific channel of its perception. The world does not disappear — the assembly point through which it was given disappears. However, for this assembly point itself, for this particular "I," this is equivalent to absolute disappearance, because outside perception, neither form, nor content, nor the very fact of existence exists for it. From this arises the fundamental sensation: "I — am the foundation of the world." Yet this sensation requires clarification. Not in the sense that the individual "I" is the center of the Universe, rather in the sense that it is precisely through it that Reason registers and manifests one of the variants of reality. It is not an absolute center, rather a local interface engaged with a more complex system.

Here a substitution takes place that is characteristic of the current stage of development of Brain genotypes — especially for transitional forms, where individualization reaches its maximum density, yet



has **NOT YET BEEN COMPREHENDED** as part of supra-systemic control. A person begins to perceive oneself as the highest value not because one truly is the highest value, rather because one **SEES NOTHING** greater beyond oneself. A person becomes enclosed within the boundaries of one's own perception and takes it for the absolute. And then the illusion arises: only that which I perceive exists. In reality, this is merely a limitation of the channel, not a property of the world. However, this illusion is not accidental. It is functional. Through it, the Mind forms a point of maximum concentration — an "I" capable of retaining and processing information, making decisions, and forming a vector of action. Without such concentration, neither experience, nor development, nor transition to the next level is possible.

Yet if a person becomes stuck at this level, without moving beyond the limits of one's own closed system of perception, **ONE BEGINS** to substitute oneself for Mind, and one's own desires for the Goal vector. Then what we observe in modern civilization arises — everyone proclaims oneself the highest value, yet at the same time loses connection with the source of that very value. From this comes the internal contradiction. In words, a person continues to speak of higher meanings, of duty, of God, of society, while through actions one confirms something entirely different — the priority of one's own existence as a closed system. This is not hypocrisy. **THIS IS A MISMATCH** between the inherited programs of the past and the actual configuration of the present. In previous Brain genotypes — 422, 423, 441 — a person was indeed integrated into supra-personal constructs: kin, community, religion, state. There, the "I" did not exist as an autonomous unit. It was a **FUNCTION OF THE SYSTEM**. And therefore, it was not the individual that was perceived as the highest value, rather the structure into which that individual was integrated. Yet with the transition to later genotypes — 442 and beyond — a rupture occurs. A person separates from the system, yet does not immediately receive the instrument for reaching the supra-systemic level of Mind. One finds oneself in an intermediate state — no longer part of the whole, but not yet aware of the whole. And therefore, one clings to oneself as the last point of support. Yet this is a temporary construct. Because the true "I" is not the boundary of the body and not the boundary of one's immediate circle. It is a **CONFIGURATION OF ENGAGEMENT** with

Mind, the degree of participation in the Goal vector. And the greater this engagement, the broader the "I" becomes, the smaller the boundary between "one's own" and "another's," the more conditional the very division itself becomes.

What a person calls one's immediate circle — family, loved ones, those whose pain one feels — is merely the initial form of expansion of the "I." This is the first movement beyond the boundaries of the body. Yet further levels are possible — when the "I" ceases to be a biography and **BECOMES A FUNCTION** of participation in a larger-scale process. And then the question "what will disappear after my death" loses its former urgency. Because it is not participation as such that disappears, only the specific form of its realization.

If the "I" is not a fixed entity, rather a changeable configuration of engagement, if the boundaries of "one's own" can expand and contract, if life itself depends on the degree of this engagement, then a fundamentally different question arises: can this process be controlled? Is it possible to consciously expand the boundaries of the "I," moving beyond biological and social conditioning? And if so — where does that boundary lie, beyond which a person ceases to be merely a bearer of perception and becomes an **ACTIVE ELEMENT** of Mind, capable not only of perceiving the world, but also of participating in its formation? It is precisely toward this level of understanding that we will begin to move.

If we examine this layer not from the position of habitual morality, rather from the position of systemic logic, it becomes clear — the division into "one's own" and "others" — **IS NOT** an invention of culture or religion, rather a fundamental mechanism of any organized life. Any system capable of existence and development inevitably establishes a boundary. This boundary is precisely what a person calls the "I." Yet this "I" is never limited to the body. It always expands — first to one's immediate circle, then to larger associations, and ultimately it can reach the level of supra-systemic engagement. It is precisely for this reason that any commandments, norms, and moral constructs arising in the His(Torah)y of humanity **ALWAYS HAVE** a hidden qualification — a sphere of application. They are not universal. They are targeted. They operate within the system, yet cease to operate beyond its boundaries. In this sense, any ethics is not an absolute, rather an instrument for the survival and strengthening of a specific configuration. And when it is said "do not kill," the system always implies — do not destroy your own. Because destroying your own means destroying the system itself. Yet everything that lies beyond the boundaries of this system falls into **A DIFFERENT CATEGORY** — one where different rules already apply, determined not by morality, rather by effectiveness. This is not cruelty. It is a structural necessity.

Life, as a system, cannot afford to treat everything equally. Equal treatment would mean the absence of a boundary, and the absence of a boundary — disintegration. Therefore, differentiation arises. One's own is strengthened; what is alien is either ignored, used, or eliminated — depending on the situation and the level of threat. This is precisely what we observe in all forms of life — from biological to social and supra-social. Yet here a key point arises that requires deeper examination. At the level of primitive forms of organization, "one's own" is determined by simple attributes — blood, kin, faith, belonging. In Brain genotypes of the early stages — 422, 423 — this was the **ONLY POSSIBLE** form of identification. The



system survived only through rigid fixation of the boundary. In subsequent stages — 441, 442 — this boundary becomes more complex, more flexible, yet does not disappear. It simply begins to be masked by ideas of universalism, equality, and humanism. However, these ideas in themselves **DO NOT ABOLISH** the basic structure. They merely overlay it with a layer of declarations. This is why the paradox of modern civilization arises: at the level of words, the equality of all people is proclaimed, while at the level of actions, the system continues to clearly distinguish between "one's own" and "alien." Moreover, those who speak most loudly about equality most often use this idea as an instrument of control, redistributing resources in their own favor. This is explained simply — a system that does not understand its own structure **INEVITABLY USES** ideologies as control shells that conceal the actual mechanisms. And therefore, the idea of "equality" becomes not truth, rather a technology.

Yet this is only the outer layer. Something else is far more important. If we accept that all life strives toward its own good, and that this striving constitutes its essence, then the question arises: what determines this good? At the lower levels — it is survival, resources, security. At the higher levels — it is no longer simply preservation, rather development, expansion, movement beyond the limits of the current form. It is precisely here that the transition occurs from the closed "I" to the Goal vector. Because at the moment when a person begins to connect one's own good not only with self-preservation, rather also with the realization of a goal extending beyond one's current existence, **THE VERY STRUCTURE** of "one's own" and "alien" changes.

A like-minded person becomes "one's own" not by blood and not by a formal attribute, rather by alignment of the vector. And one who is not engaged with this vector **AUTOMATICALLY FINDS ONESELF** outside the system — outside the "I." And then a new logic of a higher order is formed. "One's own" — is one who is engaged with the vector of development. "Alien" — is one who does not participate in it or acts against it. This is no longer biology or sociology. This is the logic of systemic control.

In this sense, the formulation "my good — victory over death" acquires a fundamentally different status. It **CEASES TO BE** a private desire and becomes a vector around which a new configuration of the "I" can be assembled — no longer individual, rather supra-individual. Yet here the most subtle and most dangerous point arises. Because this very same logic can be used at any level — both for reaching Mind and for strengthening closed systems. And therefore, the main question is not where the boundary between "one's own" and "alien" lies. The main question is — who draws this boundary and at what level. If it is drawn by a closed system, it will always strive for its own preservation, even at the cost of degradation. If it is drawn by Mind, it will **SERVE DEVELOPMENT**, even at the cost of destroying old forms. If the boundary of the "I" is fluid, if it can expand to the level of an idea, to the level of a goal, to the level of Mind, then the question arises: is it possible to consciously change the configuration of one's "I"? Is it possible to move beyond the biological and social logic of division? And does there exist a level where "one's own" ceases to be opposed to "alien" and becomes part of a unified system of development? It is precisely this transition — from the logic of division to the logic of engagement — that will become the subject of the next fragment.

If we remove the emotional coloring and examine this layer through the prism of systemic analysis, it becomes apparent that the idea of universal equality — **IS NOT A DESCRIPTION** of reality, rather an instrument for influencing it. It is a construct that does not reflect the structure of life, rather changes the behavior of those who believe in it. Any living system, from a cell to a civilization, exists only through differentiation. Difference — is a condition of structure. Hierarchy — is a condition of functioning. Inequality — is a condition of movement. Where everything becomes "equal," it is not injustice that disappears — the system itself disappears. It is precisely for this reason that in real life, beyond declarations, **THERE DOES NOT EXIST** a single society, a single religion, or a single civilization that actually

operates according to the principle of absolute equality. Everywhere, without exception, division remains — into one's own and alien, into the primary and the secondary, into that which is protected and that which is used.

Yet at a certain stage of development, the need arises to control not only bodies, but also consciousness. And then universal ideas emerge — such as equality, humanism, universal love. Their function is not to describe the world, rather to reduce resistance, blur boundaries, and shift the system from a state of tense structure into a state of fluid, controllable mass. This can be viewed as an influence on the subsystem level, **THROUGH MEANING-BASED** constructs that alter behavioral algorithms without direct coercion. By accepting the idea of equality, a person removes from oneself the mechanisms of differentiation that previously ensured the survival of one's system. And it is precisely here that an effect arises which has a very specific explanation — a system that has lost the ability to differentiate becomes vulnerable. Because it ceases to distinguish its own from the alien, the primary from the secondary, the dangerous from the safe. Try applying this yourselves to the events of today.

The problem lies not in the idea of equality itself, rather in the level at which it is applied. At the level of the biological and social system, equality is impossible and destructive, because it contradicts the principle of organization. Yet at the level of Mind, at the level of supra-systemic control, equality acquires **A DIFFERENT MEANING** — not as identity of forms, rather as equal engagement in the process of development. And it is here that the key substitution occurs. That which belongs to the higher level is transferred to the lower one — and begins to operate as a destructive factor.



When an idea intended for the level of Mind is applied at the level of survival, it turns into an instrument of destabilization. And conversely, when the principles of survival are transferred to the level of Mind, closedness, aggression, and the inability to move beyond the boundaries of the system arise. It is precisely for this reason that we observe a duality: at the level of declarations — equality, at the level of practice — rigid differentiation. This is not hypocrisy. This is a **MISMATCH OF LEVELS**. And if we move further, it becomes obvious — fixation itself on the opposition of "one's own — alien" is also a limitation. This is a necessary stage, yet not the final one. Because in the logic of Mind, "one's own" is determined not by belonging to a group, not by culture or origin, rather by engagement with the Goal vector. And then a new configuration arises. "One's own" — is not someone who is like me. "One's own" — is someone who moves in the same direction. And "alien" — is not someone who is different, rather

someone who is not engaged in the process of development or acts against it. This is no longer a biological or cultural division. This is a **FUNCTIONAL DIVISION** in relation to the vector. Here the concept of inequality acquires a different meaning. Inequality — is not about the superiority of one over another. It is about the difference in functions within the system. Just as the heart is not "better" than the lungs, yet performs a different, critically important role. Just as the Brain is not "above" the body, yet determines its direction.

A living system is always hierarchical, because without this coordination is impossible. Yet at the same time, it strives for coherence, because without this integrity is impossible. It is precisely at the intersection of these two principles — difference and coherence — that the **SPACE OF DEVELOPMENT** arises. Therefore, the assertion that equality is death is valid only at one level. At another level, it is precisely rigid inequality, allowing no transition or change, that becomes death.

Life — is neither a fixed hierarchy nor absolute equality. Life — is a dynamic system in which difference IS **CONSTANTLY REDISTRIBUTED** in accordance with the development vector. And then the main question shifts. Not "are we equal," and not "who is higher," rather — ***are we engaged in the process that leads to the next level...***

And if we return to the starting point — to the goal of overcoming death — it becomes obvious — neither the logic of humanism nor the logic of primitive division works here. A **DIFFERENT CONFIGURATION** is required here — one in which difference is preserved, yet subordinated to a common goal, rather than destroying the system from within. This configuration is only beginning to take shape. Because until now, humanity has either divided the world into "one's own and alien," or attempted to erase this division, thereby destroying the structure itself. Yet it has not created a third option — a system in which difference does not lead to conflict, rather works toward development.

If we transfer this fragment to a deeper, philosophical-systemic layer, it becomes obvious that what is being discussed here is neither social injustice nor the "cruelty of the world," rather the **BASIC LAW** governing the formation of any complex system — the law of selection according to the quality of perception and depth of engagement. A person is shaped not simply by the environment, rather by the quality of what one allows into oneself. Food, both material and informational, is merely an external carrier. The actual influence occurs at the level of programs — the very ones discussed in "FFH":¹ sub-system, system, and supersystem. And if physical food shapes the body, then informational food shapes the configuration of Mind, through which a person either engages in development or becomes fixed in stagnation.

From this arises a principle that, in simplified form, sounds like "you are what you eat," yet in reality it goes deeper: ***"you are what you are capable of perceiving and processing."*** Because the same information becomes an impulse for development for one person, while for another — noise or even destruction. Here a hidden inequality manifests itself, one that cannot be eliminated by either laws or ideologies.

Freedom, about which so much is said, in reality **DOES NOT EQUALIZE**, rather it intensifies differences. It acts as a catalyst: one who is capable of development accelerates; one who is not capable — degrades even faster. This is not a problem of freedom. It is a property of the system. Something that is very clearly observed in the realities of today. It is precisely for this reason that any attempt to "make everyone equal" by equalizing conditions **INEVITABLY LEADS** to a paradox — outwardly equal conditions produce increasingly divergent results internally.

Here we come to a painful, yet key point. Humanity is indeed heterogeneous. Yet this heterogeneity cannot be reduced to social categories, wealth, education, or origin. It lies deeper — in the ability to perceive, process, and act in accordance with a higher level of meaning. This difference manifests as a **DIFFERENT DEGREE** of readiness for the transition to the next level of organization of thinking. Some are capable of moving beyond subsystem programs, while others remain their carriers forever. It is

¹ Foundations of the Formation of Humanity ("FFH") — a collective work by the authors.

precisely this difference that forms the very "dual trajectory" spoken of by philosophers, writers, and religious texts. It is important not to fall into a primitive interpretation. This is not about "higher" and "lower" people in a social or moral sense. It is about **DIFFERENT FUNCTIONS** within the overall process. Just as a rocket has stages, and each of them performs its own task. Yet only part of the structure reaches space. The rest fulfills its function and remains behind. This is not cruelty. It is functionality.

However, an ethical and philosophical dilemma arises. Should the system be oriented toward maximizing the comfort of the majority or toward realizing the potential of the minority capable of making the transition? I will give a very clear and accessible example — "The Legend of the Grand Inquisitor" — the famous philosophical poem of Ivan Karamazov from F. M. Dostoevsky's novel *The Brothers Karamazov*. In it, Christ returns to Earth in sixteenth-century Seville, where he is arrested by a 90-year-old Cardinal-Inquisitor. He condemns Jesus for having given people an unbearable burden — **freedom of will and choice**. The Inquisitor chooses stability and consolation. He chooses preservation of the system at the cost of refusing to move beyond its boundaries. He relieves a person of the tension of choice, replacing it with guaranteed, **YET LIMITED** happiness. Christ, on the other hand, points to another path — a path requiring effort, discernment, and inner overcoming, accessible to only a few. Today, this distinction can be described as follows: one path — is the fixation of the system at its current level; the other — is the transition to the next level, even at the cost of destroying the previous configuration. And then it becomes understandable why the rigid thesis of the priority of quality over quantity arises. Because the development of a system is determined not by the average temperature, rather by **POINTS OF BREAKTHROUGH**. Not by mass, rather by the vector. Yet one more step must be taken to avoid a dangerous reduction. If we accept that the "few" move forward while the "many" remain, the temptation arises to regard the majority as "expendable material." It is precisely where many philosophies and ideologies of the past arrived at destructive conclusions. In the logic of Mind, the picture is different. The majority **IS NOT** "superfluous." It is the environment from which the new is formed. It is the field in which the possibility of selection arises. Without it, the process itself is impossible. The problem lies not in difference, rather in the **ABSENCE OF A MECHANISM** of transition.



If the system does not provide those who are capable with the opportunity to transition to the next level — it degrades. If it ignores the majority — it loses stability. And therefore, the true task lies not in choosing "whom to save," rather in creating a configuration in which the possibility of mass existence is preserved, while at the same time the path forward for those capable of development **IS NOT BLOCKED**. And here we return to the original theme of the article. Because the ability to perceive a higher level of meaning **IS DIRECTLY CONNECTED** with a person's energy. One who feeds only on simple stimuli — consumption, comfort, habits — remains within a closed cycle. One who begins to perceive a goal extending beyond the limits of current existence connects to a different source. **IT IS PRECISELY THIS** that creates the divergence of trajectories. Not social, not moral, rather ontological. And then the main question ceases to be "who is higher" or "who is right." It sounds different: what exactly does a person choose as the source of one's nourishment — a closed cycle of gratification or a vector leading beyond the system. Because it is precisely this choice, and **NOT EXTERNAL** conditions, that ultimately determines where one's trajectory will lead. Here begins the next, even deeper theme: if a person is defined by what

one perceives and what one feeds upon, then is it possible to consciously change this source? And is there a way to move a person from the level of consumption to the level of engagement with Mind as a source of energy?

If we rise above the emotional layer of this fragment and bring it together into a more coherent, philosophically rich construct, what emerges is not simply a thesis about inequality, rather a much deeper line — **THE LINE OF DIFFERENCE** between levels of perception and readiness for transition. The question is no longer whether people are equal to one another — that question becomes secondary. The point is that life itself is structured as a process of stratification according to the ability to perceive meaning and act in accordance with it. And then the words: "difference — is not an error of the system, rather its working mechanism" **CEASE TO SOUND** like a provocation and begin to be perceived as a statement of fact: life does not strive toward equalization. It strives toward the manifestation of potential through difference. It is precisely for this reason that the idea of victory over death, running throughout the entire history of humanity, each time assumes a form corresponding to the level of development of the system. In one Brain genotype, it is expressed as religious faith — hope for salvation from outside. In another — as scientific inquiry, an attempt to break into the mechanism from within. Yet both remain within one and the same construct — a construct that **DOES NOT CHANGE** the system itself, rather merely attempts to adapt within it. It is here that what can be designated as a "new word" appears. Not the goal — it truly is as old as the world. Rather, the method. Because if the system reproduces death as a result, then the issue is not a lack of effort, knowledge, or resources. The issue lies in the configuration of the system itself. And then the logic becomes uncompromisingly rigid: ***it is impossible to obtain a different result without changing the architecture that produces that result.*** This is precisely the transition spoken of in "FFH" — from working within the system to working on the system.

Another important layer emerges. Relinquishing the claim to absolute truth is not a weakness of the position, rather **ITS STRENGTHENING**. Because in the logic of the Mind, truth is not fixed as a completed form. It unfolds as a process of approximation, as movement toward a more complete configuration of understanding. The words — "the deeper you dig, the greater the mystery becomes" — are not an admission of power(less)ness. They are an indication of the in(finite)ness of the object of study. Therefore, the **ONLY SUPPORT** that remains for a person is not external constructs, rather the inner vector — that which one calls one's own desires. Yet here, too, clarification is required. Desire — is not simply an impulse. It is a signal. It is a reflection of the level at which a person is situated and of the program



through which one is engaged with the system. And therefore, some desires keep a person within a closed cycle, while others — begin to lead one beyond its boundaries. It is precisely here that the key thought appears: "the issue is not where the process begins, rather which configuration is ready to receive it."

His(Torah)y shows that the starting point is **NEVER DETERMINED** by linear logic. It is not resources, not the level of development, not the "optimality" of conditions that decide. What decides is the presence of a configuration in which the following coincide: the idea, the people, and the possibility of moving beyond the familiar. Therefore, Germany, England, or the USA may be "logical" candidates, yet there is no certainty that the shift will occur precisely there. Likewise, Russia, without having "objective prerequisites," **HAS ALREADY BECOME** the turning point today. This is explained simply — the system changes not where it is

comfortable, rather where **CRITICAL TENSION** arises, capable of breaking through the current configuration. And then it becomes clear — the process is not tied to geography; it is tied to the state of the environment and to the readiness of the bearers of the idea. And therefore, the main question is *not* "where," rather "who" and "in what state." Because it is precisely through a person, through one's engagement, through one's ability to move beyond the familiar, that the system gains the possibility of changing itself. In this sense, the entire line of reasoning converges at one point: inequality — is not a social phenomenon, rather a **MANIFESTATION OF DIFFERENCE** in the degree of engagement in the process of development. And then the next step becomes inevitable.

If the new word lies in the method, if the method is the restructuring of the system, if the system is restructured through people, then a question arises that can no longer be avoided: **WHAT EXACTLY** distinguishes those who are capable of becoming carriers of this transition from those who will forever remain within the old construct? It is precisely this distinction — not external, rather fundamental — that we **HAVE ALREADY APPROACHED**...

In concluding this series of NONarticles, I hope that for the first time the reader has been able to see it not as a collection of separate reflections, rather as a **SINGLE TRAJECTORY** — a path from external forms to internal foundations, from familiar explanations to an attempt to touch the very mechanism of what is happening. Throughout the entire series, you and I have consistently peeled away the layers... First — the illusions of the system — the state, authority, social constructs that appear stable, yet in reality are merely temporary forms of organization. Then — the illusions of equality, humanism, universal truths, which at the level of words appear lofty, yet at the level of functioning turn out to be instruments of control and simplification of a complex reality. Next — the layer of habits, traditions, and norms inherited from other epochs, which have lost their connection with the environment, yet continue to determine human behavior. We saw how a person lives by inertia, dragging behind oneself the "dead horse" of the past, **WITHOUT ASKING** the question of why one is doing this. Then — the personal layer: desires, instincts, notions of what is good. We came to understand that a person **IS NOT** the source of one's desires, rather merely a carrier of programs — innate and acquired. And until one becomes aware of their origin, one does not live, rather carries out scenarios. Next — the layer of energy. We saw that a person's energy is not born in the body. It arises where a person comes into contact with meaning. Where the future appears, movement arises. Where the goal disappears — fading begins. And finally, we arrived at the central point — difference. Inequality turned out to be not social injustice, rather a fundamental property of any living system. Difference in perception, in the depth of engagement, in the ability to move beyond the limits of the current state — this is precisely the parameter that determines a person's trajectory. **THE ENTIRE SERIES OF NONARTICLES**, in essence, has come down to one simple, yet unfamiliar conclusion: *energy = meaning = engagement with one's vector, and everything else — is the noise of the system.*



I want to say that if these NONarticles seemed strange to you in places, controversial in places, or if you do not agree with them at all — there is nothing wrong with that. The main thing is that you agree with the fundamental principles — with the Goal and the Method — and are ready to move to action. Minor disagreements among like-minded people are inevitable, yet **THEY ARE ALWAYS** smoothed out in the process of moving forward. Because the meaning of all this work is not to convince, not to prove, and not even to form a single picture of the world. The meaning lies in the transition. In the transition from observation to participation. From reasoning to action. From living within the framework of the system — to attempting to change the system itself.

I have finished the "NONarticles" and will continue the "Cognition" articles precisely as I understand the realities of today and, most importantly, why these realities are exactly as they are. And if there was even one place in these texts where what arose within you was not disagreement or rejection, rather an inner response — then a point of contact already exists. And everything else — truly is not so important.

To be continued...

F. Shkrudnev

19 August 2026